

Wear the Change!

C1 | AGES 16+ | 90 MINUTES | THE EUR 300 WARDROBE CHALLENGE

S01

Your school commissions a fashion pop-up with a EUR 300 budget and space for two activities. Reconcile its appeal to students with water-related evidence, inclusion and credible communication.

YOUR COMMISSION

Choose exactly **two activities** from the cards on S03.
Spend no more than **EUR 300** and offer at least **60 activity visits** in total.
Include students who cannot bring clothes or pay.
Create a decision pitch and a 25-word event caption.

The route from wardrobe to water



A simplified route, not a measured footprint. Repair and reuse can extend an item's life. They do not erase the water already used to make it.

Working together

Read the evidence, investigate the activity cards, check the budget and negotiate using the role cards. Then pitch your plan. All event costs, capacities, suppliers and advertising claims in this case are invented for classroom use.

SUCCESS MEANS

A feasible, inclusive plan that distinguishes evidence from assumptions, anticipates an objection and proposes a meaningful evaluation.

The water behind the label

EVIDENCE DESK | READ BEFORE YOU CHOOSE

S02

01 / A NUMBER WITH A SCOPE [1]

For EU household textile purchases in 2022, the EEA estimates a supply-chain requirement of approximately **12 m³ of blue water per person**. The scope includes clothing, footwear and household textiles. Blue water denotes consumed surface water and groundwater, excluding rainwater. This aggregate indicator cannot be assigned to an individual garment.

02 / PLACE AND PROCESS MATTER [2, 4]

UNEP identifies cotton cultivation and the consumer use phase as significant for water scarcity impacts. Chemical releases during processing raise a distinct water-quality issue. A volume alone is therefore insufficient to establish local consequences; location and wastewater management also require scrutiny.

03 / MORE WEAR, NOT A MAGIC RESET [3]

Repair, swapping and restyling create opportunities to extend use. Their effect depends on subsequent behaviour and whether new purchases are displaced. Participation figures are outputs, not evidence of a quantified reduction in water consumption.

Interrogate the evidence

Distinguish aggregate consumption from product-level data, water quantity from water quality, and event participation from behavioural change.

Correct the headline “12,000 litres per T-shirt”. Specify the scope and one inference the indicator cannot support. Explain what would be needed to assess a local water impact.

Choose your two activities

CUT-OUT PLANNING CARDS | ALL FIGURES ARE FICTIONAL

S03

Costs cover each whole activity; add the costs and capacities of your chosen pair. Capacity means activity visits, not unique students: one person can visit both. Capacity is a planning estimate, not a guaranteed turnout.

A



Repair Bar

EUR 120 / 20 visits

Offer supervised minor repairs. Continued use is plausible but unverified. Complex repairs exceed the service, and participation initially depends on owning a suitable item.

B



Style Swap

EUR 90 / 40 visits

Exchange serviceable garments. Size availability and donation-based entry raise inclusion concerns. A completed exchange does not establish displacement of a new purchase.

C



Restyle Studio

EUR 180 / 25 visits

Restyle existing wardrobes without dyeing. Shared garments broaden access, but a workshop demonstration is not evidence of sustained changes in clothing use.

D



New Merch Drop

EUR 160 / 30 visits

Promote new cotton merchandise through optional paid orders. The supplier asserts "50% less water" without disclosing baseline, scope or method. Entry is free; product purchases are additional.

Run the checks

BUDGET LAB AND ADVERTISING CHECK

S04

Find the three pairs that meet both rules: no more than EUR 300 and at least 60 activity visits. Write your calculations. A financially possible plan still needs an environmental and inclusion argument.

Pair	Total cost	Visit capacity	Meets both rules?
A + B			
A + C			
A + D			
B + C			
B + D			
C + D			

AD 1 / “50% LESS WATER. BETTER FOR EVERY RIVER.”

This is the fictional supplier's claim for the New Merch Drop. No supporting report has been provided.

Identify two methodological omissions and challenge the leap from a percentage reduction to a universal environmental benefit. Draft two precise supplier questions.

AD 2 / “Every swap saves exactly 12,000 litres.”

Identify the scope error and the untested counterfactual. Replace the claim with an accurate, persuasive caption.



The planning meeting

CUT-OUT ROLE CARDS | ONE ROLE PER PERSON

S05

Assign the four perspectives. Each participant must advance an evidence-based proposal, test an assumption and negotiate a concession. With three participants, combine budget and access.

STYLE EDITOR

Secure cultural relevance without equating participation with consumption. Defend an event identity that makes repeat wear desirable.

What might make students stay away?

WATER RESEARCHER

Distinguish quantity, scarcity and quality. Challenge unjustified causal claims and state what the available evidence cannot resolve.

What can we honestly say about water?

BUDGET COORDINATOR

Test feasibility and opportunity costs. Distinguish budgeted capacity from realised participation and identify an operational uncertainty.

What are we giving up with this choice?

ACCESS ADVOCATE

Challenge exclusion built into entry rules, sizing and participation norms. Negotiate a concrete adjustment without inventing extra resources.

Who could be excluded, and how will you respond?



Make your pitch

DECISION SHEET | TWO-MINUTE TEAM PRESENTATION

S06

Our two activities: _____ + _____

Total cost: EUR _____ | Capacity: _____ activity visits

One practical access adjustment: _____

YOUR TEAM'S RECOMMENDATION

Plan here, then write 180–220 words on S07. Defend your choice using two appropriately scoped facts. Address an objection, an evidence limitation and an inclusion measure. Propose an evaluation that distinguishes attendance from behavioural change.

Precision matters: separate anticipated benefits from demonstrated outcomes. State what would count as evidence against your proposal.

PLANNING NOTES / EVIDENCE, REASONS AND ACCESS

PUBLIC CAPTION / maximum 25 words

Invite students to the event. Make it attractive and accurate. Do not invent litres saved.

Peer check: Are both constraints met? Are the facts used correctly? Is participation inclusive? Is the caption honest?



Teaching the challenge

C1 | TEACHER GUIDE | 90 MINUTES

T01

Learning outcomes: connect clothing choices to water quantity and quality; interpret the scope of a statistic; challenge advertising claims; negotiate an inclusive, budgeted plan.

Preparation: one S01–S07 set per group; S02 per learner if preferred. Cut S03 and S05 along the dashed borders. Calculators optional. No internet, purchases or real event are required.

Time	Activity
0–8	Launch S01. Ask what makes an item worth wearing again; no personal spending disclosures.
8–23	Read S02. Correct the misleading per-shirt headline and discuss quantity versus quality.
23–35	Distribute S03. Calculate all six pairs on S04.
35–48	Evaluate the two advertising claims on S04.
48–63	Assign S05 roles and negotiate a two-activity plan.
63–80	Write the pitch on S07 and caption on S06; peer-check.
80–90	Hear selected two-minute pitches and compare the trade-offs.

Differentiation

C1: require accurate scope, an objection and a counterfactual: what would participants otherwise have bought or worn? Challenge claims of causality from survey responses alone.

Participation and care

Use the fictional budget to avoid judging learners' income or clothing. Permit oral planning, a scribe or paired roles. If the event is implemented later, check supervision, garment condition, venue access and voluntary consent for any photos.

Solutions and assessment

TEACHER GUIDE | MORE THAN ONE PLAN CAN BE DEFENDED

T02

Pair	Cost	Capacity	Feasible?
A + B	EUR 210	60 visits	Yes
A + C	EUR 300	45 visits	No: below 60
A + D	EUR 280	50 visits	No: below 60
B + C	EUR 270	65 visits	Yes
B + D	EUR 250	70 visits	Yes
C + D	EUR 340	55 visits	No: both rules

Evidence and advertising

12 m³ = 12,000 litres. This is an EU per-person supply-chain estimate for a year's textile purchases, not one shirt or one swap. It excludes rainwater. AD 1 omits the comparison baseline, production scope and verification; it cannot establish a benefit for every river. AD 2 misuses the unit and assumes a swap avoids a purchase.

Possible revised claim: "Swap your style. Give existing clothes another chance to be worn." No precise water saving is established by the case.

A defensible plan

B + C costs EUR 270 and provides 65 visits. Offer access to the swap without a compulsory donation, using available donated stock; provide shared garments for styling. Do not guarantee every size. Ask after four weeks whether an item is still worn and whether it replaced a planned purchase. Responses suggest behaviour; they do not quantify litres saved.

A + B is also feasible. B + D is financially feasible but needs a strong explanation of the new-purchase incentive and the unsupported supplier claim. There is no mandatory winning pair.

Assessment / five criteria, 0–2 points each

Feasible calculations; correct use of water evidence; critical claim-checking; practical inclusion; clear C1 communication. 0 = absent/inaccurate, 1 = partial, 2 = clear and justified. Reward reasoning, not choosing the teacher's preferred pair.



Sources and use

TEACHER REFERENCE | ORIGINAL CLASSROOM SCENARIO

T03

The evidence desk uses short original summaries of EEA and UNEP publications. Bracketed numbers refer to the sources below. The activity cards, role cards, budgets and advertising statements are original fictional teaching examples, not descriptions of real brands.

1 / EEA: Water use for EU textile consumption

Indicator for EU household textile purchases in 2022. Check the unit, product scope and blue-water definition.

OPEN SOURCE

2 / UNEP: Textile value chain, global stocktaking (2020)

Background on water scarcity impacts across the textile value chain, including cotton cultivation and the consumer use phase.

OPEN SOURCE

3 / UNEP: A pollution-free planet, textiles

Background on repair, reuse, swapping and reducing unnecessary consumption.

OPEN SOURCE

4 / UNEP: Reducing chemical waste in textiles (2022)

Background on chemical releases and water-quality concerns in textile processing.

OPEN SOURCE

USING THE MATERIAL

Original EU4Blue worksheets and vector illustrations. Free educational use and adaptation; not for resale. Supplied logos and linked source materials retain their own rights. No EEA or UNEP endorsement is implied.