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The “Inter-Agency Peace Education Program” or PEP is designed for educators in formal and non-formal settings, and for agencies which implement education activities on behalf of the government. PEP was a vision of UNHCR, translated into a program through the inputs of refugees in Dadaab and Kakuma, Kenya.

Following the Machel Study on The Impact of Armed Conflict on Children (1996), UNHCR and its field partner piloted a life skills-based Peace Education Program. It was initially started in the refugee camps of Kakuma and Dadaab in Kenya in 1997, where it was obvious that refugees, while escaping from conflict zones in their home countries, also created and had to deal with conflict in the refugee camps.[1] There was a major outbreak of violence in a refugee camp in Kakuma and 17 people were killed. PEP was subsequently introduced in some UNHCR-supported programs in Africa and elsewhere for refugees and other conflict-affected populations, drawing initially on a UNHCR trust fund for children. National educators were employed as trainers in several countries, and trained refugee educators as peace education teachers.[2]

Long-held biased attitudes and behaviors created conflict from the home countries, followed the refugees, and created problems in the camp. At an administrative level, community services officers and protection staff were convened to come up with an approach that would start with peace education, rather than with human rights, so that students and participants learned about peaceful problem solving before facing issues.

PEP is derived from the belief that peace can be fostered in both peaceful and post-conflict situations through the adoption of peace-promoting behavior and by the practice of specific peace related skills, which can be taught in a participatory approach.

PEP was designed to incorporate a school aspect and a community aspect. The creators aimed to create a supportive environment for the children both in and out of school. As such, community participatory process has been vital to the success of PEP.

The program has three main components, which encompass all potential school and out-of-school youth, camp leaders and secondary school graduates in the camp, illiterate adults, housewives, and potential PEP teachers. The first component is the formal education or school program. The second is the non-formal or community workshop for adults and out-of-school youth, which is the most dynamic element in the entire program. And the third is the training program for teachers and facilitators.
In general, the same topics are covered in both the formal and non-formal courses; however, they are covered in different ways. The formal education component concentrates on building concepts through “inductive reasoning” using games and activities followed by class discussions and reflection. The non-formal component focuses on “deductive reasoning,” moving from general concepts to specific actions through activities and discussions.

The teachers participate in on-going training, which focuses on teaching methodology, the philosophy of peace, psychology, and classroom management as well as content. Furthermore, the facilitators also have on-going training as well as bi-monthly professional development sessions.

The objectives of PEP can be summarized as follows:

- PEP educators strive to promote proactive peace; and
- PEP educators teach peace building skills to pre-empt conflicts, including an initiation into mediation techniques for conflict prevention and dispute containment.

PEP is therefore a skills-acquisition program aimed at behavior development and behavior change. Staff teach peace building skills to pre-empt conflict. PEP uses a variety of activities for teaching and learning effectiveness in the program, focusing on specific skills in each workshop and lesson. Some of the skills that the program targets include: enhanced listening, speaking and silence; trust and empathy; assertiveness deriving from one’s self-esteem and self-image; taking increased individual and social responsibility for one’s life and decisionemotions; and mediation derived from an increased attitude of tolerance and open-mindedness.[3]

Experiential learning and participatory approaches mainly characterize the program. PEP aims at improving the quality of life for all refugees in the long-term.

PEP focuses on conflict prevention, not conflict resolution. The program teaches conflict mediation techniques, which promote the active participation of the students and participants. It is concerned with finding win-win, durable solutions. The emphasis on preventive action will produce more satisfying long-term positive outcomes for everyone, in preference to intrusive methods with less durable outcomes.[5] The program is very interactive and activity oriented, so that participants have an opportunity to internalize the necessary attitudes so that change in behavior is more likely occur. Without the internalization of peace-oriented values and the repeated practice of peace-oriented skills, there will be little transfer of constructive behavior from the classroom to the world. Educators from PEP believe that peace cannot be taught, but it can be learned. The components of peaceful behavior can be learned if the participants have the
opportunity to develop and practice the behaviors through sequential, structured activities, and see these behaviors modeled.

The school program is a series of activities, games, songs, stories, and role-plays. There are almost no theories or academic components. For the community program, the workshop is followed with follow up meetings to deal with issues raised by the participants or about problems in the refugee camps.[6]

Peace education goes beyond approaches based predominantly on academic study and training. Academic study is often too removed from the real world application, and the practical implications or impact. An education project may fail to produce students able to pass state-wide exams, but may succeed in reducing tensions between particular social groups by creating and institutionalizing a non-threatening and constructive environment that increases neutral contact and decreases misunderstanding by dispelling stereotypes and misconceptions.[7]

According to Pamela Baxter, one of the creators of this program, many people misunderstand what peace really means. It is not just an absence of conflict, but it is a long process of educating people. Before, people conflated the absence of conflict with peace, when in fact peace has to be proactive. PEP emphasizes proactive peace, not “passive peace,” by letting people practice peace concepts repeatedly in order to reestablish societal norms.[8]

The program teaches the skills and values associated with peaceful behaviors. The program is designed to enable and encourage people to think constructively about issues, both physical and social, and to develop constructive attitudes towards living together and solving problems that arise in their communities through peaceful means. The program allows the learners to practice these skills and helps them discover the benefits for themselves so that they psychologically ‘own’ the skills and behaviors. No individual can learn peaceful behaviors instantly, and if programs to change or develop behaviors are to succeed, they must be both activity based and sustained through a structured and sustained program.[9]

The program also helps people see that peace is personal, not for the sole responsibility of the government. Before participating, many people had just heard of peace treaties, but never understood they were involved. The program brings peace to an individual level. In the past, local people looked up to the elders in their communities to solve problems. According to Baxter, there was a woman in a camp saying that before she entered the program she did not know that she could make a decision herself. She thought she had to listen to the elders. She did not understand that she could take responsibility for her life.

Many activities are based on the idea “what happens if?” What happens if the individual affects the whole community or group? For example, what happens if you play a game in a group and someone drops a ball on you in your team? Group
activities make society function. If you drop the ball, you have to get the ball you cannot wait or hope for others to go pick it up.[10]

There is also the "Exclusion Game," where you tell one person to leave the room while the rest form a circle, and the other person has to try to break the circle. Another activity is, "One Hand Clapping," during which the students are asked to put one hand behind their back and then to clap. They must use each other’s hands, and this activity reinforces group collectivity.[1]

Peace education is an evolving field. Educational and training materials are continuously being produced and revised. It is a dynamic work-in-progress. There is growing international demand for programs to teach conflict prevention skills in multiple languages.
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Background

The PEP was initially developed in the Kakuma and Dadaab refugee camps in Eastern Kenya. These camps were chosen because ethnic tensions had led to an uprising amongst Sudanese refugees in 1995 and 1996. Pamela Baxter, the curriculum creator, held over eighty community meetings to assess needs and get community input into the program’s content and methods. The program officially began in 1998 and ran until 2005 when UNHCR cut its funding.

Participation and Implementation

The program started with the adult community and school components. However, waiting lists became so long that the youth component was also developed. By 2001, only halfway through the program, 12,000 youth and adults and 200,000 children had participated in the program (Obdura, 2002). Ten sessions were running at any given time in the camps, and there were still waiting lists.

Impact

UNHCR conducted an evaluation of the programs in 2002 and found that the program was highly successful and had a significant positive impact on peace in both camps. A baseline study had been conducted before the program started, so the follow-up evaluation was able to show change. The report found the following positive impacts (Obdura, 2002):

- Conflict prevention
- Resolution of small disputes
- Conflict escalation prevention
- Improved camp security and less crime
- More/better inter-group interaction and integration
- Emerging spontaneous/unplanned effects: in the camps, initiatives by refugees to follow up and spread PEP in the home country
- Increased confidence and skills of PEP educators
- Daily demonstration in schools of non-violent, supportive teacher/pupil relations

The report also highlighted some stories showing positive impacts. For example, PEP educators were called into a local Kenyan police station to resolve a dispute, showing not only community appreciation for the program, but confidence in its effectiveness from Kenyan institutions.

Lessons Learned and Challenges
First, the strength of the program rests on the teachers. Its success requires ongoing, high-quality training (ideally 30 days per year) and supervision. All facilitators/teachers went through the program themselves. If they did not embrace the values and behaviors the program espoused, they could not be effective teachers. Supervisors and teachers were paid and respected in the community. Budgets and staff allocations for training and supervision must be prioritized. High teacher turnover was a challenge because teachers were often resettled or moved in the camps. Second, the program was successful because the community was consulted from the start and it had buy-in from elders and religious leaders. Third, the program breaks behavior down into a set of sequential skills. Although the program is made to be modified in terms of its activities and stories, as such the core steps and sequence should be followed. For this reason it should also be implemented on a small scale and be allowed to grow organically. Next, gender must be specifically addressed through recruitment, training, curriculum, and class management. The program teaches potentially controversial attitudes about respect for women and children. Finally, funding was ultimately the program’s greatest challenge, as the program was cut in 2005 despite its documented success and implementation in 11 countries. It is assumed that the program continued to some extent after 2005 through community initiative, but little is known or documented.

Kenya 2008

The program was initiated again in 2008 after the post-election conflicts. The Kenyan government contacted the UN to bring the program back, showing that its impact and popularity lasted. Pamela Baxter trained government leaders and teachers on the program. The government modified it to the situation by adding information on citizenship. Unfortunately Ms. Baxter was not informed about what happened with the program after those training sessions.
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CASE STUDY 2: GHANA (2007)

Background

The Liberian conflict that led to over millions of citizens fleeing the country occurred between three ethnic groups; Krahn, Gio, and Mano. Conflict between these ethnic groups began when Samuel Doe became President in 1980. Doe, who was from the Krahn ethnic group, designated all key public position within society and the army to members from the Krahn. When a failed coup occurred to change this, the military targeted the Mio and Mano ethnic group, killing 3000 civilians.

Between 1989 and 2003, two coups occurred, the first transpired with Charles Taylor starting a rebellion against Doe and the Krahn. Taylor mobilized a group of soldiers from the Gio and Mano ethnic group, which ended when Charles Taylor won the presidential election. Only after two years in office a rebel group started as second civil war, forcing Taylor out of office in 2003.

Participation and Implementation

During the course of the conflict at least 200,000 people were killed, 1.2 million were internally displaced, and 750,000 left Liberia. One of the refugee camps where Liberian refugees lived was in Ghana. It was established in 1990 in Buduburam, which was located west of the capital city, Accra. Although the camp was designated to house 5000 people, it swelled to close to 40,000 refugees. In 2007, there were 80,000 Liberian refugees in West Africa.

In the initial set-up of the camp, hostilities existed between the different ethnic groups. To ameliorate the ethnic tensions in the Buduburam camp, international organizations developed programming around reconciliation and other conflict-based programming. Although, refugees understood the importance of the need for ethnic groups to live peacefully, and concurred with this need; however, there was still prejudice and suspicions prevalent in the camp. PEP was one of the methods used to ease tensions and begin the reconciliation process within the Liberian refugee camp.

PEP for this particular assessment commenced with Friederike Feuchte and Andreas Beelmann, Ph.D students from the University of Jena. They started off with a 4-day training of trainers using PEP’s training manual in community workshops. Over the course of four days twelve Liberian refugees were trained from the Center for Youth Education, a NGO who had previously implemented peace programs with youth and adults. One of the objectives of the training of trainers was to expose and develop the facilitator’s approach when leading
interactive activities, group discussions and PEP’s principles in adult learning.

At the conclusion of the training of trainers, the twelve Liberian facilitators led two three hour workshops per day, for three days a week over the course of two weeks. The topics covered during those two weeks of workshops included conflict management theory, trust, one-way and two-way communications, active listening, bias, stereotypes, prejudice, empathy, cooperation, emotions, mediation and reconciliation. Exercises used to transfer knowledge and skills included group activities and discussions, brainstorms, using text to discuss empathy and role-play.

In total, 101 Liberians and one Ghanaian participated in the workshop series. The Liberians participating in the workshops belonged to all ethnic tribes. The tribe most prevalent in the trainings was the Krahn making up 36% of all participants. Men dominated in the workshops comprising at (73%), with a significantly lower amount for women at (27%). The age range was 15 to 53 years of age, with a mean of 32 years. Christian constituted about 93% of the adults involved in the workshops, while 3% were Muslims. Most of the participant’s education level ranged from 5 to 20 years, and 70% were unemployed. Overall, Liberians lived for an average of 9 year in the Buduburran camp.

Impact

Throughout the training and assessment of PEP in Ghana many positive outcomes occurred for the Liberian refugees. Participants felt more trust towards other people, enhanced their knowledgeable about peaceful conflict resolutions, higher readiness for reconciliation and more positive evaluation of other Liberian ethnic groups. The reception of PEP was not only appreciated, but the value of the program was evident to participants before the workshop’s series conclusion. During the course of one of the trainings a conflict occurred between some of the males in the group and the international female volunteers. Since the group just learned methods to resolve conflicts the facilitator used this opportunity to have the participants mediate the situation. The outcome was a positive resolution to the issue that arose, allowing participants to see the value and practical application of the skills they just learned.

The integration of PEP into the community is another impact of the program. Eleven months after the workshop Friederike Feuchte interviewed twenty-nine participants who stated that they had applied the skills learned in PEP in different areas of their life. When interviewed each of the twenty-nine participants they were able to recall information presented in the workshop and could list some of the topics covered. Out of the twenty-nine, twenty-two stated that they had developed friendships with other from the workshop. In addition, they commented that they would recommend PEP workshops to others, and were convinced that they would use the skills when they returned to Liberia.
Lesson Learned and Challenges

While working on PEP in Ghana some challenges surfaced throughout the process. One such area was guiding the facilitators into a more interactive approach in discussions and activities. Due to their previous teaching methods, it was hard to adapt to a different lecture style. Since the success of transferring knowledge and skills depended on the engagement of the participants, it is paramount that the trainers are coached and encouraged to adapt their teaching methods to that of PEP. Being able to elicit information from passive participants as well as learning how to navigate large groups successfully also posed a problem during the workshops.

Another factor, that was a challenge, was how to address the aspect of culture, values, beliefs, and religion within PEP. In PEP, culture is not a topic which is addressed, but participants bring in their own beliefs with regards to culture, tradition, and religion. As such, it would be beneficial to have guidance from PEP on this matter, to help facilitators be more cultural sensitive and conscious when leading workshops of groups.
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Background

Following the Portuguese decolonization of Timor-Leste in 1974, the Indonesian military headed an operation to invade and occupy the territory for twenty-four years. After a UN-supervised referendum, and an agreement between Indonesia, Portugal, and the United States, Timor-Leste declared independence on May 20, 2002. Nevertheless, the political situation has remained tenuous and in 2006 the country went through another civil crisis.

During this crisis, CARE International Timor-Leste began to design and establish a peace-building project. The PEP was incorporated into the project for its simplicity, clarity, and adaptability to the country context. CARE also decided on the program because of its ability to be freely utilized by anyone. CARE currently implements the program, with support from the Ministry of Education and donor support from UNDP and USAID.

Participation and Implementation

A local NGO, working on the promotion of peace and democracy in the country, conducted a three-day workshop on the basics of peace and conflict resolution for 179 civic education teachers from 147 pre-secondary schools in all districts throughout the country. Aside from the initial training, there was also a three-day refresher training and there continues to be classroom monitoring to assure implementation of the activities and to offer support to the teachers.

Since the target audience is pre-secondary school students, the project has used the lessons and materials from grades 6-8 in the Teacher Activity Book. The peace education materials, such as the manual, storybooks, flip charts, role-plays, proverbs, and perception cards (developed by the INEE working group) were translated into the two official languages of Tetun and Portuguese. The material has also been adapted to the Timorese context. For example, the names of characters in stories have been localized; Timorese proverbs about peace have been added to the proverbs activity; and a set of posters has been designed with Timorese children to convey the main elements of peace education.

Another component of the project has given small grants ($350 maximum) to student groups in order to implement peace-building activities within their schools and communities. The majority of the activities have been sports tournaments, the
painting of peace slogans on school walls, peace poetry and music competitions, traditional dance and culture festivals, and a regular peace-building magazine for children and teachers.

**Impact**

The trained civic education teachers are currently teaching peace education to approximately 12,000 pre-secondary students. In Timor-Leste, pre-secondary officially encompasses ages 12-15, but often includes older students due to grade repetition. Thorough information regarding the impact of the program is not yet available, as the project is still ongoing. The final evaluation will be conducted sometime in April 2009, after the project has been completed.

**Lessons Learned and Challenges**

CARE found that some of the concepts in the manual were too complicated for the majority of the civic education teachers, affecting the comprehension of the topics. Since the country is in a post-conflict situation, the level of educational background has greatly varied among the teachers. Aside from educational background, the amount of time and the number of teachers available to participate in the trainings has been limited as well by official policies from the Ministry of Education.

While CARE has found the PEP to be easily transferable to different environments, the language translation, cultural relevancy and simplification of the materials has taken time and has lost some of the quality of the original program. For instance, although the Teacher Activity Book has been translated into both Portuguese and Tetun, the Portuguese version contains many errors and the trainers were unable to conduct the training in Portuguese.

The program has been successful and eagerly accepted by teachers and students who are both very interested in learning about the different components of building peace. Furthermore, because the training was conducted by a local NGO, there has been a great sense of trust between the teachers and the trainers, assisting the implementation process. The classroom follow-up visits also were a source of motivation and the teachers were highly appreciative. Lastly, the Ministry of Education has been supportive, highly influencing the success level as well.

**Future of the Project**

There is interest from the Ministry of Education to incorporate the PEP manual, or elements of it, into the new pre-secondary civic education curriculum, which is still in the process of being designed.
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CASE STUDY 4: SUDAN (2003-2006)

Background

In Southern Sudan, the majority of the peace education activities were implemented through a partnership between the Catholic Relief Services (CRS), the Catholic Diocese of Rumbek (DOR), the Diocese of Torit (DOT), and the UNHCR Regional Support Hub, located in Nairobi, Kenya. The objectives of these activities were twofold: to train 250 teachers on how to use high-quality education methodologies and how to incorporate peace-building activities into their lesson plans; and to implement peace education and other peace-building programs in 50 schools. As such, the principal target populations for the PEP were initially teachers, who subsequently targeted school children.

Participation and Implementation

Three hundred teachers were trained in Chukudum and Ikotos (in the Eastern Equatoria State), and in Rumbek, Marial Lou, and Mapourdit (in the Lakes State), through this joint initiative between UNHCR, CRS, DOR, and DOT. The program implementers also included refugee communities, returnees, UNHCR-partner NGOs, and government representatives. Many of these teachers were Sudanese. More specifically, the teachers were either Sudanese "returnee" teachers, who were once in exile in Kenya and Uganda, or were Sudanese volunteer "stayee" teachers. During school holidays, the teachers participated in 3 phases of PEP teacher training. Each training phase was conducted over an 8-day period, which trained teachers in active learning and teaching methods, and the core concepts of the PEP.

Impact

The impact of the PEP can be qualitatively measured by feedback from refugees, beneficiaries, and partner organizations. Especially, the rights-based approach in the PEP has been well received. For many of the affected people, this component of the PEP creates contextual and practical meaning behind some of more abstract international legal documents such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention on the Elimination on all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and the 1951 Refugee Convention. Most importantly, the PEP allows for the space in public discourse to talk about the idea of peace, even if conflict is ongoing.

Two statements below from PEP facilitators at the Fugnido Camp in Ethiopia for
Sudanese refugees, illustrate this point:

“...There is a great influence [of the Peace Education Programme] and even church leaders are asking for copies of the community workshops manual because these concepts are important in churches as well...” (Mathew Mayom, Community Services Agent and PEP Facilitator).

“... We are not only conducting community workshops but also involved in community problem solving ...” (Dobuoul Wang, Community Services Agent and Peace Education Facilitator).

**Lessons Learned and Challenges**

An encouraging lesson learned from the South Sudan case, was that the original UNHCR PEP developed into a larger community-based program, which also reached adults. This reinforced the core skills, values, behaviors, and attitudes that children learned in school, because adults were also learning the same concepts. To expand on the PEP, a good lesson learned is to allow for community workshops to be open to self-selected participants, so that everyone in the community - children and adults - understand the message that everyone has a stake and responsibility in maintaining peace.

However, an ongoing challenge to implementation of the PEP is language barriers. Additionally, language barriers exacerbate the difficulty in communicating concepts like perception, stereotypes, bias, discrimination, and prejudice. To effectively communicate these core components of the PEP, one must have an advanced skill of translating not only the words, but also the concepts.

**Future of the Project**

In Southern Sudan, a plan has been initiated to include Peace and Civic Education into primary school curriculum.
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RECOMMENDATIONS

Through literature review and interviews with practitioners of the PEP around the world, our team has developed recommendations for good practices and opportunities for future use. The recommendations, which developed out of the key lessons learned and challenges, are both micro and macro-level recommendations in that they span from on the ground implementation to policy and advocacy.

MICRO-LEVEL

The first micro level recommendation is the need for translation of the PEP materials into local languages, taking into consideration local contexts, religion, and culture. Effective translation is needed to communicate core concepts and words in the PEP.

Secondly, ongoing high-quality teacher training and outreach are necessary for capacity building, sustainability of programming, and effective knowledge transfer. The PEP stands or falls based on the quality of the teaching and facilitation. As such, the categories of PEP professionals requiring training in the program include: teachers, facilitators, trainers, advisers, monitors, program developers; and managers at field, national and regional levels.

Additionally, local staff, facilitators, and teachers must be trained not only in PEP content and methods, but also in the values, skills, and attitudes that the program aims to impart on participants. Ideally, teachers and facilitators must also participate in the program before training to teach it. Unless the facilitators and teachers themselves demonstrate the skills, values, and attitudes of PEP (i.e. ethics, integrity), they cannot help students to acquire these skills. Thus, it is suggested that PEP administrators increase the number of workshops and participants per year; allow for 30 days of training divided throughout the year with local and regional trainers; and establish a regional post for a senior experienced trainer and a training planner.

However, even with ample training opportunities and workshops in a community, the PEP program will fail without the support from local NGOs, and local community and religious leaders. By focusing on elders and traditional leaders, and existing on-the-ground actors, PEP implementers can build trust in order to facilitate community participation.

Regarding the implementation of the PEP, it is recommended that practitioners follow the sequence of the module, as skills are built upon each other. The program breaks down peaceful behavior into a set of sequential skills, as such, if steps are skipped, the program will be less effective. In addition, some practitioners
recommended that the PEP class occupy its own particular class time, outside of regular school.

Regarding the development of the PEP curriculum, several recommendations came out of the research. Principally, developers must be intellectually objective and rigorous, ensuring that each activity is purposeful and not filling the program with activities that lack purpose. When designing curriculum, one must keep things simple at first, and build upon core concepts gradually. More specifically, there should be more exercises that promote personal and intergroup friendships (e.g. work in pairs, getting to know each other more personally), and more information about human rights, including some content about the history of different human rights. It is recommended to include differentiated information about reconciliation (e.g. When is it possible to forgive? What does reconciliation really entail?); and to include some optional lessons, depending on the context (e.g. role of culture, religion, collective narratives in conflict, and information about post-traumatic stress disorder if counseling can be provided).

Additionally, activities and examples in the Teacher Activity Book should be contextualized, as some teachers struggled to identify with the materials and to suitably adapt them to their context. Finally, the teacher-training materials should be polished, revised, and up-dated to ensure the best possible training, taking special consideration for trainers with basic education.

It is recommended that the PEP typology be promoted and expanded to other contexts, as the PEP materials can serve as the foundation or boilerplate for new programs. Developers can use the structure, concepts and skill sets to build their own program. For example, by 2005, PEP was implemented in 11 countries. In 2008, the Kenyan government adapted the PEP for use after the post-election conflicts. In Liberia, a human rights focus was added. Additionally, other models of the program that have been used include, the Dadaab model (to refugees only), the Kakuma model (to refugees and host nationals near camps, separately); the Uganda model (to refugees and nationals integrated populations); and the DRC/Eritrea Model (to refugees and nationals that integrate into the national school systems).

MACRO-LEVEL

Advocacy, information sharing and evaluation
At the macro level, it is recommended to create a “Peace Education Community” online in order to promote the PEP more effectively. The INEE can play an important role by improving its web site, which can enhance communication among the Peace Education Community. Information dissemination inside and outside the implementing agency, and the development of briefing mechanisms for the PEP staff awareness and information sharing are necessary for the promotion of the
Pamela Baxter suggested that advocacy is needed within the UN and among aid donors, and sufficient awareness among some senior agency managers is needed of the PEP objectives, processes, and targets.

At the field level, networking and gaining recognition for the PEP in-camp, in the diaspora, and integrating the PEP into official camp security activities should be considered, as each camp needs a strong local PEP management presence. For this reason, commitment and support from donors and their regional and branch office is crucial. In this sense, we recommend that capacity building of the PEP itself is necessary for the promotion of the PEP.

More evaluation of the PEP should be shared through the INEE web site, including a fact sheet of best practices and lessons learned. This way, the PEP can easily be accessed. Information sharing among implementing agency is crucial as the peace education is still an evolving field. Not just improving accessibility and awareness, it is also recommended to develop sufficiently focused and structured monitoring mechanism and advisory services for teacher and facilitators for further improvement of the PEP.

Funding
As the PEP in Kenya had to be terminated in 2005 because of the lack of the funding, funding is the important part of recommendation our team would like to highlight. Funding needs to be adequate for teacher and facilitator trainings. First, it is recommended that donors should increase funding to the PEP and make sure that funding is allocated specifically for peace education, as this is often not a priority area. Re-allocation of budgets is also recommended so that teacher and facilitator training, and advisory support are strengthened. Pamela Baxter believes that there is demand for more community-based programs for children and youth out of school due to a low school enrollment rate. As such, it is recommended the PEP should have more staff to address those needs.

Coordination
It is recommended that implementing agencies should be coordinated to promote and enhance the PEP. First, it is recommended that the PEP material restore the UNICEF label on the cover of the curriculum, as this would help UNICEF staff accept the materials. Second, in order to incorporate the PEP into the curriculum and to ensure the sustainability and continuity of the PEP, the Ministry of Education and local NGO’s participation is necessary.

Gender and vulnerable populations, i.e. women, illiterate people, disabled people
There should be more focus on gender and vulnerable populations within the PEP. Development of materials that are more inclusive of disabled people is recommended, as many of the activities are experiential and physical. It is also necessary to address gender and the PEP power structure through recruitment
measures, gender training, curriculum review, method development, and class administration and management.

Human Resources
Lastly, developing a PEP career structure for senior refugee PEP staff across the region is recommended to demonstrate the career potential of the PEP and the genuine commitment of the international community in providing refugees with professional development.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARE International - Timor Leste</td>
<td>Teodosio B. Ximenes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:teodosio5@gmail.com">teodosio5@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE International - Timor Leste</td>
<td>Ginny Kintz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ginnykintz@pobox.com">ginnykintz@pobox.com</a></td>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich-Schiller University</td>
<td>Friederike Feuchte</td>
<td><a href="mailto:friederike.feuchte@uni-jena.de">friederike.feuchte@uni-jena.de</a></td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Ronja Hoelzer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ronja.hoelzer@gtz.de">ronja.hoelzer@gtz.de</a></td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Education Associates (HREA)</td>
<td>Felisa Tibbitts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ftibbitts@hrea.org">ftibbitts@hrea.org</a></td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iEarn Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@iearnsierraleone.org">info@iearnsierraleone.org</a></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Consultant</td>
<td>Phyllis Kotte</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phylliskotte@yahoo.com">phylliskotte@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief International</td>
<td>Rowan Salim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rowan@iri.org">rowan@iri.org</a></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Youssif Ahmed Adam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adamy@unhcr.org">adamy@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Amniata Gueye</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gueye@unhcr.org">gueye@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Caroline Aasheim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aasheim@unhcr.org">aasheim@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Anna Buskens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buskens@unhcr.org">buskens@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Luisa Cremonese</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cremonese@unhcr.org">cremonese@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Zahra Mirghani</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mirghani@unhcr.org">mirghani@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Stephane Jaquemet</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaquemet@unhcr.org">jaquemet@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Naoko Obi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:obi@unhcr.org">obi@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Ruvena Zaballa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zaballa@unhcr.org">zaballa@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Vick Ikobwa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ikobwa@unhcr.org">ikobwa@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Wella Kouyou</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kouyou@unhcr.org">kouyou@unhcr.org</a></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR (formerly)</td>
<td>Pamela Baxter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pamelabaxter@gmail.com">pamelabaxter@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR (formerly)</td>
<td>Margaret Sinclair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margaret.sinclair@yahoo.com">margaret.sinclair@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Linda Jones</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lJones@unicef.org">lJones@unicef.org</a></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2:
INTERVIEW WITH PAMELA BAXTER

What are the basic concepts of PEP that most people do not have the clearest sense of or misunderstand?

The term peace education program has already been chosen by Magaret Sinclaire. Reasons why?

1. Practical reason: high commissioner at UNHCR at the time, very support of a proactive approach in peace building. Prevent refugee situation from happening. 2. There was a major outbreak of violent in Kakuma. 17 ppl were killed. Ppl now saw the need of conflict resolution/peace education. 3. Susana from UNICEF has created conflict resolution foundation working for developing countries, but her main base is in the US. Examples were inappropriate people didn’t really understand what exactly that is. Never Pam choice to call peace education. In the early days, international label office, target audiences. What is peace actually mean? It’s not just an absence of conflict, but long process of education. Proactive. In the past look at “passive peace”. They thought absence of conflict equal peace. BUT I had a guy apply for international office in Kenya, was retired from Kenyan civil services. I asked what do u think peace education means and what would u do? I work in peace education for 27 years I know exactly what PE means. The other misconception is that people see it as fussy bureaucratic process. All nice to each other and if that happen we would have peace. One bastard will come in to take control. It been notion. Lack of understanding.

All peace education program then should be proactive that teaches people skills and appropriate behavior. It’s like raising people, raising children same concept. Especially societal norms. Pragmatic. Before it was like look up for the elders will look up to that. Then the conflict normally escalates before the elders come in to take a look. Not structural framework.

Short answer they don’t answer it should be proactive. Not passive peace. And it’s teaching basic skills based program.

Already answered my second question. Look up the video. The girl said before enter the program I didn’t know I can make a decision myself I thought have to listen to the elders. I did not understand that I could take a responsibility on/of my life. Like that I can take.

2. I would like to ask you regarding the core principle of PEP. How do you instill idea that it is also an individual responsibility in maintaining peace, not only community leaders? We mix with concepts with the activities. Based on the idea “what happen if”. experience learning. What happen if the tiny aspect of individual role. What
happen if you play a game in a group and someone drops a ball on you in your team. What people did not understand, To get it right. Everybody was like “go get the ball!”

Group activities to make the society function. If you drop the ball you have to get the ball you can’t wait or hopes for others to go pick it up. We do lots of things like that

Kids pick up on this thing very quickly. With adults it is more difficult. And community and religious leaders all have a level of power that they’re not necessarily willing to give up. To Chantal, lesson learned

Rule number 1: do the initial meeting, do initial community workshop with the community leaders. They say the approval first. I say to them about we here to keep the peace to make sure the society function. Like the small things that people can solve by themselves should not bother them. Solve small problems will release you from the problems. They picked it up very well.

In Kakuma then I had to listen to them everything now my life is a lot easier.

3. Where else PEP has been implemented, except Sierra Leone, Kenya, Timor Leste, Iraq/Jordan, and Ghana?
When I did it in Ghana I never sure that we received from UNHCR money they re in control. The people on the ground were obliged to report back. So you got number and quantify data all the structure in place. That only works for the countries we get funding. Ghana Sri Lanka Bangladesh it was not central money they were under no obligation to let me know what they do with the program. The money came centrally from UNCHR now it goes to given to INEE. Sierra Leone, Timore and Afghanistan. Nobody ahs obligation but Allison reported us as courtesy.

In the old days UNHCR funded it was in Ethiopia. Uganda, Ghini, Liberia. Pakistan. Nepal went through UNESCO and now UNICEF has taken over.

Thailand is not a developing country it is a middle income country. People go to NGO to work. Burma Vietnam Laos and Cambodia. Thailand looks like the queen of the region

INNE in Afghanistan. Go check this one!

4. In your opinion, what areas do you feel have been most successful about the program?
When I started the program, the activity book did not get incorporated. A school program to teach peace education. When I did my research, it was just call “talk to the people” now it is called “participatory-action research”.

How do you know what work ad what is not so you have to talk to the people. What they wanted to learn. Create community program.

Geneva: the boss said yes. Money was ready. Community program. Before we sent in teachers they needed community workshop themselves. They cannot absorb all knowledge and transfer immediately to the kids. You don’t have to love mathematics to teach mathematics they can be good teachers.

You have to love the idea of peace education to teach it instead and that is the whole idea of it.

Ironically, the single most successful of program has been the community program. The workshop for adults.

Reasons:
1. it is two weeks long.
   in post conflict era, normally do two weeks full time. But they cant really absorb all that in such an intense time. In Liberia, they would come in to town attend the workshop and never go back because travelling would waste more time. They could come to workshop for weeks.
   So the community component has been the most successful part of the program.

Recently, in Sierra Leon and Liberia, people came back to me and say let them know how to apply the program but they never understood clearly. I write in my final report. Two weeks is really hard for intensive training. It is sort of like school program, the most successful is adult at the beginning. If teachers don’t understand what is the program since the beginning and how the process works how are they going to teach. So yes the adult program is the most successful part.

5. What are the feedbacks you have received from different agencies after implementing PEP?
IRC has a different ways of approaching the program they implement it as part of curriculum, which in many ways marginalize it. All sort of problem associate with implementation

Not taken seriously and not examinable.
People get pissed off. They teach it at after schools and that mean you got limited number of children involved, not taken seriously by the kids and the schools.
IRC considers the program to be successful. There was a scandal in West Africa three years ago. UNHCR and all NGOs on the grounds selling the food instead of giving for free. A few researchers uncovered that. UNHCR came to me. Really was
shocking, it was all made up and UN didn’t do anything about it. The media exposed. One recommendation from that situation is to expand peace education program. We cannot afford it we don’t have any money,

It was the strongest piece of feedback not what anybody said but what ppl picked it up and said it. In countries that strongly racially different like Sierra Leon and Iraq, it took me 10 years that u have to create program that specifically match the culture because you can’t transfer program from different culture to another. Have to create program initially pretty much every ethnic group in West Africa. They are not the same. Every culture in the world agrees that “respect” is the most fundamental thing in every culture. Maybe a little bit different on how you show that respect. You have to recognize that and embody it into your program. Brand new culture norm you have to work with that. That was the first element.

The second element:
In Kenya, the staffs work very hard and become own bias and prejudice. In Kakuma, basic rules, all boys and all girls teams, u need to scatter them around. Of course that team with a girl with a leader won. He was so devastated. African man came from traditional culture, normally they would have mothers, sisters and wives carry the water after exercise they were like now no more I would carry for them. I will never ask them to carry the water again. So the adult program has lots of different things that are cultural sensitive an adapt to the course. So it works well.

6. What are the opportunities for future use or ways in which the PEP could be used but has not yet?

PEP is being used as like a model manual. It is very comprehensive but not a perfect program. It’s not that comprehensive but it does work very well as fundamental base. So this is true that Kenya PEP we want all of this but we also added “citizenship”. Courtesy to each country. Like In Kenya, they added “early childhood component” and they added it. So the teachers are trained.

One example I took the material to the ministry in Liberia, and he slow it down, they are pretty smart in applying it.

I think the real opportunity and will have the longevity component is that PEP as “jumping off point”. It s a basis, now I can spend my time and energy looking at the stuff that isn’t there and make it more comprehensive and culturally relevant and community, local culture.

Serious adaptation will not understand the fundamental of curriculum. In developing countries, a lot of agencies take developmental approach, major flaw in lots of intervention. A good teacher will do...Nepal a middle-income
country...Hindu is mix and 50%. The modification they made this is not curriculum this is common thing like context work on the ground. There is the game called stone carry. No stone so they replace it with something else.

You see the activities and come up with local stories that reinforce the basic concept of PEP. Proverbs from your country as an example. Common sense. I would trust teachers to be able to do that.

7. Would you like to make any changes to the PEP based on your own analysis as well as information shared by different agencies practicing in the field? Yes I would. Not fundamental changes, I had time and spaces and enough freedom and nobody intervene too much things on other people. Time constraints. I want to just do the work. If I have opportunity, people skills about peace, 27 questions to star. Evaluation. Whose responsibility is to keep peace? What would you do to develop peace? Somebody jump in front of you what would you do if they cut line for water? When ask these question people who always say all the wonderful things about peace suddenly get pissed and said that bastard. Correlation between an extreme people. Common things they are projected as somebody should do these things.

Big problem in Dadabb, Christians in the camps and have the church and being stoned a lot of stoning. So this person came to me and we had a workshop and I said to this woman she was a fundamentalist. Lets pretend you are in Australia and dress like me. Would you dress like me if you came to Australia. And she said yes. So I asked explain to me again why would you stand by and watch children who stone people from different religions? They were like pretty much omg when u looked at it like that. It is a dynamic of a workshop that make them think you know. They caught up in stories didn't even know camera us rolling. That's a terrible way to treat anybody.

Changes that I would make not fundamental but we modify. We do external evaluation to get feedback, final modification. You need to be discreet and separate when started. But if keep it separated you marginalize it and can't get accepted. So need to be discreet. Mainstream thing. Community workshop works much better, will sue as a source of don't take this to the police you need to take matters to the community workshop to resolve conflict. It is much easier to mainstream that to the community in school it is much more hassle, make it separate subject. If it is not examinable or after school it is already marginalized. If it is separate subject, the change in term of structure of program NO. The change inside the program yes. I would do powerful exercise in Pakistan.

Six common values across the group like honest respect sharing love example. In Sudan, we map ppl out, how the behavior affect that value the y thing they hold dear? ...equality an dignity

I would include early childhood.
APPENDIX 3:  
CASE STUDY: GHANA

Name: Friederike Feuchte  
Organization and job title:  
Address:  
Phone/fax:  
E-mail: friederike.feuchte@uni-jena.de

Background Questions
1. In which specific locations has the PEP been used in the country?
   • Buduburam, refugee camp for Liberian refugees in Ghana

2. Over what period of time has the PEP been used?
   • The community workshops: 4 weeks in 2007 plus parts of it integrated in another course over 3 months; 2 weeks in 2008, the programme for the school around 5 months.

3. What populations have participated in PEP in this country? (children, adults, youth, vulnerable groups, etc...)?
   • Mainly adults and youth

4. How many people participated in the program?
   • I am not sure about the school programme, there was high fluctuation as the camp was about to close down. For the adults: 102 participants in four full community workshops in 2007, 90 participants in five 9hours’ workshops (different parts of the whole programme)

5. Who were the teachers/facilitators and how were they trained?
   • Liberian refugees who volunteered for their own local camp based organization Center for Youth Empowerment (CYE). I trained them according to the PEP manual for one week and supervised them when they were facilitating the workshops, giving feedback and assisting with preparation etc. I was assisted by a volunteer from the US.

6. Why did your organization start to use the Peace Education Programme (PEP)?
   • I wanted to do an evaluation of peace education in a refugee camp for my Ph.D. project, I found PEP to be a useful programme for this context, suggested it to my supervisor at the university and the Liberian organization CYE and they agreed.

7. Who was involved in implementing the program?
   • Around 12 Liberian refugees as facilitators and organisors,
   • me bringing the programme training and supervising the facilitators
   • a volunteer from USA as assistant supervisor.

Core Questions
8. List and describe the ways in which you used the PEP. Be as specific as possible.
   • The training for facilitators and teachers
   • whole community workshop
• parts of it integrated in a course about peace building
• I split the community workshop in 3 different parts dealing with more affective, behavioural and cognitive topics

9. Did you adapt the PEP to your context and to the work of your project? If yes, how so?
• I split the community workshop in 3 different parts dealing with more affective, behavioural and cognitive topics
• Some facilitators integrated prayers
• CYE integrated parts of it in another course and project planning to train mediators in rural Liberia (but they still look for funding!)

10. What were the lessons learned and/or examples of good practice from your experience using the PEP?
• Participants were very enthusiastic about it, some were using the conflict resolution techniques
• Participants wanted handouts and follow-ups, would like to spread what they have learned
• Facilitators need a lot of training and supporting supervision

11. What challenges have you encountered while using the PEP and how did you overcome or work around them?
• Small budget...
• Facilitators had problems to get used to the interactive methods. Reminding them of the “flower-method” and giving them feedback, reinforcing them when they used it, it became better
• In some groups there were too many participants and some were quite passive, there was too much discussion in the whole group
• Only few women were participating, only few ex-combattants
• “African time” – the habit of coming too late was a problem for some facilitators (!) and for some participants. Giving food before beginning the course only helped.
• Team-teaching is not easy if one in the team is the talkative executive director of the organization

12. What impact has the use of PEP had on participants and the community?
• Participants were very enthusiastic about it, some were using the conflict resolution techniques
• Because of PEP a cooperation was starting between two camp-based organizations, overcoming the “NGO-tribalism”

13. Would you recommend any revisions or changes to the curriculum? Which ones?
• There should be more exercises that promote personal (intergroup) friendships (e.g. work in pairs, getting to know each other more personally)
• The part about human rights should include some input about the (history of the) different human rights
• The part about reconciliation should be more differentiated e.g. (when) is it possible to forgive, what does it really mean (many people seemed to force themselves to forgive and forget because of religious pressure, but they were not really ready for this step)
• Include some optional lessons, depending on the context e.g. role of culture/religion/collective narratives in conflict, information about post-traumatic
stress disorder (especially if counseling can be provided)
- support transfer e.g. integrate follow-up meetings

14. What opportunities do you see for PEP’s future use in this country or other contexts?
- Most refugees returned now to Liberia. The situation is such that PEP can be very helpful there.

15. Do you have any relevant documents, evaluations, or materials that you would be willing to share?
- I am still working on my Ph.D. thesis evaluating the data. You have my poster already, I attach an article about the implementation in the first year. The article is still under revision, so please ask me if you want to use anything out of it, that I can send you the revised vision then.

16. Please provide any additional comments or feedback on the PEP.
Background Questions

1. In which specific locations has the PEP been used in the country? 147 pre-secondary schools in all districts in the country.

2. Over what period of time has the PEP been used? Two years project (April 2007 – April 2009)

3. What populations have participated in PEP in this country? (children, adults, youth, vulnerable groups, etc...)?
The training was conducted for Civic Education teachers of pre-secondary schools who are later will be teaching Peace Education to the pre-secondary students. Pre-secondary encompasses ages 12-15, and often higher since many of the students are overage.

4. How many people participated in the program? 179 Civic education teachers from pre-secondary schools and approximately 12,000 pre-secondary students.

5. Who were the teachers/facilitators and how were they trained? The training team attended three days workshop basic knowledge about peace and conflict resolution. This workshop was conducted by a local NGO that is working on the promotion of peace and democracy in the country. In addition to this, the trainers received lesson practices that given by their supervisors. The participants were Civic Education subject area teachers and they were trained two times with one week for the first phase and three days for the refresher training. Apart from these trainings, the trainers also did monitoring in schools to support and to assure that the teachers were really implementing the peace education activities and lessons in the classroom.

6. Why did your organization start to use the Peace Education Programme (PEP)? Timor-Leste is a post-conflict country after 24 years of Indonesian illegal occupation. The country became independent in 2000 and went through a civil crisis
in 2006. It is during this crisis, where the thought of peace building came across to
our mind which resulted in the design and establishment of the project.
The first reason of why we select the program is that the packet is simple, clear,
adaptable and relevant to the country context. The second reason is that it can be
freely utilized.

7. Who was involved in implementing the program?
CARE International Timor Leste with approval from the Ministry of Education and
donor support from UNDP and USAID.

Core Questions

8. List and describe the ways in which you used the PEP. Be as specific as
possible.

We used the lessons and materials for levels 6-8 since our target audience was pre-
secondary school students.
The peace education materials such as: manual, story books, flip charts, role-plays,
proverbs and perception cards that were produced by the INEE working group were
translated into the two official languages Tetun and Portuguese.

We have also used some of the lessons from the other levels as features in our
regular children’s and teacher’s magazines to promote peace-building.

9. Did you adapt the PEP to your context and to the work of your project? If yes,
how so?

Yes, we did some adaptation to the Timorese context.
Examples for these are:
• Names of the characters in the stories were localized.
• We also added some Timorese proverbs about peace into the proverbs activity.
• A set of posters designed with Timorese children to convey the messages about
the main elements of peace education.

10. What were the lessons learned and/or examples of good practice from your
experience using the PEP?
Lessons learned:
• Some of the concepts in the manual are quite complicated especially for teachers
who came from different level of educational background in a post conflict
country. That is why the translation and explanation is needed to be clear and
simple.
• The introduction of the PEP is really fit with the context. Teachers and students
are eager to learn about different components of building peace.
There is a sense of trust between teachers and the trainers, which helped the training implementation process. The teachers particularly appreciated the classroom follow-up visits made by the trainers.

11. What challenges have you encountered while using the PEP and how did you overcome or work around them?

- Timor-Leste has two official languages, Portuguese and Tetun. Although the manual is written in both languages, the trainers could not conduct the training in Portuguese.
- There are different levels of educational background of teachers, which affect the comprehension of topics in the manual.
- The amount of time and the number of teachers available to participate in training was limited by MoE policies.

12. What impact has the use of PEP had on participants and the community?

The information is not available at this moment because the final evaluation will only be conducted sometime in April 2009. We will be happy to send you the findings once the report is received.

13. Would you recommend any revisions or changes to the curriculum? Which ones?

No recommendation.

14. What opportunities do you see for PEP’s future use in this country or other contexts?

There is interest from the Ministry of Education to incorporate the PEP manual, or elements of it, into the new pre-secondary curriculum which is still in the process of designing.

15. Do you have any relevant documents, evaluations, or materials that you would be willing to share?

Will share final evaluation when it becomes available.

16. Please provide any additional comments or feedback on the PEP.

We appreciate very much the work that went into the development and testing of these comprehensive materials and the fact that they are freely available to everyone to use.
November 18, 2008

Hi Margaret,
Sorry for the delay in getting back to you.

Our peace education program focuses on pre-secondary schools, which is years 7-9. We are using the Teacher Activity Book and some of the teacher training materials. We had the lessons in the TAB for grades 6-8 translated into both Portuguese and Tetun (national language). The Portuguese translation is not the greatest and we are finding lots of mistakes in it as we go along, which I am told is normal, but frustrating nonetheless. Unfortunately, that means that it is not in a form that we would want to share with other Portuguese speaking countries, unless someone was prepared to do quite a bit of editing.

The program started in May 2007 and is scheduled to end in April 2009. Our work has been with civic education teachers in pre-secondary schools, training them in the use of the curriculum. We also had a component which gave small grants ($350 max) to student groups to implement peace-building activities in their schools and/or communities. The majority of the activities were sports tournaments, many involving neighboring schools. Other activities included painting peace slogans on the school walls, peace poetry and music competitions, and traditional dance and culture festivals.

The Ministry of Education will soon be developing a new curriculum for all of pre-secondary school. We will be serving on the Civic Education subject group and will advocate for the integration of peace education into Civic Education as a standard subject. We'll keep you informed as that develops.

Let me know if there is anything else you would like to know. We are very appreciative of all of the work that was done to develop these materials and make them easily accessible for others to use.

All the best,
Ginny

Ginny Kintz
Education Project Advisor
CARE International Timor Leste
Dili, Timor Leste
APPENDIX 6
CASE STUDY: SOUTHERN SUDAN

Date: 06/03/09
Name: Vick IKOBWA
Organization and job title: UNHCR, Office of the Deputy Representative (Southern Sudan Operation)
Associate Reintegration Officer (Formerly Peace Education Advisor, UNHCR Regional Support Hub, Nairobi)
Address: C/OUNHCR Representation in Southern Sudan (next to UNDP Office)
Phone/fax: + 41227397554
E-mail: ikobwa@unhcr.org

Background Questions

17. In which specific locations has the PEP been used in the country? The bulk of the peace education activities in Southern Sudan were implemented through collaboration between CRS\(^1\), DOR\(^2\), DOT\(^3\) and the UNHCR Regional Support Hub in Nairobi. CRS education support to church-managed schools enabled peace education training for teachers in the schools covered by the catholic dioceses of Torit and Rumbek. CRS undertook the logistical support necessary to support the trainings while UNHCR provided the technical support that comprised conducting the trainings and provision of written materials.

18. Over what period of time has the PEP been used? The UNHCR/CRS collaboration in peace education in southern Sudan was during the period August 2003 - March 2006.

19. What populations have participated in PEP in this country? (children, adults, youth, vulnerable groups, etc...)

In the southern Sudan context, the programme had two main targets: 1) To train 250 teachers to employ high-quality education methodologies and integrate peacebuilding activities in their lessons and 2) Peace education and other peacebuilding programs functioning in 50 schools. Therefore the main targets for PEP were teachers (adults) who in turn targeted children in their schools.

20. How many people participated in the program? Through the UNHCR/CRS collaboration in peace education, 300 teachers were trained in Chukudum and Ikotos (Eastern Equatoria State) and Rumbek and Marial Lou and Mapourdit (Lakes State).

21. Who were the teachers/facilitators and how were they trained? Many of these teachers were either Sudanese returnee teachers back from exile in Kenya and Uganda or Sudanese volunteer “stayee” teachers. They were given three phases of peace education teacher training during school holidays. Each phase of the training was organized for 8 days and covered active teaching methods (activity learning) and the concept areas of peace education.

22. Why did your organization start to use the Peace Education Programme (PEP)? The UNHCR Peace Education Programme (PEP) was developed as a response to a situation in

---

\(^1\) CRS/Sudan – Catholic Relief Services
\(^2\) DOR – Catholic Diocese of Rumbek
\(^3\) DOT – Diocese of Torit
Kenya where it was obvious that refugees, while escaping from conflict in their home countries (Sudan, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi, Ethiopia and others), also created and had to deal with conflict in the refugee situation. In 1997, the research for developing a programme began. Quite early in the discussions, the refugees stated that while it was important for the children to learn these skills and behaviours it was also vital for the adults to learn. So from the beginning, the programme had two distinct components - the formal education component and the community component. These reinforce each other and ensure that the programme has a solid acceptance in the community.

23. Who was involved in implementing the program? Refugee communities, Returnees, UNHCR and its NGO partners, as well as government stakeholders

Core Questions

24. List and describe the ways in which you used the PEP. Be as specific as possible. **My work as peace education advisor for UNHCR operationalised PEP as follows:**
   - supporting country offices already implementing the programme and helping initiate projects with those operations interested in the concept. Countries covered include Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia, DRC, Rwanda and Chad.
   - developing training and facilitating actual training workshops, including "Training of Trainers"
   - acting as a resource base on all aspects of peace education, in close collaboration with UNHCR Community Services and Education staff
   - conducting community workshops for Nairobi-based urban refugees
   - integrating the UNHCR peace education concept within the context of other inter-agency initiatives
   - developing and disseminating public awareness material on peace education including a quarterly newsletter *Peacemaker*
   - Supporting links between the UNHCR peace education programme and life skills programmes through the *Inter Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)*, a network of UN and NGO agencies working in emergency education. This includes sharing the existing UNHCR peace education training materials with the interested agencies (CRS, DOR, DOT, NCCK, LWF and ZOA) within this network.

25. Did you adapt the PEP to your context and to the work of your project? If yes, how so? **The Peace Education programme is founded on a strong moral base, and working in it as a Peace Education Advisor I had to internalize and portray the same skills, values and attitudes for peace that I promoted and expected from the school children and community workshop participants undergoing PEP workshops. The ideal is that they should internalise these skills, knowledge and attitudes.** Being an advocate for peace entailed (entails) representing the tenets inherent in the programme at all times such that that our actions mirror what PEP stands for. **It is through this that I was able to earn respect from the community members and other actors we interacted with.**

26. What were the lessons learned and/or examples of good practice from your experience using the PEP?
   **What had originally been envisaged by UNHCR as a peace education school programme spontaneously developed a community based component targeting adults.** This was positive development in that adults were now in a position to *reinforce* the constructive skills, values, behaviours and attitudes that their children learnt in schools. Because community workshops are open to self-selected participants, the message right from the beginning was that everybody
has a responsibility to maintain peace. This was a good lesson learnt in the evolution of the programme.

27. What challenges have you encountered while using the PEP and how did you overcome or work around them?

Language barriers presented a big challenge in the implementation of the programme. Communicating certain concepts like perception, stereotypes, bias, discrimination and prejudice required the advanced skill of translating the concept and not the words. This is not always easy.

28. What impact has the use of PEP had on participants and the community?

Feedback from refugees and other beneficiaries and partners regarding the UNHCR peace education programme points to the impact of PEP. The rights based approach adopted in the programme has been greatly appreciated. It makes the international legal instruments such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention on the Elimination on all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the 1951 Refugee Convention concrete, practical and meaningful to conflict affected people. Above all, the programme makes it possible for peace to remain in public discourse even when conflict is at its peak.

The two statements below from Peace Education Facilitators attest to the above (Extracted from my mission report to Ethiopia 27th November to 3rd December 2004):

“…there is a great influence [of the Peace Education Programme] and even church leaders are asking for copies of the community workshops manual because these concepts are important in churches as well…” Mathew Mayom, Community Services Agent and PEP Facilitator, Fugnido Camp

“… We are not only conducting community workshops but also involved in community problem solving…” Dobuoul Wang, Community Services Agent and Peace Education Facilitator, Fugnido Camp

29. Would you recommend any revisions or changes to the curriculum? Which ones?

I recommend the revision of all activities and examples used in the Teacher Activity Book (school programme) as some teachers in some contexts take a long time to identify with them and suitably adapt them.

30. What opportunities do you see for PEP’s future use in this country or other contexts?

Southern Sudan has a provision for the inclusion of Peace and Civic Education on their primary school curriculum. They will benefit a lot from the work done already by INEE members.

31. Do you have any relevant documents, evaluations, or materials that you would be willing to share? I have attached AN evaluation of the PEP programme in Uganda (2005)

32. Please provide any additional comments or feedback on the PEP.
APPENDIX 7:
EMAIL FROM ROWAN SALIM ON UGANDA

Tuesday March 10, 2009

Dear Allison and Lydia,

The main reasons that RI Jordan chose the AVP program are that:

a- It can be implemented easily through informal education. This can include community centers, neighborhood groups, mosques and churches, prisons, schools etc. This suited us because RI Jordan works in informal education and many of our beneficiaries are not engaged in the formal education system. This also meant that the program could easily be used in the wider community.

b- Participation in the program is voluntary by nature of it being linked to the informal system. All aspects of the program from being a participant to being a trainer are voluntary.

c- RI was prepared to translate the manual to Arabic.

d- There is a global network of AVP volunteers who can be called upon to offer training. This reduces the cost of the trainings.

e- The program grows organically through training of trainers. So participants can take the beginner course, followed by the advanced course and followed by the ToT course. Once they take the TOT course they can then become trainers. They are mentored by master trainers until they build the skills necessary to conduct trainings themselves. This means that there is no need to rely on external trainers and funding. It also means that the growth of the program will depend on how useful participants really feel it is.

f- The program was piloted to a group of RI volunteers and youth and feedback was taken prior to deciding whether or not to proceed with the program. The feedback was also used to determine how the manual and trainings can be more culturally appropriate (we are currently in the process of editing the Arabic training manual following the first phase of implementation)

Finally, perhaps one of the most important reasons that we chose AVP is that we were approached by a fervent AVP advocate called Ann Ward who supported us throughout the process and helped us locate funding and invite volunteer trainers. If you’re interested in finding out more about AVP, I’d recommend getting in touch with Ann on ajw109@psu.edu

I’m attaching sample AVP materials including the youth training manual for you to look at. We are also finalizing the evaluation of the first phase of the program and if you’re interested I can send you that report too.

I hope this helps, Rowan
APPENDIX 8:
CASE STUDY: KENYA
Telephone interview with Pamela Baxter on February 26, 2008

Background Questions
1. Over what period of time has the PEP been used?
   1998-2005

2. What populations have participated in PEP in this country? (children, adults, youth, vulnerable groups, etc...)?
   Dadaab: Primarily Somali refugees (90%)
   Kakuma: Primarily Sudanese refugees (80%), although the group was more diverse and included 10-15% Somalis and the remaining 5% a mix of Congolese, Rwandan, Ethiopian.
   The youth program was added later when the waiting lists for the community program got extremely long. Even though there were 10 workshops going on each month, still there were more people who wanted to participate. This was partly because it was one of the only intellectual activities going on in the camp for people who were out of school. The youth focus addressed an important population that wanted to participate.

3. How many people participated in the program?
   This is unknown, as the evaluator’s position was cut in 2005.

4. Who were the teachers/facilitators and how were they trained?
   Pamela Baxter developed the curriculum. She hired two staff members who had interned from the University of Kenya (one Kenyan and one British). They trained facilitators from the camps. Recruitment and training were ongoing, as there was high turnover of teachers due to teachers being resettled.

5. Why did your organization start to use the Peace Education Programme (PEP)?
   (Information taken from emails from Margaret Sinclair)
   After the 1996 Machel Report, UNHCR's activist Children's adviser, Neil Boothby, created a trust fund in UNHCR for support of refugee children, and offered half the initial money for education. This was allocated to PEP, though start up consultancies of Pamela Baxter in 2007.

   A January 1997 meeting to begin development was attended by community services officers as well as protection staff, and emphasized an approach that would start with peace education rather than with human rights, so that students learned about peaceful problem solving before facing issues of rights (eg if food is delayed, do we burn down the store because our rights are not being met).

   It was started in Kenya refugee camps because Kakuma had had a lot of internal ethnic conflicts which led to a big uprising amongst Sudanese refugees in 1995 and
1996. The program was also piloted in Dadaab because Kakuma had primarily Christian refugees and Dadaab had primarily Muslims. This way they could ensure that the program was relevant for people from different countries and religions.

6. Who was involved in implementing the program?
Pamela Baxter created and implemented the program until 2005 when funding was cut.

Core Questions
7. List and describe the ways in which you used the PEP. Be as specific as possible. All three of the PEP components were developed and used.

8. Did you adapt the PEP to your context and to the work of your project? If yes, how so?
To design the PEP, Baxter held over 80 community meetings to assess the community’s needs, get community buy-in, and develop tools that would be culturally relevant. The program was piloted in 1997.

9. What were the lessons learned and/or examples of good practice from your experience using the PEP?

a. While designing curriculum, one must keep things simple at first, and build later. Developers must be intellectually objective and rigorous, ensuring that each activity is purposeful and not filling the program with good activities that lack purpose.

b. Local staff and facilitators/teachers must be trained not only in PEP content and methods, but also in the values, skills, and attitudes that the program aims to impart on participants. Unless the facilitators and teachers themselves demonstrate the skills, values, and attitudes of PEP, they cannot help students to acquire these things.

c. Because PEP promotes internal change in attitudes, skills, and values, it should be implemented on a small, local scale first. It should grow organically and incrementally before any national implementation.

d. Implementers must accept that PEP is a program about ethics and integrity. Although cultural norms may vary, the program promotes a universal ethical behavior. The program teaches people to apply their own values to broader groups of people. For example, most cultures value respect for elders or men. The program takes that value and encourages participants to extend it to women and children. The program works across cultures because the facilitators and teachers are encouraged to modify the program to make it culturally relevant.
e. PEP should be implemented proactively for prevention, not reactively. It should not be implemented in response to a particular issue of violence because it is not designed to change situations or political issues directly. It is about personal and behavioral change. Additionally, it is not only conflict resolution program. Although it does include conflict resolution, it should not be used only for that purpose.

f. The program breaks down peaceful behavior into a set of sequential skills. The sequence is important to follow, as skills build on each other. If steps are skipped, the program will be less effective.

g. It is essential to work community leaders and religious leaders first. You must have their support for the program or else it will fail.

h. There is a need for ongoing, high quality teacher training. The categories of PEP professionals requiring training in the programme include: teachers, facilitators, trainers, advisers, monitors, programme developers; and managers at field, national and regional levels. The report emphasises that PEP stands or falls on the quality of the teaching and facilitation. Theoretically, 30 days of training divided throughout the year is ideal. Teachers and facilitators must also participate in the program before training to teach it.

i. Develop a PEP career structure for senior refugee PEP staff across the region, to demonstrate the career potential of PEP and the genuine commitment of the international community to providing refugees with professional employment.

9. What challenges has PEP encountered in Kenya and how did the implementers overcome or work around them?

a. In 2005, the program got cut because of a UNHCR funding crisis and a new unified budget system that abolished trust funds. Advocacy is needed within UN and aid donors to support the importance of peace education. Funding needs to be adequate for quality teacher/facilitator training.

b. High teacher and population turnover was a problem. Teachers and camp inhabitants were often chosen for resettlement or experienced camp rotation. For this reason, the program never reached the desired 10% of the community. To address this, ongoing teacher training and outreach are necessary. Additionally, additional staffing was needed to address demand and create more community programs for children and youth out of school (due to a low school enrollment rate).

c. After going through the program, some women showed more violent behavior. This is because they felt empowered to stand up for themselves and state their opinions. Although this seems negative, it is actually a sign of growth in the development of assertive but peaceful behavior.

d. It was impossible to accommodate very disabled people because many of the
activities were experiential and physical.

10. Would you recommend any revisions or changes to the curriculum? Which ones? Ms. Baxter reports that the teacher training element needs polish. This was the least revised and upgraded element because she, as the creator, was the main one using it, and therefore did not need it to be as thorough. Also, restore the UNICEF label to the cover of the curriculum, as this would help UNICEF staff to accept the materials.

11. What opportunities do you see for PEP’s future use in this country or other contexts? By 2005 year, PEP had expanded to 11 countries. Recently in 2008, the Kenyan government modified it to use after the post-election conflicts. They added information about citizenship to the curriculum. In Liberia, a human rights focus was added. Now, its major function is to act as a mother manual or foundation for new programs. Developers can use the structure, concepts and skill sets to build their own program. PEP should be included in the INEE Teaching and Learning tools so they can easily be accessed.
Hi Siri and Chantal,

It is really great to hear that you are working on the INEE PEP. I was behind the programme from the UNHCR Geneva side, and have tried to promote it ever since. After the 1996 Machel Report, UNHCR’s activist Children’s adviser, Neil Boothby, created a trust fund in UNHCR for support of refugee children, and offered half the initial money for education. This was allocated to PEP, though start up consultancies of Pam in 2007, preceded by an internal design workshop in Jan 1997 at UNHCR Hqs, were funded from UNHCR HQs technical budget (pending arrival of the trust fund money, which was later supplemented by more donations).

The Jan 1997 meeting -attended more by community services officers as well as protection staff, emphasised an approach that would start with peace education rather than with human rights, so that students learned about peaceful problem solving before facing issues of rights (eg if food is delayed, do we burn down the store because our rights are not being met).

Pam put up with short term consultancies initially and later had UNOPS arrangements for herself and national coordinators, which kept going until 2005. For her last 18 months Pam was half time with UNESCO, mainly to do an edit of the materials.

The materials were donated to INEE in 2001 by Chris Talbot, then UNHCR Senior Education officer. UNICEF went through a formal procedure before putting its name on the cover, alongside UNESCO, UNHCR and INEE.

Unfortunately the second edition cover does not show the UNICEF imprint, though changes were minimal, because it was printed by UNESCO under a UNHCR-UNHCR partnership for Pam’s work.

I wish that the UNICEF label could be restored, as it would help UNICEF staff to accept the materials.

UNHCR does not normally support long term innovation, as well as it had to give up having Trust Funds (moving to a ‘unified budget’) so eventually the PEP was ‘mainstreamed’ meaning that the funds for operations, national and sub-regional trainers, printing etc as well as Pam were all abolished unless cash-strapped UNHCR country programmes included them in their UNHCR national budget envelope (which meant displacing something else like books or blackboards).

Moreover UNHCR went through a long financial crisis, which meant that mainstreaming was usually a polite term for giving up (Yes, Pam?).
However, the materials have been incorporated by Pam into a lot of her subsequent consultancies, especially post-crisis eg Sierra Leone (teacher training), Libera (pilot schools), Kenya (areas affected by tribal clashes/national textbook).

The PEP materials also include vital teacher training guides, which I hope can be integrated as such into INEE Teaching and Learning Resources.

Hoping that gives some background. Pam will fill you in on most things, and I will be happy to help further and also to get an update about what has been done where.

There is an issue for trialling the translations that have been made, and possibly improving the actual translations. Hopefully your report will also deal with that.

I have just started a new assignment in Qatar, so am a bit preoccupied. But this is of the greatest concern to me so please cc me on correspondence; and I will definitely give priority to helping out.

Best regards,
Margaret Sinclair