International Human Rights Education Evaluation Symposium

HRE for Social Change: Evaluation Approaches and Methodologies

Report of Proceedings

Montreal, Quebec
May 3–5, 2007

Centre international d'éducation aux droits humains
International Centre for Human Rights Education

Organized by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and Equitas—International Centre for Human Rights Education.

Equitas – International Centre for Human
Rights Education
666, Sherbrooke Street West
Suite 1100
Montréal, Québec
Canada H3A 1E7

Tel.: (514) 954-0382
Fax.: (514) 954-0659
E-mail: info@equitas.org
Web site: www.equitas.org

ISBN 2-921337-86-X

Publication of these proceedings was realized thanks to the financial support of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Agence canadienne de développement international

Canadian International Development Agency

Table of Contents

Table of Contents ..... *i*

Introduction ..... *v*
Background v
Goal and Objectives v
Participants v
Methodology v
Our Understanding of Human Rights Education vi
About the Organizers viii

Opening Remarks by the Organizers *1*
Elena Ippoliti, Methodology, Education and Training Unit / RRDB Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) 1
Ian Hamilton, Executive Director, Equitas 1

Session 1: The Current State of HRE Evaluation *3*

Activity 1: Welcome and Four Corners Introductions *3*

Small Group Presentations: Four "Burning'' Questions about HRE Evaluation.. 3
What does the impact of HRE look like? 3
What exactly do we want to measure in terms of results of HRE? What is feasible to measure? 4
What are some effective approaches, methods and tools to evaluate the impact of HRE? 4
What can we learn from the fields of education and professional training that will help us in our HRE evaluation work? 5

Activity 2: Symposium Overview: The Current State of HRE Evaluation *5*
Felisa Tibbitts Executive Director Human Rights Education Associates 5
Question and Answer Session 8

Activity 3: Goals and Impact of Human Rights Education (HRE)—Required Knowledge and Attitudes *10*
Individual Level 10
Community Level 12
Societal Level 13

Activity 4: Preparation for Day 2 ..... *14*

Activity 5: Education Evaluation and Professional Training: Current Theory and Methodology *14*
Saul Carliner Assistant Professor, Educational Technology Concordia University . 14
Adnan Qayyum Doctoral Student, Educational Technology Concordia University 14

Proving the Impact of Human Rights Education on Societal Change *17*

Sélim Kfoury Human Resources Consultant 17
Discussion 19

Activity 6: Taking Stock of Day 1 ..... ***19***
What's Hot 19
What's Not So Hot… 21

Session 2: Sharing HRE Evaluation Experiences ***23***

Recap of Day 1 ..... ***23***

Activity 1: Roundtable Presentation: Current Effective Practices in the Evaluation of HRE ***24***
Moderator: David Donahue, Mills College, US 24
Panelists: Vincenza Nazzari Equitas 24
Ana Maria Rodino Inter-American Institute for Human Rights Costa Rica 24
Frédéric Hareau Equitas 24
Dr. I. Devasahayam People`s Watch Tamil Nadu India 24
Non-Governmental Organizations 24
Institutions of Higher Learning 25
Non-Formal Education for Children and Youth 27
Formal Elementary and Secondary School Education 27
Large Group Discussion 29

Activity 2: Sharing Additional Effective Practices in the Evaluation of Human Rights Education (HRE) ***30***
Purposes of Evaluation 31
Methods of Evaluation 31
Impacts/Results of Evaluation 32

Activity 3: Challenges and Critical Unanswered Questions ***33***
Context Implications for HRE Evaluation 34
Tools for HRE Evaluation 35
Methodology for HRE Evaluation 36
Theoretical Assumptions in HRE Evaluation 37
Definitions of HRE Evaluation (Need, Sustainability and Accountability) 38
Sharing HRE Evaluation Results 40

Session 3: Moving Forward ***41***

Recap of Day Two ***41***

Activity 1: Determining What to Evaluate or Measure ***42***
Non-Formal Sector (Children and Youth) 43
Formal Education Sector (Primary and Secondary School) 44
University Sector 45
The NGO Sector 47

Activities 2 and 3 Evaluation Techniques and Evaluation Indicators..... 48

Activity 4: Planning Follow up to the Symposium 48

Appendices..... 53
Appendix 1: Bibliography: Resources on Human Rights Training Evaluation..... 55
Appendix 2: List of Participants..... 63

Introduction

Background

This Symposium was jointly organized by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and Equitas-International Centre for Human Rights Education to examine the impact of human rights education (HRE). Evaluating the impact of HRE is a complex undertaking, as this type of education, whose ultimate goal is greater respect for human rights leading to social change, is difficult to measure in isolation from political, economic and social factors. Strengthening evaluation will enable HRE practitioners to better measure and demonstrate with reasonable confidence the transformative effect of HRE and ultimately, to strengthen its effectiveness.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of this Symposium was for HRE practitioners to share new ideas, knowledge, skills and other practices to effectively evaluate human rights education, particularly over the longer term.

The objectives of the Symposium were to:

- *Review the various approaches to HRE evaluation within different contexts, nationally and internationally, with a view to drawing some conclusions around the current status of HRE evaluation.*
- *Identify the successes and challenges of different HRE evaluation methodologies and the appropriate tools to effectively measure the results of the HRE over the longer term.*

Participants

The Symposium brought together 27 international experts, researchers, practitioners and educators, six of whom were alumni of Equitas' annual International Human Rights Training Program (IHRTP). In addition, four IHRTP alumni participated virtually. Four Equitas staff were also involved as participants. The criteria for selection of participants included those individuals who had current experience in the evaluation of HRE activities, or in the effective evaluation of education or professional training activities.

Methodology

The methodology for the Symposium was based on a participatory approach to learning. A basic assumption in this approach is that much of the content comes from the participants, and that the process serve as the framework for drawing out this content.

A gender approach was integrated throughout the Symposium, to identify and analyze how certain policies and practices to promote and protect human rights can affect men and women differently. This approach is necessary to develop gender-sensitive strategies that help achieve equality between women and men.

Our Understanding of Human Rights Education

Human rights education is a process of social transformation that begins with the individual and branches out to encompass society at large.

The goal of human rights education is **EMPOWERMENT**. The result is social change. Human rights education involves the exploration of human rights principles and instruments and the promotion of critical reflection and inquiry. Ultimately, human rights education inspires people to take control of their own lives and the decisions that affect their lives.

The role of human rights educators is to foster within each person an **AWARENESS** of human rights and a sense of the individual's capacity to effect change. It is the responsibility of human rights educators to provide a supportive environment where people are free to define which issues are at the heart of their own human rights struggles.

The practice of human rights education is founded on mutual respect, reciprocal learning and **ACTION**. Participatory methods that promote the sharing of personal knowledge and experience are fundamental. The modes of communication are numerous (from brain- storming and discussion to street theatre and festivals), but the challenge lies in discovering how to truly communicate across different cultures, values and perceptions.

Context and Definition of Human Rights Education
Source: United Nations General Assembly. (2005). Revised draft plan of action for the first phase (2005-2007) of the World Programme for Human Rights Education. Available online: http://www.ohchr.org/english/issues/education/docs/A.59.525.Rev.1.pdf

1. The international community has increasingly expressed consensus on the fundamental contribution of human rights education to the realization of human rights. Human rights education aims at developing an understanding of our common responsibility to make human rights a reality in every community and in society at large. In this sense, it contributes to the long-term prevention of human rights abuses and violent conflicts, the promotion of equality and sustainable development and the enhancement of people's participation in decision-making processes within a democratic system, as stated in Commission on Human Rights resolution 2004/71.
2. Provisions on human rights education have been incorporated in many international instruments, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (article 26), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (article 13), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (article 29), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (article 10), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (article 7), the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (Part I, paras. 33-34 and Part II, paras. 78-82) and the Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, held in Durban, South Africa, in 2001 (Declaration, paras. 95-97 and Programme of Action, paras. 129-139).

3. In accordance with these instruments, which provide elements of a definition of human rights education as agreed upon by the international community, human rights education can be defined as education, training and information aiming at building a universal culture of human rights through the sharing of knowledge, imparting of skills and moulding of attitudes directed to:
   a) The strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms;
   b) The full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity;
   c) The promotion of understanding, tolerance, gender equality and friendship among all nations, indigenous peoples and racial, national, ethnic, religious and linguistic groups;
   d) The enabling of all persons to participate effectively in a free and democratic society governed by the rule of law;
   e) The building and maintenance of peace;
   f) The promotion of people-centred sustainable development and social justice.

4. Human rights education encompasses:
   a) Knowledge and skills — learning about human rights and mechanisms for their protection, as well as acquiring skills to apply them in daily life;
   b) Values, attitudes and behaviour — developing values and reinforcing attitudes and behaviour which uphold human rights;
   c) Action — taking action to defend and promote human rights.

About the Organizers

Equitas – International Centre for Human Rights Education was established as a non-profit, non-governmental organization in 1967 by a group of leading Canadian scholars, jurists and human rights advocates with a mandate to advance democracy, human development, peace and social justice through educational programs.

Since then, Equitas has become a global leader in human rights education. Equitas' capacity-building programs in Canada and abroad have assisted civil society organizations and government institutions to participate effectively in human rights debates, to challenge discriminatory attitudes and practices and to advance important policy and legislative reforms to enhance human rights protection and fulfillment.

Equitas' regional human rights education programs currently focus on developing knowledge, strengthening skills and promoting action around the following themes: the creation and strengthening of independent national human rights institutions; training for NGO trainers; human rights education in the school system; training in human rights advocacy and monitoring; the protection of particular groups in society, including women, migrant workers, children and minorities; and the promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights. Equitas' current plans call for the expansion of our programming in Canada, the Middle East and the Americas while continuing to work in Asia, CEE/CIS and Africa.

For more information consult:
www.equitas.org

We would also like to acknowledge and thank our partner in this symposium, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The OHCHR is mandated to promote and protect the enjoyment and full realization, by all people, of all rights established in the Charter of the United Nations and in international human rights laws and treaties. The mandate includes preventing human rights violations, securing respect for all human rights, promoting international cooperation to protect human rights, coordinating related activities throughout the United Nations, and strengthening and streamlining the United Nations system in the field of human rights. In addition to its mandated responsibilities, the Office leads efforts to integrate a human rights approach within all work carried out by United Nations agencies.

OHCHR is working to promote human rights education by:

- Supporting national and local capacities for human rights education in the context of its Technical Cooperation Programme and through the ACT Project, which provides financial assistance to grass-roots initiatives;
- Developing selected human rights education and training materials;
- Developing selected resource tools, such as a Database on Human Rights Education and Training, a Resource Collection on Human Rights Education and Training and a Web section on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- Globally coordinating the World Programme for Human Rights Education.

For more information, consult:
http://www.ohchr.org/english/issues/education/training/index.htm

Opening Remarks by the Organizers

Elena Ippoliti, Methodology, Education and Training Unit / RRDB Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

On behalf of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, I would like to welcome all participants in this symposium and to thank all of you for having accepted our invitation to participate in this activity. I would also like to thank all EQUITAS staff involved in the organization of the Symposium, as well as the Canadian International Development Agency for its financial support.

This International Human Rights Education Evaluation Symposium addresses the core meaning and value of our work as human rights educators. The participants of the Symposium will contribute to a variety of discussions addressing important questions regarding: how we can make a difference; how can we measure the impact of our Human Rights Education (HRE) work; what can we learn as HRE practitioners from the contributions being made in the fields of education and professional training; and finally, what could we do better to advance human rights education discourse and practice.

The involvement of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in this initiative is in line with our priority objective to support methodological development in the area of human rights education, as a contribution first to the UN Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004), and then to the World Programme for Human Rights Education (2005-ongoing). On behalf of the OHCHR, I wish us all a good and productive meeting; we expect it not only to generate more attention to HRE evaluation but also to provide direction for future methodological efforts, so that we can continue improving or assist others to improve the way we work.

Ian Hamilton, Executive Director, Equitas

Equitas – International Centre for Human Rights Education (formerly the Canadian Human Rights Foundation) was founded on April 25, 1967. This Symposium is an important hallmark event expressing our longstanding engagement in human rights education, and we thank you for being a part of it.

I cannot think of a better way of celebrating our 40th anniversary than by bringing together this group of dedicated individuals that have demonstrated a strong commitment to human rights education, to reflect upon our HRE work collectively and develop new strategies, look for new solutions, and share our experiences.

As many of you know, this organization was set up specifically with the mandate to undertake HRE work, and the last four decades is a testament to that work. Our work began in Canada, and since the 1990s it has expanded to a large constituency of HRE workers internationally.

The International Human Rights Training Program held in Canada has been the cornerstone of Equitas for over 28 years and has expanded to a broad spectrum of Human Rights Education Training Programs in all regions of the world. Further, we have recently strengthened our focus once again within Canada by establishing new

programming for children aged 6 to 12, and we look forward to the opportunity to share some of those experiences with you and also to learn from a very exiting HRE work that you have been doing.

The tremendous response we received when we first proposed the idea of hosting this Symposium is a strong indication of how important a challenge HRE evaluation is to our work and of the tremendous role it will play in helping us to set priorities in our HRE work in the near future. As human rights activists, we are challenged by innovations to our HRE work all the time and realize that we cannot implement every great idea; however this 3-day Symposium is an expression of our collective perseverance.

Uniquely, CIDA agreed very promptly and enthusiastically to support our endeavor of holding this HRE Evaluation Symposium as well as other support we have received over the years and I want to extend our thanks to them, particularly to Stephanie Manson who's here with us this morning. When this event was confirmed, we contacted the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, in particular Elena Ippoliti, and her response was very enthusiastic and very quick. We want to thank the UN OHCHR for both their financial commitment and their support in terms of developing the thinking around this initiative; it is a good example of the partnership we maintain.

The commitment that each of you brings to this Symposium is a very clear indication that the topic of this Symposium is a priority for us in our HRE work. On a daily basis, we are asking ourselves how can we do our job better and make sure that we are achieving the changes that we want to see in the world. During this Symposium, I expect we will come up with some answers. I also anticipate that we will identify a long list of new questions, which will be a sign of our success. Our hope is that the learning from shared experiences and collected wisdom will reenergize us with a new commitment to tackle the challenges we face when assessing the impact of our HRE work.

This Symposium is an important step in the process of building upon what we already do and my hope is that it will provide a new opportunity for us to continue to share our experiences around human right education and evaluation, and lead us to develop new evaluation approaches and tools. When we look around at the people with us today, it is clear that we are represented by most organizations involved with human rights education around the world and I think it is a tremendous opportunity for us to use this Symposium to share this knowledge and certainly at Equitas, we are committed to do that.

Session 1:
The Current State of HRE Evaluation

The first session of the Symposium focused on developing a shared understanding of what we want to achieve through our human rights education work, and on examining some effective evaluation practices from related disciplines. The main questions addressed were:

1. What does impact of HRE look like?
2. What exactly do we want to measure in terms of results of HRE? What is feasible to measure?
3. What are some effective approaches, methods and tools to evaluate the impact of HRE?
4. What can we learn from the fields of education and professional training that will help us in our HRE evaluation work?

Activity 1:
Welcome and Four Corners Introductions

The aim of this first activity of the Symposium was to have participants get to know each other and begin to examine some of the main issues regarding the evaluation of human rights education (HRE).

The facilitator posted on different walls in the conference room four "burning" questions about HRE evaluation, which would be addressed during the Symposium. Participants were asked to gather around the question that most interested them, and where they felt they would have the most to contribute. After introducing themselves to each other in their respective groups, each group of participants addressed their question and developed short presentations to report back to the larger group. Key ideas from their presentations are outlined below according to the questions addressed.

Small Group Presentations:
Four "Burning" Questions about HRE Evaluation

What does the impact of HRE look like?

Group Participants:
Felisa Tibbitts, Gail Dalgliesh, Herlambang Perdana Wiratraman, Stephanie Manson, Ana Maria Rodino, Kristi Rudelius-Palmer, Pavel Chacuk, Ian Hamilton

The group concluded that the following points would illustrate the impact of HRE:

- *Organized and collective action*
- *Social change for all*
- *Recognition of the right to education*

- *Empowerment of children to become peace leaders in their communities*
- *Transition in individuals from disrespect to respect*
- *Creation of a human rights culture*

HRE may have different meanings for different audiences, group members said, and its impact depends on various factors such as personal circumstances and context. The intermediary effects of HRE—knowledge, skills, and attitudes—should all lead people to take action.

The group agreed that HRE should also impact governments and its institutions, whereby they respect human rights, meet their international human rights commitments, and promote legal and policy development through a human rights lens.

HRE should help build capacity and expand the human rights movement, changing vocabulary and ways of thinking. The group said HRE should contribute to the participation and empowerment of stakeholders.

What exactly do we want to measure in terms of results of HRE? What is feasible to measure?

Group Participants:
Emily Farrell, Sally Salem, Dave Donahue , Rob Shropshire, Joyce Muchena, Abraham Magendzo, Catherine Moto Zeh, Andrea Galindo, I. Devasahayan

The participants agreed that ideally, HRE impact should be measured within the context of a move from war to peace, with transformations at all levels—from the individual to government.

The process of impact measurement is more important than the results, group members said. There is a balance between quantitative and qualitative evaluation data, as there is between proving the worth of the program to donors to maintain funding, and allowing educators to use evaluations to improve the program.

What are some effective approaches, methods and tools to evaluate the impact of HRE?

Group Participants:
Pearl Eliadis, Audrey Osler, Jeff Plantilla, Anja Mihr, Paul McAdams, Daniel Roy

The more you work on evaluation, the more difficult it becomes," a group member said. The group also noted that The International Human Rights Training Program offered by Equitas provides good baseline data as a basis for comparison of evaluation results.

Evaluation approaches can be short, medium- or long-term, but must have clear time frames, instructions for follow up, and plans for the best follow-up methods. The group distinguished between the concepts of measurement and of evaluation—a topic that requires greater discussion, they said.

Evaluation can be difficult when HRE program participants' expectations change during the program, the group said; in such cases, a development approach could be useful.

The group said participants must take responsibility for and ownership of an HRE program. While some human rights content must be taught, participants should have the

opportunity to interact and "own" the work. In taking responsibility for their learning, participants also contribute to the evaluation process.

The focus should be not only on HRE training programs and activities; it should go beyond the classroom to a public activity and policy instrument. As such, participants' networks should be used to spread ideas about human rights.

Why evaluate? Should evaluations be for educators' purposes only and if so, should they serve to develop HR policies and programs, or should evaluations respond to funding needs? Different purposes for evaluations will require different approaches.

What can we learn from the fields of education and professional training that will help us in our HRE evaluation work?

Group Participants:
André Keet, Ruth Anderson, Salim Kfoury, Génévieve Côté, Kevin Chin

The group questioned whether evaluations should be summative (after the program) or formative (during the program). They agreed that individuals and organizations should each have different levels of evaluations. Evaluation methods should be more rigorous; the group also suggested a look at performance-based evaluations, which explore how participants apply information in their daily environments.

The group said HRE programs would be more relevant if they incorporated research findings, such as cognition studies. The introduction of evaluation models—John Branford's work on how people learn, for example—was recommended.

Program accountability should also be evaluated to determine both the tangible results and how money is spent.

As with the other groups, many questions emerged, including how instructional design affects program development**,** and how people use knowledge, skills and attitude on the job.

Activity 2:
Symposium Overview:
The Current State of HRE Evaluation

Felisa Tibbitts
Executive Director
Human Rights Education Associates

Felisa Tibbitts provided an overview of current work being carried out in HRE evaluation and research, highlighting key areas of challenges that confront the field as well as some strategies to address the challenges.

Tibbitts underlined two key points in HRE evaluation. First is the fact that HRE programming is very diverse: it takes place in and out of the classroom, in other venues such as prisons, and among groups ranging from the young to the potentially vulnerable. Its transformative nature is the common denominator for HRE.

HRE moves at different paces in different contexts—more quickly for vulnerable populations than for young people. The diversity of HRE in these different contexts is a strength that allows human rights principles to be adapted locally.

The second point Tibbitts stressed was that evaluation design could not be separated from program design: it must be tailored to the intervention. It is dependent on the human rights framework, since HRE provides the skills and knowledge to transform participants' lives. Tibbitts said HRE evaluation "might embody transparency, empowerment, and inclusion, particularly for vulnerable groups."

The purpose and process of HRE evaluation work is openly shared to honour the principle of transparency. To promote inclusiveness, evaluation design would include stakeholders, especially the beneficiaries, at all stages of research. In HRE and HRE evaluation, the power dynamics within stakeholder groups must be identified so that those that are most likely to be excluded from the process have an avenue for participation.

Tibbitts said research could be empowering if shaped and owned by stakeholders. "We are engaging them in capacity building."

Tibbitts said she assumed that most of the participants at the Symposium were working in university or school settings. She chose for her focus the impact of HRE on young learners, on adults in their professional lives, and community, along with influential environmental and personal characteristics.

HRE Impact on Children

Traditionally, Tibbitts said, there has been a division between values and attitudes, and knowledge and skills. Various studies have documented the increase in children's knowledge of human rights once exposed to HRE, but also its impact on their beliefs, which are less readily defined.

Where values and feelings are concerned, a transformation would be signified by accepting differences, and respecting and defending the rights of others. Learners should be encouraged to develop empathy towards others.

Many studies evaluating HRE with children have shown it to be an effective agent of moral education. Children who learn about the Convention on the Rights of the Child tend to be more respectful and grow in psychosocial competencies. However, research in the US indicates that while HRE results in eliciting empathetic responses in many children, only a few wanted to take action. Tibbitts said they view caring and empathy as internal, not external, responses.

Children have a natural understanding of justice if they have high self-esteem and have had unjust experiences, Tibbitts said. People operate in multiple modes of citizenship, one of which is a sense of confidence to make a difference in the group to which one belongs, or to protest non-violently.

HRE Impact on Adults

Tibbitts said while HRE impact on children has been relatively well addressed, the impact on adults "has something to add to the current discussion of HRE evaluation." In a special issue of the *Journal of Intercultural Education*, research indicated that HRE programs had resulted in their intended impacts. For example, women in Turkey who

were exposed to HRE showed significant increases in cognitive and affective competencies. A decrease in physical violence from partners was also reported as part of a general shift in decision-making dynamics, and dozens of grassroots organizations were founded. All of these observations signalled that social transformation had taken place, particularly at the family level.

Research on women from the slums of Rosario, Argentina, who were denied health services, also documented social change and institutional responses after HRE interventions. Researchers attributed the transformation to the women's increased self-perception, their "renewal," and activism.

Environmental and Personal Characteristics

Tibbitts said environmental and personal characteristics are a new but very relevant area for HRE. The political and social context of the learner, his or her gender, and the actual learning environment all influence the impact of HRE.

HRE will have more impact on certain groups of people. Of the three types of learners identified in the special *Journal* issue, HRE impact was found to be most profound for victims of human rights violations—for example, Chileans under the dictatorship—because of the profound shift in their perspective and their empowerment after HRE. The larger context for the HR learner is the political one.

Tibbitts noted that gender has emerged as an area of interest that warrants further study.

A German study of students from 43 high schools found that females were profiled as more emotionally and socially sensitive than males, and were also more actively engaged with human rights. In the same study, teachers found that tools eliciting greater emotional involvement were more successful.

The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement's (IEA) Civic Education Study of thousands of 14-year-olds and teachers worldwide found striking gender differences. Females, for instance, were more supportive of immigrants and generally more empathetic, but were less likely to be active in human rights.

The learning environment is very much connected with democratic learning, Tibbitts said. In a democratic learning context, where learners are truly engaged, one could expect higher levels of learning and moral development.

Tibbitts said she found the concept of moral engagement as it relates to education an area worthy of further discussion.

Country level predictors of HRE impact remain theoretical at this point, but more would be emerging. Tibbitts said that while it is important to keep different levels of methodology and evaluation in mind, "we also need to think about the big picture." It has been shown that countries with governments paying more attention to human rights also have students who are more aware of them.

The growth of HRE worldwide has been documented, Tibbitts said, and there has been a certain "globalization of human rights." Ideas about human rights are spreading through transnational organizations and "policy borrowing." Still, many questions remain to be answered, such as how human rights are transferred, and how the reception countries give HRE can be explained by country-level predictors such as level of democracy, status of civil society, and post-totalitarian or post-conflict histories.

Tibbitts said these and other questions are important if "we are to be empowerment- and action-oriented." She said HRE is moving into the areas covered by civil society organizations and that non-governmental organization (NGO) involvement will always be critical.

For the complete text of this presentation see:
http://www.educadem.oas.org/documentos/Equitas_HREResearch_Tibbitts.pdf

Question and Answer Session

The "Spread of HRE"

A participant agreed that human rights and HRE are spreading through globalization, and asked to what degree human rights policies and programs are being "hijacked." How, he asked, can HRE impacts be assessed when there are overlapping national government or international programs such as Access to Justice? He expressed concern about the kind of "HRE spread" that is not truly HRE, where the government is not committed to protecting human rights.

Tibbitts said this concern related to the discussion of the difference between human rights and citizenship education and their definitions. Some citizenship education programs do promote HRE, she said.

Another participant said the spread of HRE is not all voluntary. The Inter-American Court on Human Rights, for example, has handed down sentences to Latin American countries that stipulate implementation of HRE programs. She suggested that these mandated programs and how they will be evaluated would be worthy of study.

Learner Types and Gender Issues

A participant said it would be logical that the three types of learners Tibbitts had mentioned—those who have experienced human rights violations, adolescents, and human rights educators and activists—crosscut the various categories of environmental and personal characteristics. Tibbitts agreed and noted that it is a matter "of where you draw the lines," so that the categories are clear and understandable.

A participant said she had found similar results in her own work of the gender differences presented by Tibbitts, and wanted to discuss how to address children and adolescents of maras (gangs) and soldiers. Tibbits noted that the issue of gender is coming up in conversations with greater frequency. "I want to invite you to share stories of successful outreach to boys and men in HRE." She said that since beginning the symposium she had heard of two programs and some interesting strategies to reach males that should be shared.

A participant told the group of a program in Timor where the ongoing cycle of domestic violence was a serious problem. The program did not focus on this as a human rights issue and rather sought to engage men in the discourse about domestic violence. It was suggested that HRE should be designed separately for the men and women in the program.

Built-In Evaluation Strategies

A participant said after-the-fact evaluations make the findings more questionable, and built-in indicators should link to outcomes. "We want to move to *a priori* instructional design that already has evaluation instruments in place."

Tibbitts said it would depend on the context. In school settings, pre-imposed evaluation design works well, but this is less obvious with skills or applications in the workplace. For example, she said, in the study of HRE impacts on Turkish women, a whole program of transformation was involved—HRE formed just one part. The evaluation was also very qualitative. She agreed that the most powerful research would be that with embedded evaluation, so it can inform the program as it proceeds and support critical reflection. In such an embedded process, community participation will form part of the design and lead to pressure to think equitably.

Concerns about the IEA Civic Education Study

A participant raised several concerns about the IEA study as a model. While much of the work done under the auspice of citizenship education is useful in promoting human rights, when countries introduce citizenship education, the premise is different. For example, citizenship education programs would include citizens' rights and their duty to vote. Such programs are making good citizens but not necessarily citizens who will work for transformation. Questions about this are not posed in the IEA study, the participant said, and consequently the data should not be relied upon too heavily.

Another problem with the IEA study is that secondary analyses are afterthoughts, since the original data was collected for one purpose. While one can determine what young people's behaviours are, the underlying "why" is harder to understand from such a huge study.

A participant said the IEA questionnaire never used the words "human rights" but rather "children's rights," and the idea of citizenship and civic obligation. "How can we focus on what to evaluate?" the participant asked. "I have a feeling we are not focusing on human rights issues."

Tibbitts commended the IEA study for the qualitative data it provides to build the relationship between national conditions and individual behaviour. She noted, however, that she was not here to defend the study. While the study had its limits, she said, it was valid and valuable, and did pose questions about immigrants', women's, and children's rights. She said "we should always be critical about studies," and the IEA study underlines the real need for a qualitative study.

HR Terminology/Language

Another participant asked how students could be convinced of the importance of human rights and apply them if they cannot recognize them. He said a survey he conducted indicated that some students have the wrong idea of human rights when it is phrased as such, but when the term "justice" was used, understanding improved. Acceptance of terminology is a challenge, and if human rights language is not used then it is difficult to know how impact can be measured. Educators may discuss legal implications and as long as human rights values and concepts are there, that type of education should not be ignored. He said HRE should be placed in the context of different countries, according to different perceptions.

The same participant said that in the Philippines, more HRE did not translate into more human rights activism. He questioned whether people really internalize the core idea of human rights, and how one defines human rights activism.

Other Comments

A participant said the South Asian perspective is missing from the school and gender impact discussion. "The caste factor" represents a big problem in India and other South Asian countries.

Activity 3: Goals and Impact of Human Rights Education (HRE)— Required Knowledge and Attitudes

Participants worked in small groups, organized according to the main target audience of their HRE work, to review HRE goals and determine the potential and desired impacts of HRE at the levels of individual, community, and society.

The four target audience groups were as follows:

- ***Formal Education Sector*** *(schools: students and teachers in elementary and secondary sectors): Felisa Tibbitts, Kristi Rudelius-Palmer, Jeff Plantilla, Catherine Moto Zeh, Andre Keet, I. Devasahayan, Ruth Anderson*
- ***University Sector:*** *Ana Maria Rodino, Audrey Osler, Herlambang Perdana Wiratraman, Anja Mihr, Abraham Magendzo, Kevin Chin*
- ***Non-formal HRE for children and youth:*** *Frédéric Hareau, Shirley Sarna, Gail Dalgliesh, Emily Farrell, Sally Salem, Daniel Roy, Elena Ippoliti*
- ***NGOs:*** *Paul McAdams, Joyce Muchena, Stephanie Manson, Pavel Chacuk , Andrea Galindo, Pearl Eliadis, Rob Shropshire*

Individual Level

The small discussion group on **non-formal HRE for children and youth** discussed a children's rights approach and the importance of making children aware that "they are important in their own being." They agreed HRE helps children to better understand that their rights are protected and that all children are equally important. Children also acquire a deeper sense of personal dignity, self-esteem, responsibility toward others, and solidarity with their peers.

Although they cannot necessarily understand or talk about human rights mechanisms, children "need to know where they can go and to whom they can turn in the community," said the group's representative. She said HRE helps children understand that "they are all not the same" and that they must respect others with different cultures and backgrounds.

Participants discussed the impact of HRE on children's sense of empowerment. They agreed that HRE helps children to develop analytical skills and skills to deal with conflict through negotiation and resolution, rather than through violence. Participants said HRE provides appropriate means of communicating, and teaches children to think on their own and to ask questions. They discussed concrete examples and agreed that children with

human rights training are generally more inclusive, respectful, non-discriminating, and interested in the realities of other children. Children feel included and "speak out rather than act out," said one participant. They take initiative and are the originators of ideas and activities. They also work harmoniously in teams.

Participants in the **formal education sector** group reached similar conclusions. They discussed the importance of knowing the symptoms and underlying causes of human rights violations, resources for addressing these violations, and the impact of human rights violations on others. One participant said part of human rights awareness is the sense of "interconnectedness with those around you" and the effect of one person's actions on another.

The **university group** suggested bringing HRE into people's professional and personal lives. Participants said HRE was very individually oriented at the university level, and depended on a particular teacher including human rights in his or her curriculum, or a student enrolling in a human rights course. They said it was important to have courses that provide field experience. At the university level, one participant said, "Awareness can lead to action as well but action allows empowerment." Participants agreed that more work needed to be done at the higher education level, which is "at a different place" than the elementary and secondary levels in terms of HRE.

The **NGO group** discussed NGO-based human rights programs in general, and the role of the NGO in the community. Human rights programs enable individuals and NGO members to know their rights, as well as the various human rights instruments and mechanisms. Participants said the goal would be not only to acquire knowledge of what is listed in the UDHR but also to "recognize particular situations that relate to human rights." They expected individuals to "believe in human rights" as a result of HRE. They also said individuals require skills to use the legal human rights instruments available. In terms of action, participants suggested individuals "take action in protection of their own rights and for the rights of others."

The NGO group representative said HRE enables children to acquire a sense of individual responsibility for promoting and protecting human rights. Participants in this group said HRE should include training skills related to collective action, such as organizing protests, writing letters, and starting a blog. They agreed that feelings of empathy and caring for others should be cultivated. One participant said the link in moving from attitude toward action is often "a stronger feeling of outrage for injustice." They also discussed reporting and resolving human rights violations, expressing one's sense of human agency, and moving from the articulation of a point of view toward collective action. Administrators, teachers, and parents are all target groups in the broader community. The group members agreed that if they had had more time, they would have developed longer lists.

The **virtual group** participants from Kenya and Ukraine suggested that at the individual level children develop an understanding of human rights principles through the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). They said HRE teaches responsibility to and respect for self and others.

Community Level

At the community level, the **non-formal HRE for children and youth group** discussed the need to develop programs on human rights for teachers, parents, and all those who accompany children in the community, which include the UDHR and CRC. In this way, the presenter said, children would grow up "in an environment of human rights" with positive role models who respect and promote human rights in their daily interactions, and who demonstrate an appreciation of non-discrimination. Not only would children then have an understanding from an intellectual point of view, but also the experience of living it. Such an environment would help children to think creatively, and develop good listening skills and skills for peaceful negotiations. She said children should also be involved in the conception and delivery of these programs.

The **virtual group** focused on the importance of engaging the community in a human rights dialogue, the power of the collective voice, consciousness of power, and analytical skills. Participants in this group also discussed the creation of a human rights society—a culture of human rights that would govern relationships. They advocated a human rights dialogue at the community level with schools, parent associations, and management structures. They said understanding of individual and group rights is important, along with identifying the duty bearers at the local level.

The **formal education group** identified the following groups as transmitters of HRE at the community level:

- *Classrooms*
- *Schools*
- *Teachers' unions*
- *Parent-teacher associations*
- *Student councils and student groups*
- *Community-based associations*
- *Human rights institutions*

At the community level, participants in the **NGO group** said they felt NGOs should be accepted as an integral part of the community, not seen as foreign bodies financed by foreign money. The ability of NGOs to use human rights mechanisms and instruments to reach their goals, to establish democratic structures, and to believe in their responsibility to the community were all mentioned as desired awareness impacts of HRE. Participants encouraged advocacy and lobbying activities to be undertaken together by NGOs and the community, and suggested that NGOs share their reports on the human rights situation in a particular community. They said NGOs should not only have knowledge of human rights instruments, but also how to work toward changing the human rights situation—whether it be a change in governmental practices and policies, or a change in perception by a certain group of people. "It may be interesting to have a fourth level of government or state," said one participant, "because if you are conducting HRE programs the aim is to produce change not only in the community and society but more broadly at the policy level."

Societal Level

The **non-formal HRE for children and youth group** reported that at the societal level, institutions that have an impact on the political and social lives of children need an understanding of human rights and what human rights mean to children. Participants encouraged an approach that enables children to play a key role in implementing children's rights.

Cases of domestic violence, abuse, and neglect need to be brought into the public domain, said one participant, because violence against children "is a social issue, not a private one." Participants in this group also stressed the importance of creating social spaces for a human rights dialogue and ensuring a universal rights-based approach to education. They said a shift from thought to action was essential to see a reduction in the cases of abuses against children and children involved in conflict, as well as to create mechanisms so children have someone trustworthy to turn to within the community. They agreed the community must be given the tools to look after its children and to make a difference in their lives.

Participants in the **virtual group** suggested that effective lobbying and advocacy skills, as well as adequate resources to promote HRE, be provided to students, parents, and teachers. One participant said all educational institutions, teacher training institutions, education ministries, law-making bodies, and parliament should promulgate HRE policies. Notions of disempowerment and alienation or psychosocial values need to be addressed, a participant said. Another participant stressed the importance of learning from and getting involved in HRE success stories in the school, community, and even the country, to further develop and improve HRE activities.

One participant asked, "Which universities are dealing with human rights in their curriculum?" She said more work needed to be done to promote interdisciplinary studies of human rights, rather than simply relying on the traditional law faculties. Another participant said that over the past several years the number of human rights centres had proliferated at the university level, particularly in North America. She said many more universities are promoting inter-disciplinary studies of human rights and gender.

One participant said, "People often think that human rights is a foreign concept." She cited the example of a case in Somalia where individuals, once exposed to the concept and meaning of human rights, realized "they believe in these values as well." She said it was important for people in the community to understand that human rights are linked to the community rather than existing as an abstract concept.

Another participant noted the importance of NGOs in the HRE movement, and particularly the influence of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire and his social justice pedagogy. He also said that many NGOs working today on issues such as gender, indigenous peoples, and sexual orientation are in fact "doing fantastic work on empowering people on human rights" and as such are very important for the field of HRE.

Another participant agreed that, although there is still a certain risk in suggesting NGOs are human rights educators when they "don't actually do HRE for long periods," NGOs have had a crucial role in HRE.

One participant asked about the role of labour organizations. "In terms of civil society, labour unions had a massive power base," he said; NGOs are not the only groups influenced by "those who pull purse strings." He said NGOs play an important role in the depth and scope of activities of duty bearers and rights claimants.

Another participant said the values and principles that exist within a particular society, context, or local expression need to be taken into account.

Activity 4: Preparation for Day 2

Activity 5: Education Evaluation and Professional Training: Current Theory and Methodology

Concordia University's Education Technology Unit, Montreal

Saul Carliner
Assistant Professor, Educational Technology
Concordia University

Adnan Qayyum
Doctoral Student, Educational Technology
Concordia University

This activity took the form of a presentation and a Q&A session. The aim was to explore the current theories and methodologies in the fields of education evaluation and professional training evaluation, which are particularly applicable in the context of HRE and measuring impact. Saul Carliner and Adnan Qayyum both talked about education evaluation in general.

Saul Carliner explained the differences between evaluations in the not-for-profit and profit sectors. The profit sector, he said, has more resources than the not-for-profit sector and is not required to conduct evaluations. In contrast, the not-for-profit sector has pressure to provide results and communicate accomplishments to appeal to donors for more funding.

Carliner highlighted eight practical tips for evaluation:

1. You're Conducting Evaluation, Not Research

The difference between evaluation and research is analogous with the O.J. Simpson trial, in which the defendant's conviction required proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

"It is not reasonable," Carliner said, "to expect to have this kind of evidence" in an evaluation. Although Simpson was found "not guilty beyond a reasonable doubt," he was later found guilty during a civil trial because of the differences in standards of evidence. Similarly in research and evaluation, Carliner said, "the difference lies in the burden of proof." Research requires near-perfection in data collection, over a long period of time. For evaluation purposes, conclusions can be drawn from the available evidence. In fact,

Carliner said, an evaluation can reveal the effectiveness of a program based on "only a shred of evidence."

2. Allocate Resources for Evaluation

Carliner emphasized the need to allocate resources for evaluation, including such expenses as mailing, telephone, and photocopies. The standard evaluation amount, as determined during an evaluation of the United Way (or Centraide) Campaign, is between 5% and 10%.

3. Starting with Objectives Clarifies the Outcomes to be Shown

Carliner said a statement of observable measurable outcomes is important to establish the expectations of a given program. This statement of objectives maintains the program's focus. When determining a program's objectives, he suggested remembering the acronym SMART:

- *Specific*
- *Measurable*
- *Achievable*
- *Realistic*
- *Time-phased*

Although the goal to "improve human rights" is a good one, it is "too big," Carliner said; instead, he recommended a smaller, measurable goal, such as "draft human rights legislation so that it conforms to guidelines that have been proven effective elsewhere."

In response to a question from the floor, Qayyum agreed there is a "tension between how we associate what people put into a program in terms of their time and resources and the outcome on the other side." He referred to a methodology entitled *Outcomes Mapping*, which is being used at the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Ottawa to make the connections between a development program and the achievement of outcomes.

4. Choose an Appropriate Approach to Evaluation

Carliner explained that to acquire a sense of reach, an evaluation should provide attendance figures to determine the number of people affected by the program. Post-class surveys and focus groups should be organized to determine participant satisfaction. He defined focus groups as two-hour meetings for small groups of approximately 8–12 people, using a limited number of questions. He suggested that food be served, a good moderator hired so that "no single person dominates," and a transcript produced. To gain a sense of how much was learned, participant observation and tests are helpful. A test should be designed by returning to the program's stated objectives. For example, Carliner said, "If your objective is to write legislation, then a good test would be to write legislation."

To determine transfer, multiple-perspective surveys and observations after some time has passed will show how much information was retained. A survey with the learner and someone who works with the learner can be useful for those who have access to the Internet. Panel studies of a cross section of society, conducted over a long period of time,

determine the impact on society if people were to use the legislation, but such studies can be costly and time consuming.

5. Make a Convincing Case

Carliner said a case is more convincing when only the most appropriate information is provided to stakeholders. He recommended evaluators "let the data speak for itself" and refrain from "embellishing the data" to prove a claim, because "modesty is usually rewarded."

6. Appropriately Attribute Effectiveness

Determine which results can actually be attributed to the training program, Carliner said. In the case of the draft human rights legislation, the number of bills introduced, the overall change in legislation, and the subsequent change in human rights will determine the impact of the program.

7. Prepare an Effective Report

An effective report, Carliner said, is one that is clearly written and avoids jargon. If jargon is unavoidable, then it must be defined. A report must reveal the goal of the evaluation, explain the procedure, state results, and identify the limitations. He said, "By saying what you don't mean, you give yourself more credibility." He encouraged participants to present a sample evaluation report before even beginning to collect data, to ensure it meets the executives' needs. This way, he said, "They have already bought into your process."

8. Be the Bearer of Your Own Bad News

If data suggests a program is ineffective or incomplete, Carliner said participants should be unafraid to reveal such data. Responding to this information and even addressing and making suggestions for improvement will lend credibility to the program. He pointed to the following additional resources on program evaluation:

- *Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., and Worthen, B. R. Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines (3rd ed.) Allyn & Bacon.*
- *Kirkpatrick, D. & Kirkpatrick, J. Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels (3rd ed.) Berrett-Kohler.*
- *McCain, D. Evaluation Basics. ASTD Press.*

A participant asked Carliner to elaborate on his comment about "evaluation not being research." "The biggest issue in research is the perfection syndrome," Carliner said. Researchers tend to view satisfaction surveys as cheap, easy, and unreliable; for an evaluator, a satisfaction survey is very informative. He said the essential difference between the two mindsets lies in the timeframe: an evaluation is a quick summary, whereas research is long-term analysis.

In a discussion of whose values are represented in an evaluation, Qayyum pointed to the web site of the Evaluation Centre at the University of Western Michigan, and in particular the Daniel Stufflebeam papers on the CIPP (context, input, process, and product) evaluation model.

Proving the Impact of Human Rights Education on Societal Change

Sélim Kfoury
Human Resources Consultant

Sélim Kfoury gave a presentation on evaluation in the private sector (i.e., professional training). This was followed by a Q&A session.

Kfoury said the objectives set at the beginning of a program should guide the evaluation. "What is it that you wanted to change?" he asked. Once the results and stakeholders have been determined, then current competencies—knowledge, skills, values, and aptitudes—must be defined, and the gap between the actual situation and the ideal situation identified. Only then can the learning intervention be developed, he said. Once the intervention is implemented, the measurement begins.

Kfoury identified the following criteria for an effective evaluation process: simple, economical, credible, flexible, applicable, and theoretically sound—that is, reliable methodology and techniques that can be defended. He said other factors, such as political or economical crises, disease, or natural disasters, could also affect the results of a training program.

Kfoury described the four levels of a comprehensive approach to evaluation. The first, he said, is determining whether the participants were pleased with the training by using smile sheets on the last day of the training. The second is determining whether the participants learned from the training about a month afterwards, and the third is job application, namely determining behaviour change and the transfer of information to particular experiences. The fourth level deals with the impact on society, which is usually measured years later. Kfoury explained that evaluation expert Jack Phillips added a Return on Investment (ROI) level to determine whether the training was justified financially.

Kfoury discussed tangible results and provided examples of indicators:

- *Time cycle of a program*
- *Time to project completion*
- *Application approved for funding*
- *Tasks completed*
- *Signatures on petitions*
- *Number of workshops*
- *Collaborative projects*
- *Number of schools introducing HRE*
- *Number of complaints*

In conducting an evaluation, he said the first level must be met before continuing on to the next level. If the target audience has not acquired the required competencies, the first

level has not been met and the learning intervention must be redesigned. He said, "Each level must be mastered before proceeding to the next."

Kfoury identified several data collection techniques:

- *Follow-up surveys and questionnaires*
- *Field observations*
- *Interviews with participants*
- *Follow-up focus groups*
- *Program assignments*
- *Action planning*
- *Performance contracting*
- *Program follow-up sessions*
- *Performance monitoring*

To help isolate the effect of a program, Kfoury suggested taking the average proportion of the estimated impact by program participants, stakeholders, and other recognized experts.

He said increased job satisfaction, teamwork, organizational commitment, and reduced conflicts all indicate a successful program. Sometimes the level of frustration, in terms of ability to transfer knowledge, indicates a successful program.

If there is a change in the field, then the program has had an impact. "Impact is change," Kfoury said. He also said an analysis or readiness assessment is needed before starting a program, and suggested approaching key stakeholders to determine "if they really want to go through with this process."

With four evaluation levels, he said it is easier to "pinpoint the problem." By isolating the level of the problem, "you know where to go to improve the program." He asked, "is it the instructor who didn't know the language (from the smile sheet) or is it the participant who didn't transfer the knowledge?" Another important benefit of this process is that, if a program is proven to be a success, it can be shared with colleagues.

Kfoury said impact evaluation is an ongoing process requiring constant design, implementation, and improvement.

One participant asked for more details on the seemingly complex ROI level. "I am struck by this process by which they calculate a return on investment on learning in financial terms. Is this something used only in the business environment?" Kfoury suggested two publications by Jack Phillips:

- *Phillips, J., Pulliam, P., Measuring ROI in the Public Sector, In Action, ASTD 2002 (Case Studies)*
- *Phillips, Jack J., Return on Investment in Training and Performance Improvement Programs, Butterworth-Heinemann 2003*

Discussion

Carliner said, "Many want financial return, but this is not always feasible." He suggested participants determine the average cost per person and "figure out if it is reasonable." He said very few businesses, about 5%–10%, actually conduct ROI.

Qayyum suggested the IDRC's *Outcomes Mapping* was a better evaluation method.

In response to a participant's reference to time constraints, Carliner agreed there is a knee-jerk reaction to evaluation, and that there could be unrealistic expectations by funders. He encouraged meaningful conversation upfront with funders about their expectations, and inclusion of funders in the decision-making process.

Participants discussed the tension between an instrumental, pragmatic model and the notions of empowerment, transformation, liberation, emancipation, and freedom. One participant asked if there is a model that begins from a different etymological point of view in order to solve this tension.

Qayyum suggested participants read *Fourth Generation Evaluation* by Guba and Lincoln, which is more qualitative in its approach, albeit extremely labour intensive.

Kfoury pointed out that there is no such thing as objectivity, only less subjectivity. He said, "We are human, so objectivity doesn't exist." He suggested evaluators ask many groups of people the same question and then take the average. He also suggested a conservative approach to making claims. He said, "If you have only 5% success, talk about 4%."

Activity 6: Taking Stock of Day 1

In an effort to evaluate the day's session, participants passed around a talking stick in the tradition of Canada's Aboriginal peoples, and took turns expressing what they felt was "hot" and "not so hot" about Day 1.

What's Hot

- *"Felisa Tibbitts' information on HRE research, which was clear, concise and very informative."*
- *"A group of people that challenge you to think."*
- *"Listening to the presentations."*
- *"The ability we have to make assessments about our own work."*
- *"The smaller conversations during coffee breaks to hear about other people's work."*
- *"This group of people that has gathered here in this room."*
- *"The awareness that there are people around the world who share the same view of the need for substantial research and evaluation in order to proceed."*
- *"My first experience discussing the impact of human rights education."*

- *"The idea that we can have a discussion on human rights education and assessment—something we have been avoiding—and bring together various disciplines and understandings is extremely exciting."*
- *"Although I don't have an education background, I learned a lot today."*
- *"We received a lot of good information today that pushed us to think in smaller group discussion, which then brought on new questions."*
- *"The level of engagement."*
- *"Before I talk I would like to say a few words…" [this was a running joke throughout the symposium].*
- *"The small groups and one-on-one interactions."*
- *"Small group discussions were diverse, challenging, and thought provoking."*
- *"The various cultural and contextual differences that influence our practices and outlook on human rights education."*
- *"The space to do what we could…fill out forms, have conversations, come up with questions rather than answers."*
- *"Small group discussions and knowing we will get a picture of how HRE has worked already."*
- *"The variety and diversity of perspectives, comments, and great ideas for the projects I'm currently working on."*
- *"Presentations and questions generated by the group discussions."*
- *"It's the first time I lost the feeling of time, the discussions were so interesting."*
- *"The unexpected analogy between O.J. Simpson's murder trial and evaluation."*
- *"Solidarity with so many."*
- *"I have not experienced any jet lag yet and am happy to see lots of people from Equitas. The presentations were really insightful, discussions were very relevant to the guts that are constantly felt in human rights work. I feel now that I do not have the pressure to prove beyond a reasonable doubt and I feel confident to not make objective claims but 'less subjective' claims."*
- *"Wonderful discussion from all of the presentations."*
- *"The format is good. I got to hear from a lot of people and enjoyed the evaluation presentations."*
- *"Meeting new people."*
- *"Presentations…exciting to be reminded of things to add to my program."*
- *"The diversity of voices and the wealth of information…as a representative of the money, my purpose is to be an information conduit, lending to my ability to understand the science in this."*

- *"Evaluation is a difficult process and all that was said today confirmed this; but we have to go through and we are going through. We are evaluating ourselves and what we have done today."*
- *"A lot of ideas and lots of questions still on my mind."*
- *"Really dynamic conversations."*

What's Not So Hot…

- *"Couldn't be here for the whole day."*
- *"The lower energy level in the afternoon."*
- *"Meeting a lot of interesting people in such a short time frame."*
- *"Looking out the window at such a beautiful day."*
- *"My sleepiness."*
- *"My pasta."*
- *"Wanting to put so much information together."*
- *"The sheer volume of information."*
- *"Lack of focus during the day."*
- *"My flu."*
- *"Waited too long to start my human rights education."*
- *"The cold room after lunch."*
- *"Lack of an overview on what is human rights education."*
- *"Time constraints on small group discussions."*
- *"Sitting down all day."*
- *"My own discomfort with walking into HRE…it's my first exposure with it and I feel like I'm in calculus when I belong in remedial math."*

Session 2: Sharing HRE Evaluation Experiences

The second session of the symposium focused on the sharing of information by participants about work currently being carried out in the area of HRE evaluation. The main questions that were addressed were:

1. What are some effective practices in the area of HRE evaluation?
2. What links/connections can we reasonably make between our HRE events and positive changes in the HR situation?

Recap of Day 1

Participants were asked to recap the events of the previous day. The following section details the previous day's events.

Regarding the first day of the symposium, participants said they felt they had gained new insights and perspectives on HRE evaluation. They said they appreciated the Four Corners Introduction small group activity as an unusual and effective way to get to know other participants, and to launch immediately into questions about HRE evaluation.

The second activity centred on small group work by the following target sectors: formal (elementary, secondary and university) education, non-formal education, and NGOs.

Each group identified the specific individuals targeted within a sector and addressed how the goals of awareness, empowerment, and action at the individual, community, and social levels could be evaluated. For example, key awareness goals for the non-formal and formal educational sector at the community level would include knowledge of human rights, while action goals would mean active involvement in creating human rights programs and activities.

Overall, participants agreed that more must be done at the higher levels of learning. One participant said that in post-secondary institutions, educators "are often stuck in their heads and may not be getting to HRE." At that level, the challenge is to promote HRE experiences successfully. "We are fractured in academia because we are working in so many different contexts."

Tibbitts' presentation emphasized the localization of HRE. The research results she shared indicated that the purpose and goals of HRE vary at different levels. Research is part of a transformative process. The link between HRE and evaluation is evident and can be seen in the American Society of Evaluation's principles for evaluation: the need to respect other people, to foster social equity, and to promote an understanding of differences.

Some participants said Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation was useful in conceptualizing HRE evaluation. At the first level of evaluation, information is gathered on stakeholders' satisfaction with a program—whether they liked it, and which material was relevant to their work. Level One is easy, and a focus on a level where participant motivation can be determined is significant, since it will encourage their engagement. Level Two relates to learning and seeks to determine how successful the program has been. Pre- and post- tests

are useful here. In Level Three, changes in behaviour/transfer are evaluated and could be determined through observation. Results are evaluated in Level Four to determine the long-term HRE impacts. One participant suggested that a Level Five exists: a return on investment (ROI), which would look at changes in efficiency in terms of time and money.

The Society for Training and Development published the results of a survey that asked Fortune 500 companies how far they take evaluation. Of the 18 companies surveyed, 91% evaluate only at Level One, 54% at Level Two, 23% at Level Three and 8% at Level Four. These results mean the extent of evaluation is not resource-dependent. NGOs have the motivation but not the resources to do extensive evaluation, while large private companies have the resources but not necessarily the motivation.

Activity 1: Roundtable Presentation: Current Effective Practices in the Evaluation of HRE

Moderator: David Donahue, Mills College, US

Panelists: Vincenza Nazzari
Equitas

Ana Maria Rodino
Inter-American Institute for Human Rights
Costa Rica

Frédéric Hareau
Equitas

Dr. I. Devasahayam
People`s Watch Tamil Nadu
India

This was a roundtable presentation designed to provide participants with information and 'lessons learned' on current HRE evaluation practices within the field for the different target sectors.

The panelists shared their experiences about the purpose of the evaluation, the methods used, the results/impacts, and the challenges and unanswered questions remaining.

Non-Governmental Organizations

Vincenza Nazzari said the International Human Rights Training Program (IHRTP) is now in its twenty-eighth year, and has approximately 120 human rights workers immersed in HRE for three weeks. She said she wanted to focus on evaluation methodology and program follow-up, in light of the fact that "the learning process begins before the program, continues during training and long after it is over."

Nazzari said that the IHRTP's long tenure has enabled Equitas to design, develop and enhance the evaluation process. Not only can Equitas formally and informally evaluate the training program while it is taking place, but "we have access to people for a long time afterwards…. We can also ask participants if their perceptions have changed outside

of the classroom" to determine whether content expectations have been met and appropriate delivery methods are being used.

The IHRTP primarily uses self-evaluation, Nazzari said. Evaluation begins before the course, when participants have an opportunity to talk about their human rights experience. In 2007, Equitas plans to track this kind of qualitative information more rigorously by asking participants to rate their level of experience with HRE design and evaluation before and after their participation in the program. The main evaluation instruments used in the IHRTP are questionnaires, which gather information on whether participants' perceptions of human rights have changed, and if so, how they have changed. They are also asked about the most useful thing they learned and what they would apply, if they were to choose just one thing.

Nazzari said Equitas has each participant develop a plan to set out how the training will be applied. This gives participants a tool with a built-in analysis of how they can incorporate the learning into their daily lives. Follow-up questionnaires are sent to IHRTP alumni six months and 24 months after the training. Alumni meetings aim to continue the learning and the sharing of experiences. Training of trainers (TOT) is given in a second level of programming where Equitas gives participants an opportunity to implement what they have developed during the TOT.

"Through the Equitas Community, an online discussion tool, we now have access to less formal data from participants' experiences," Nazzari said. She emphasized the need to "sit with participants and go through questionnaires with them," to obtain the stories behind the answers.

In the IHRTP, "we question the questionnaire," Nazzari said; Equitas has instituted a meta-evaluation process. Once participants have filled in two questionnaires, they are asked in a separate session to reflect on their responses—e.g., "What do you mean when you indicate satisfactory?" Conversations with participants about evaluation questions and selection of responses can provide valuable insight into how participants view them and as a result give more validity to the results.

With the IHRTP's focus on changing perceptions, evaluations have shown that participants do indicate after training that they see human rights differently than before. Many participants have noted a change in their personal beliefs about human rights and in their relationship with others. The question remains as to whether these are genuinely fundamental changes.

Nazzari said real results occur when participants use what they learned. It is important to know whether they are using the educational methodologies, how many alumni have gone on to do human rights work, and whether they continue to advance human rights in their own environments. She expressed interest in effective or efficient ways to measure changes in society, to make the connection between those changes and HRE.

Institutions of Higher Learning

Ana Maria Rodino said she teaches a course in the Master's in International Human Rights Program at Universidad Nacional de La Plata in Argentina. Although her course is optional, a "very motivated student population" takes it. She said the evaluation methods she uses are not specific to higher education, and are readily adaptable to other school and age levels.

While evaluations are required in formal education, school administrators do not specify details. "You don't have to be accountable except to your students," Rodino said. "Have they met course goals? Have they attended?" Evaluation is an issue only for educators who want to probe further; the school system is not interested.

She said that if evaluations are required, "let's make them useful." In determining how to do so, Rodino delved into the literature and had discussions with peers. She said she has tried to "approximate the learning experience for the teacher, but also for the students." Evaluations could also serve the university administration, community members, and student peer workers.

Her own goals in evaluation were to assess student learning at the intellectual, emotional, and pragmatic levels. Although she said, "It was too much to ask for fulfillment of all those goals," she wanted to assess some degree of learning at these levels. She said she also wanted to know if changes in student behaviour had occurred, and how to improve the program.

Rodino said she wanted to know whether the course content contributed to student understanding and practice of human rights in their personal and professional lives. Although hers is a legal program, human rights constitute an ethical issue that is essentially about "how we relate to each other."

She expressed interest in whether the methodology provided in the course gave students the tools to think about themselves and others from a human rights perspective. Examples of good evaluation questions might be whether the teacher contributed to a challenging and rewarding learning environment, whether the course experience encouraged action processes in students, and whether these potential outcomes continue to develop after the course is done.

Rodino said the development of an action plan based on evaluation results is useful for teachers but more difficult for students. Instead, she asked students to keep a journal for the duration of the course—an exercise that proved particularly helpful. In contrast, the final paper did not work well until she modified it to a brief paper on a human rights issue with a specific audience—for example, colleague lawyers—in mind. Rodino sought a balance between background research and "spontaneity" that used the reading and learnings from the course.

Rodino said she used this approach with younger students by asking them for a text for their own web pages or blogs. If that was not relevant, children could write a letter to a friend or an article for a class or school newspaper. "It works! Once children connect to an idea, they are keen to make their point."

Rodino said that in some Latin American countries where HRE was started in conjunction with Amnesty International (AI), "you could not mention the words AI or human rights." The term "children's rights" was acceptable, however.

"We are lucky to be teaching HRE, and regardless of age and school level, we are always likely to get a satisfactory response; after all, we are not teaching math." HRE is enlightening, Rodino said; "we can't do it wrong," but evaluations will address the teaching process. From evaluations, teachers can get ideas about how to maximize the thinking that HRE provokes and its influence on stimulating student commitment to act.

In formal education, there is little possibility of follow-up evaluation. If the school administration were interested in implementing a mechanism to track alumni, however, there could be opportunities to determine the extent of long-term impacts of HRE with observation, interviews, and stories.

Rodino questioned the sustainability of HRE, and whether the ideas HRE teachers hope to develop in participants continue to develop in them after the HRE intervention.

Non-Formal Education for Children and Youth

Frédéric Hareau discussed Equitas' HRE program in the City of Montreal's children and youth summer day camps. The program, *Play It Right*, was implemented in the summer of 2006.

Hareau said full-day training sessions are provided to camp counsellors who use games to transmit the human rights message to the children. "We look at children's behaviour and their interaction with other children and the counsellors." He said the project began with a needs assessment whereby Equitas staff visited day camps. One key component was buy-in by the City and camp workers. In 2005, a prototype program was developed in conjunction with the City of Montreal.

The *Play It Right* program has reached approximately 500 youths and several thousand children. Although the program was evaluated through questionnaires, "it is really through the stories that you can get an idea of what changes have happened." This is why Equitas conducts many interviews and observes interactions.

Hareau said simply administering a questionnaire was ineffective. However, when there was a story preceding the questionnaire, the questions had context and the children participated.

Hareau said the link between HRE and change, particularly at the individual level, was easy to make. Children could identify human rights after the program, and attitudes and behaviours seemed to have been impacted. Children in the day camps are involved in the development of rules for interactions, which increases their level of responsibility.

At the community level, program evaluation showed that the number of violent or aggressive incidents decreased by half in the camps. Through exclusion and inclusion games, there was a move towards prevention in the camp. Hareau said that at the societal level the link has not yet been made, but that the next goal is to make the link with parents.

Asked about challenges and unanswered questions, Hareau expressed interest in ways that HRE evaluation could be used as an empowering tool for educators and others.

Formal Elementary and Secondary School Education

Dr. I. Devasahayam described the "massive" HRE program that is now in place in schools in ten states in India. While the program has been successful in reaching more children and teachers, its evaluation is not satisfactory. Devasahayam said there is some assessment since it is the formal education sector and there is a syllabus, but the evaluation "is not scientific."

In India, human rights violations are part of the societal structure, something the school programs aim to break. "We hope to create within teachers and children a passion for human rights," said Devasahayam. Since he and his organization are looking to change behaviours and values, they need to evaluate whether children understand the human rights modules prepared for them. Devasahayam said they still need effective ways to evaluate whether HRE in schools results in sustainable changes in children and teachers. Evaluation is also needed to further develop and improve the program.

The school HRE program in India uses a two-pronged evaluation approach, gathering both qualitative and quantitative information through observation, interviews, analyses of reports, and records. Students are asked to write stories for school newsletters. Program evaluation also relies on reports and informal conversations with students.

The five-day training program for teachers is evaluated through review meetings where they are asked a range of questions. Devasahayam's group also does state-level consultations that bring in children to share their experiences. Internally, there are core group meetings for monthly program evaluations, and within the school there are monthly planning, monitoring, and evaluation meetings for peers.

Devasahayam emphasized that children and non-HRE teachers need changes to be created in schools. Even though human rights are universal, one must be very aware of the profile of the students: they may, for example, be in a caste system. According to a student's context, human rights may change. With that in mind, Devasahayam's group asks both closed and open-ended questions.

Devasahayam said his group looks for qualitative changes in children and teachers, and pointed out that in the classroom, children are passive recipients, a circumstance that is paralleled at the family and societal levels. "That situation is slowly beginning to change." For example, children are questioning teachers, and there is dialogue in increasingly democratized classrooms.

Devasahayam illustrated this with the example of the abolishment of corporal punishment—a campaign initiated by children, then taken on by teachers, and finally instituted as policy. Children now sometimes intervene.

Untouchables did not know that the caste system of which they are part is a human rights violation. "Now they know and their parents are coming to the school administration complaining of problems in the community: 'What are you teaching our kids?'"

Devasahayam pointed out the limitations in their evaluation ability. In some areas of India, such as the north, HRE goes under the name of "citizenship education." He expressed hope that while they cannot measure the impact there, there would be long-term changes.

Devasahayam said HRE remains a challenge in a state-sponsored system where the state is still a violator of human rights. "When we deliver HRE, we can't talk about the violence committed by the state."

He stressed the difference between HRE and human rights in education. In India, there is a dual system for the poor and the rich: access to education is a fundamental problem. It is difficult to intervene in a system that legitimizes inequities. "That mindset has to be broken," he said—not an easy undertaking in a country where the rich upper caste fills the bureaucracy and thereby maintains the social structure.

Large Group Discussion

Human Rights Language

A participant said it is difficult to evaluate HRE impact on participants affected by human rights violations in a political or cultural context, where the expression of human rights ideas is not encouraged. The participant expressed concern about how to transform HRE material in these parts of the world. "If you stop using human rights language, how can you evaluate impact?"

Another participant asked how HRE materials are being used around the world, and whether they use an HRE context to mobilize people, or a children's rights context. She said that in Latin America, HRE materials are likely being used in the HRE context and moving human rights forward. In places like Canada, she said, there may not be a similar awareness, and materials might be directed toward transforming children into human rights leaders.

Research and Theory

A participant said that as an emerging field, HRE evaluation is missing a theoretical framework. If no theoretical assumptions underpin evaluation tools and design, he said, it is difficult to know the impact on evaluation methods.

Another participant noted the potential neglect of in-depth evaluation research, and the lack of balance in resource allocation. "How can we engage in more such research? Should we rely on others outside of the human rights community to engage in it and… piggy back on that research?"

HRE is part of human rights work, said another participant: "We need to find HRE best practices." Principles or ethical guidelines should be established to guide HRE evaluation.

Cultural Aspects

A technological focus for evaluation can diminish the role of culture, Tibbitts said; the cultural element is critical. In some countries, for example, questionnaires are considered threatening. She reminded participants that judgement must be used in applying evaluation technologies, keeping in mind not just reliability, but cultural context and the gender issue.

Other Comments

An Equitas staff member said that in the IHRTP evaluation, Equitas has no direct access to target groups at the local level but works with trainers, who then work with other groups. However, Equitas has direct access to the children in the City of Montreal day camps, and the many lessons learned from working with the children directly can feed back into better and more effective program design. "How can we build evaluation tools into our programs to enable us to train educators," he asked, "so that they can, in turn, evaluate their target group, so that ultimately that information is fed back to improve programs and to keep them effective and relevant?"

Another participant was uncertain how far evaluations should go in order to improve programs, given limited resources. Considerable evaluation efforts on one program mean that others are being neglected or not even launched.

Nazzari said that even when HRE has an impact, a change in government to one that is more oppressive might mask that impact.

A participant said a repertoire of common evaluation tools—attitude surveys that are reliable with both children and adults, for example—would save time and money. These tools could then be adapted and embellished, depending on the context.

A participant asked whether streamlining HRE evaluation methodologies affects capacity, whether a human rights educator can handle HRE evaluation, and what this means for time-fixed projects. She said there is a need for built-in levels of evaluations in interventions. To avoid capacity issues, "we need to make evaluation part and parcel of the HRE process."

Activity 2: Sharing Additional Effective Practices in the Evaluation of Human Rights Education (HRE)

The aim of this activity was to have participants share their own HRE evaluation experience with respect to the same target groups discussed by the resource persons in Activity 1.

This activity was divided into three parts:

- *Part A—Participants worked by main target groups to address particular questions from Activity 1.*
- *Part B—Newly formed groups synthesized the discussions in Part A.*
- *Part C—Participants presented the results.*

The following details the results of these discussions and syntheses.

Elena Ippoliti shared the criteria used to define good practices, as compiled from various studies undertaken in the UN system. She identified the following criteria:

- *Innovation in outcome and process*
- *Impact and effectiveness with regard to objectives set*
- *Relevance for audience*
- *Sustainable impact*
- *Replication*
- *Level of efficiency in terms of time and cost*
- *The integration of human rights principles—such as non-discrimination, participation, accountability, and empowerment—in the process and content*

By target group, participants shared effective practices from their own HRE evaluation experiences and addressed questions on the purpose, method, results, and challenges of evaluation. They shared their results with the larger group.

Purposes of Evaluation

Participants across the sectors agreed that evaluations should assess the methods and relevance of content with regards to trainers, schools, participants, and timing. Evaluations determine the sustainability of the process, methods, and results, and they build a case for program direction. Measuring significant changes in behaviour, attitudes, skills, knowledge, and action—as well as identifying gaps between program objectives and implementation—were also identified as evaluation purposes.

One participant said that accountability had an external connotation and was not applicable here. Another disagreed and said accountability referred to the social contract between trainer and trainee. He asked, "Are we delivering the best possible program?" and said accountability is an efficiency index that applies "to all and to our selves."

A participant said evaluation is a means of informing and improving HRE practices by investigating the relationship between HRE-related policies and HRE outcomes.

Another participant said she sees evaluation as "inspiration for HRE educators" to continue to improve the efficiency of HRE programs.

One participant said evaluation in higher education is more "client-driven and seen as a market process." The purpose of evaluation, he said, is to encourage students to evaluate not only their courses, but also their own learning skills and needs.

Methods of Evaluation

Participants discussed upfront considerations and the importance of pre-design, with regard to scope and purpose, project versus entire program, and timing. They suggested evaluation questions be determined during the design stages of the program, and that the evaluation stay focused, with clear goals. They said it is important to use mixed methods—qualitative and quantitative, triangulation, and multiples sources of data—to answer questions.

One participant recommended setting aside enough time for evaluation activities, such as analysis and reporting. She said it takes time "to put together what you have found."

Methods with which many participants said they were now familiar were quickly identified:

- *Surveys*
- *Questionnaires*
- *Interviews*
- *Focus groups*
- *Observations*
- *Objective independent or participatory observers*
- *Video*
- *Formal or informal review of participant products*
- *Projects or writing assignments*

- *Journals*
- *Posters*
- *Self-portraits*

Participants also discussed methods of communication:

- *Electronic forms*
- *Databases*
- *Software programs (Atlas)*
- *Data analysis tools*
- *Critical incidence*
- *Case studies*
- *Blogs*

One participant suggested simulating real situations for those who do not master the language and described a rural training program about violence as a human rights violation. To ensure participants had understood the training, she said they were asked to think of a case of violence in the home and "play act it in front of people" with support from articles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the Convention on the Rights of the Child. She said artistic expression and creative ideas are important to reach particular groups and draw conclusions from the program.

The facilitator described a successful method used in a training program in Peru for illiterate women, who were asked to draw themselves before and after the training.

One participant noted the overlaps between assessment of learning, and evaluating the success of a program.

Impacts/Results of Evaluation

In each group, participants said the impact/results question had been somewhat neglected during the morning session. The higher education sector identified results to be students making a difference in their subsequent professional lives, or taking on important roles in civil society. Another result, a participant said, would be teachers incorporating HRE in the curriculum, or establishing a human rights centre within their various faculties.

Participants in the university sector discussed:

- *Cooperation and partnership with NGOs*
- *The ability to influence public policy*
- *Ensuring human rights policy in the curriculum of the formal school sector*
- *Students mobilizing to produce a movement for change*
- *Peer-to-peer learning across international boundaries*
- *Research produced by graduate students, including evaluations of human rights initiatives by NGOs*

The NGO sector discussed children and people working with children and said process is more important than results. Some of the results they discussed included: children transferring learning to other children outside the initial learning setting; children communicating more effectively and asking questions; and children showing solidarity in protecting the rights of other children.

Participants discussed sustainability through smaller "zones of change" or "zones of peace" within society, rather than the whole of society.

One participant discussed the difficulty in regional work and improper tracking of participants in programs. In Bangladesh, children created human rights cells that brought together students, teachers, parents, and guardians. The children's learning was transferred from the school to the community.

Another participant said changes in government policy and practices are key when discussing human rights and government duty bearers.

Graduate students' evaluations of NGO programs were discussed, along with the challenge of disseminating the information to academics and back to the NGOs themselves.

One participant noted the wealth of dissertations on HRE in university databases across North America. Another participant noted the difficulty in publishing the work being done by NGOs on HRE.

A participant said the program funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) called Community-University Research Alliance (CURA), which posts proposals and guidelines for university research, speaks to these issues.

Another participant said the participatory aspect of evaluation should be emphasized over the strictly academic approach. "There is a need to involve communities in their own evaluation" to better develop the methodology and kinds of impacts that "would make sense" in their communities, she said.

The challenge presented by these evaluation methods, said one participant, is to find ways to apply them to the reality of a small organization's resources and time frame.

Activity 3: Challenges and Critical Unanswered Questions

The aim of this activity was to have participants discuss the challenges and unanswered questions about the evaluation of HRE generated in Activity 1. The activity began with small group work followed by presenting the results of discussions to the larger group.

Participants discussed the challenges and unanswered questions related to HRE evaluation. The following 16 questions were developed:

- *How do we evaluate in a context where participants are illiterate or do not master the language?*
- *How do we evaluate in a context where there is very little or no access to information and communication technology, such as Internet online evaluations, which is still a privilege to many people?*

- *How do we use research as a tool for evaluating HRE?*
- *How do we go beyond the questionnaire and change the paradigm of evaluation?*
- *How does evaluation feed research and how does research feed evaluation?*
- *How do we evaluate things that do not happen (such as prevention)?*
- *How do we deal with contextual factors in evaluation?*
- *How do we evaluate the impact beyond the participant?*
- *How do we link the process to the results?*
- *How do we get funding for evaluation?*
- *How do we deal with the cultural differences?*
- *How do we make the evaluation within participants' interest?*
- *How do we evaluate when there is no baseline—for example in Somalia, if there is only one NGO, who can they compare with?*
- *How do we evaluate taking into account gender and other differences?*
- *How do we interest HRE programmers/trainers to conduct evaluation and research?*
- *How do we measure impact of HRE in an uncertain world?*

These questions and others were grouped under the following themes: Context Implications, Tools, Methodology, Theoretical Assumptions, and Definitions. Participants divided into groups to address some of the questions. They were asked to take notes and report back the following day.

Context Implications for HRE Evaluation

- *When the state is a perpetrator of human rights violations, how can HRE effectively be done without compromising human rights principles?*
- *How can we teach HRE in schools without integrating human rights throughout the school and education systems?*
- *How can we handle bureaucracy challenges when HRE needs governmental support?*

Participants said they felt these questions related to HRE as opposed to HRE evaluation. HRE scope affects HRE evaluation scope. Although the questions are important, participants said they should be addressed at the HRE level.

- *When working with international groups, how do we evaluate impacts with people who "translate" words to fit different context—for instance, in countries where human rights language is not allowed or not used, as well as where there is a lack of language skills?*

Participants questioned the meaning of "translation" in reality. They asked, "Is it a change in concept or is it the same concept in a different language or terminology?" They said the integrity of human rights principles should be the focus of HRE and consequently HRE evaluation. HRE evaluations should be done with the modesty of the

HRE interventions in mind and at the level where the interventions take place. They agreed that objectives should be set within the scope of the HRE.

- *Do we need to share contexts of our evaluations?*

Participants agreed that contextual analysis should form part of the content of an HRE evaluation report or document.

- *What are the cultural considerations involved in evaluations—both within your project and societal contexts? In some countries, evaluation is highly threatening (even simple surveys). In some places, there is a hesitation to be critical. Also, gender issues can arise—the gender of the evaluator can influence what learners feel most comfortable sharing.*

Participants identified the following cultural considerations:

- *Gender sensitivity*
- *Simple, sensitive, clear, and age-sensitive language*
- *Ethnography*
- *Innovative methods that respond to participants' special needs, such as drawings for illiterate participants*
- *Use of theatre, folklore, and story-telling*
- *How do we evaluate in a context where participants are illiterate or there are no information technology tools?*

Participants in this group said illiteracy should not be a challenge to either HRE or HRE evaluation.

The group did not discuss the following topic questions:

- *How do we evaluate HRE impact for those of participants who work in political and/or cultural contexts where explicit use of HR language is problematic?*
- *Which instruments and approaches are most appropriate to the context we are studying?*

Tools for HRE Evaluation

- *How do we evaluate if people are using materials to forward global social awareness versus smaller community awareness?*

Participants agreed that the answer to this question seemed self-evident; they were not clear on the intent of the question. They said the content of the training would focus on one, the other, or both, but that there were occasions where people use the human rights framework to advance the interests of a particular group while demonstrating no empathy for others. They provided the following examples from past training programs:

- *Participants from a country experiencing massive human rights abuse complained that other participants raised sexual orientation as a human rights issue and then encouraged other participants to condemn homosexuality and bar its discussion.*
- *A Hutu and a Tutsi participant from Rwanda were unable to tolerate one another.*

Participants agreed that evaluation should measure whether the training is internalized only with regard to one's own group, or empathy is created for victims of abuse everywhere.

- *How accurate are questionnaires when taking into account the short time given the participants to answer them and fatigue at the end of the day/training?*

Participants laughed about this question because they were doing this exercise at the end of the day and were very tired.

- *Sometimes we use evaluation to learn—but sometimes we just need to know what the course accomplished. So here, should the evaluation just assess whether the course met expectations?*

Participants agreed that it is important to learn what could be improved and to look at what has changed as a result of the course. Otherwise, they said, "you are neither getting maximum return on investment, nor are you achieving the best possible results."

- *How can we better share HRE evaluation instruments?*

Participants said the Internet could make HRE evaluation instruments more accessible so their effectiveness could be evaluated together. They suggested the use of the Equitas community website, the Human Rights Education Associates listserve, or another evaluation symposium.

The group did not discuss the following topic questions:

- *How can we build tools that enable us to train participants so they can give us feedback?*
- *Are there standardized tools to use within the community?*

Methodology for HRE Evaluation

- *Who might lead international (alternative) research?*

Participants suggested that Equitas or the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights could lead international and alternative research.

- *How do we evaluate how HRE programs reach the goal of creating a human rights environment when related actors are several steps removed from the initial HRE program?*

Participants agreed that funding, or former participants who move or are too busy, could be challenges. They suggested tracking the participants, and the participants in turn tracking, the participants in their own training. They also said a budget of 5%–10% was needed, a figure that should be included in planning. While this might be difficult in some cases, they said it would also help get buy-in from funders, and build a case for the work being accomplished.

- *How do we evaluate how or whether children or young adults are becoming agents of social change?*

Participants suggested developing indicators to look at changes in levels of understanding (for example, the ability to articulate issues), observe and measure peer educators, and determine whether they become active in advocacy.

- *How can we engage participants to conduct research?*

Participants suggested paying people to conduct research. "Help them understand" the consequence or benefits of the ROI for conducting research, they said.

- *What are some effective ways of measuring the connection between HRE interventions and the society?*

Practitioners should identify ways for participants to apply what they have learned, multiply impacts up front, and measure post-intervention networking. "Focus on the 'zones of change'", they said, and conduct surveys and interviews with the target group.

- *How do we link the process with the results?*

"Identify your expected results up front and then design a process to achieve those results," the participants said. They also recommended a process evaluation.

- *How do we make HRE evaluation interesting to the participants?*

This group agreed that trainees must be involved from the beginning. They recommended engaging them in the learning process and encouraging critical reflection.

- *How do we evaluate where there is no baseline study?*

"Ask your participants what has changed," the group advised evaluators.

- *How do we encourage HRE programmers to do evaluation?*

Participants said HRE programmers should be encouraged to think about the benefits HRE evaluation offers.

The group did not discuss the following topic question:

- *How can evaluation be a learning process for participants?*

Theoretical Assumptions in HRE Evaluation

- *What are the theoretical assumptions underlying tools/designs?*
- *Are people willing (do they need to) engage with the philosophical aspects of evaluation if all they want to do is carry out program evaluation?*
- *Are we in danger of developing evaluation strategies as an alternative to more in-depth research?*
- *How does evaluation feed research, and research feed evaluation?*

A discussion of the need for a theory of HRE evaluation shifted to the existing human rights normative framework. The participants also said academia is responsible for supporting NGOs by providing theory and methodology.

Evaluation actions are informed by theory in HRE, either explicitly or implicitly. Participants agreed that human rights theory is different from HRE theory, and that theories are built around the construction of knowledge. HRE is different from other types of education because it does not critique its normative framework, but rather promotes its adoption.

The group said that because HRE is fairly new, theories are not well developed. The normative framework of human rights is so attractive that it has become a credo. Participants discussed whether human rights are considered to be a dogma or ideology. There was no consensus: some agreed it was a time-based ideology, while others said it was more a widely built agreement to have such norms and principles.

The group agreed HRE theory should resolve the existing tensions between learning-focused pedagogy and normative norms, with consideration given to culture. They said the normative framework provides guidelines, but is not itself an interpretation. Because HRE is tied to context, so is HRE evaluation.

Definitions of HRE Evaluation (Need, Sustainability and Accountability)

Questions associated with this topic were not all discussed, but included:

- *Do we need to put "values and principles" into HRE evaluation? If yes, then what are the most relevant "values and principles"?*
- *Why evaluate? Maybe a list of major reasons will help.*
- *Who should evaluate—internal vs. external evaluators?*
- *What are the ethical dimensions of HRE evaluation and research? For instance, human rights principles such as non-discrimination, transparency, empowerment, inclusiveness, or participation should be respected also in the process.*
- *What is the sustainability of processes we are developing during human rights courses or activities? How self-sustaining are they?*
- *What are the evaluation questions associated with HRE? (If evaluation is in part a learning experience, what do we want to learn?)*
- *How far do we need to go in terms of evaluation? Take into account time, human resources, money, level of expertise needed. Take also into consideration multiple factors in social changes and changes in government/political environment.*
- *Do we necessarily have to possess evaluation skills because we are human rights educators?*
- *We have not spoken much about what HRE means in terms of engaging government, and we have not spoken at all about HRE and the UN human rights system.*
- *How do we evaluate things that do not happen (preventive role of HRE)?*
- *How do we evaluate analytical skills after a program?*
- *How can we use HRE evaluation as an empowering tool for ourselves and others?*
- *To what extent ought we evaluate the lecturers/experts who teach in a human rights class/course?*
- *Tension between what we **want** to know versus what we **need** to know from evaluation.*
- *How can HRE evaluation be flexible and adaptable to variations in HRE programming?*

- *What are some ways in which evaluation could be embedded in any given HRE program? (Are there indicators common to all/most programs?)*
- *To what extent is it feasible to develop a framework for evaluation and/or research across different programs?*
- *How do we get funding for HRE evaluation?*
- *Why evaluate?*

The group agreed that evaluation is necessary to improve HRE educators and ensure the activity has impact on HRE participants. They said that often, evaluation can be thought of as a task one must complete for the funding agency, when it is an essential part of "keeping HRE educators honest, creative, and effective." They also discussed the "value-added" of evaluation as professional development for HRE educators.

- *What are important definitions in HRE evaluation?*

One participant defined the term "evaluation" as "significance, merit, and worth" and said it places "value" on something. Other participants shared their phobias about using the word, and its monetary rather than ethical connotation. Participants preferred the more accessible term "assessment," but agreed that it can often be used as an assessment of a specific activity by one learner, rather than a larger program evaluation.

- *Might we draw on other evaluation frameworks to develop an HRE evaluation framework?*

Ruth Anderson encouraged participants to explore "Utilization Theory," "Empowerment Evaluation," and "Participation Evaluation" since many of these areas have similar ethical and outcome goals.

- *What is our own self-interest and collective interest in HRE evaluation?*

Participants discussed ways to make evaluation more appealing and ways to eliminate feelings of isolation in HRE evaluation.

- *What are creative approaches to HRE evaluation?*

Participants said case studies are important to evaluate effective practices and storytelling impact.

- *How do we evaluate entire organizations and effectively integrate evaluation into the programming and systems?*

Participants said it could be difficult to integrate evaluation into the larger organizational programs and systems.

Sharing HRE Evaluation Results

Notes for this discussion included:

- *How do we capture stories of HRE impact via multiple media?*
- *How might we work to evaluate each other's research activity as each other's (external) evaluators?*
- *Practical tips on management of data arising from HRE evaluation include any good practices or experiences on the following: analysis, archiving, developing databases, and sharing outcomes with stakeholders.*

Session 3: Moving Forward

The main goals of the final day were:

- *To determine some good practices in HRE evaluation drawing on the discussions from the previous two days*
- *To determine existing gaps and identify some strategies for addressing them*
- *To plan the agenda of moving forward in terms of developing and sharing practical and effective HRE evaluation models*

The first three activities of this Session focused on developing innovative and effective evaluation models for the three main target audiences addressed throughout this symposium, as well as determining what models could be used across target audiences.

Given that this symposium was considered to be a first step in the development of new ways of looking at HRE evaluation, the final activities focused on how this work can be carried forward. Day 3 began with a recap of the previous day's activities.

Recap of Day Two

Vincenza Nazzari summarized the evaluations she collected from participants the previous day, to determine whether the content and process of Day Three were appropriate.

Participants said they wanted more time for discussion, and said increased small-group facilitation would help keep them on track and allow for a smoother process.

Many participants requested that evaluation methodology, definitions, and an introduction to evaluation theory and framework be included in the symposium; Nazzari noted that these topics were reviewed in the participants' manual.

Participants asked what constituted the competency of the HRE educator to do evaluations, and some participants asked for a clear distinction between research and evaluation, to alleviate the stress caused by the overlap. Some participants wanted answers to the questions they had raised in small-group discussions, but Nazzari reminded them that generating questions was one of the objectives of the meeting. "The idea is to raise as many questions as possible with the intent to try to continue to address them after the symposium."

Several participants requested more examples of HRE project evaluations. Nazzari reminded the group that 17 examples of HRE evaluations had been included in participant kits, four of which had been presented in the previous day's fishbowl discussion.

Some participants asked for more pre-session work, such as gathering samples of effective evaluation tools. Nazzari suggested that this would constitute a very important follow-up activity to the symposium.

She said evaluation projects have been launched in a number of countries where human rights language is not allowed, and where there is a lack of language skills. To evaluate these projects, she said indicators would have to be generated in advance, perhaps drawing on indicators developed from a meeting in Marrakech. "We should include indicators for cultural diversity in the future," Nazzari said; this would make a good follow-up research project.

Nazzari said the evaluations showed there was enthusiasm to "continue the work we are doing." She noted that although the questionnaire was directed at determining what could be done differently on Day 3, most participants commented on what could have been done differently on Day 2.

Nazzari said some participants had neglected to fill in their gender information. Suggestions were made to modify the form so that people would not think that supplying gender information was optional.

Activity 1: Determining What to Evaluate or Measure

The aim of this activity was to have participants determine what is important to evaluate and what can reasonably be evaluated with respect to HRE work with particular target audiences.

This activity was divided into three parts:

- *Part A—Participants worked in small groups to discuss different elements of evaluation for specific target audiences and at different levels of impact.*
- *Part B—Participants presented the results of their group discussion to the larger group.*
- *Part C—the facilitator led a large group discussion to address the same elements at the societal level and have participants draw some general conclusions about what they had learned*

As an example of what to evaluate, Vincenza Nazzari said that when evaluating the IHRTP, Equitas began by looking at the purpose of the program and then gathered feedback on content and process. They looked for perception changes among participants, and the potential for transformation. At the individual level, this could translate into increased understanding of HRE in terms of what was learned, and in action taken.

She said baseline data—the participants' level of knowledge and experience when they entered the program—is important. Nazzari said this would be determined through self-evaluation rather than testing, and that evaluation of the IHRTP at the community level would include a look at participants' organizations and at the people they were training.

Nazzari asked the participants to return to their target sector groups and specify what to evaluate and measure, what baseline data would be required, what the challenges and limitations would be, and what strategies would address the challenges.

Non-Formal Sector (Children and Youth)

What to Measure

The group agreed that they would like to measure children's knowledge of conflict resolution and peace building techniques, along with their general knowledge of human rights. Communication skills, among other things, could be measured for respectfulness; teamwork skills and the successful application of conflict resolution techniques could be measured as well. Group members said they wanted to measure a change in attention to and esteem for others, a change in the number and type of incidents of conflict, differences in collaboration and interaction, and the use of language, such as name-calling. Group members said they could measure the same things at the community level.

Baseline Data Required

Participants noted that qualitative and quantitative data could be collected both before and after an HRE intervention. The group envisioned data from individual personal histories that would include age, gender, and race. They also wanted baseline data similar to the measurement points noted in the previous section. They said interviews could be conducted with the people who interact with children to obtain some of this baseline data.

The group proposed using the indicators from the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* both before and after an intervention as a way to "measure the temperature of your community."

Challenges and Limitations

Group members identified challenges and limitations affecting both individual and community levels. For example, a proper evaluation at either level would require intense human resources and the funding of a dedicated staff person.

Some suggested that the bias and subjectivity that sometime influence HRE could be resolved by human right educators who reflect the diversity of the community they are teaching. Another challenge is present when the larger environment is not human rights-oriented. To address this as evaluators and educators, "we need to be mobilizers." Interventions beyond education are needed at many levels, as are linkages among the different interventions—for example, between education and development. Societal mobilization requires follow-up measures to HRE.

The group said the entrenched behaviour resulting from the negative experiences of children whose human rights have been violated could be a challenge. This cannot necessarily be addressed by an educational process, and may require a healing process, psychological therapy, and substantial support.

Participants from this group also noted the lack of well-designed evaluation tools and methods, and the need to better share existing ones. They discussed the role simplified tools and training could play at the community level.

Comments from the Other Groups

One participant said the concept of "taking a community's temperature" has been modified to be used for children on www.thisismyhome.org. This website features additional modifications that provide a template to "translate" to HRE.

An Equitas staff member said it is important to identify extraneous factors not easily accounted for by evaluations, but that these factors "speak to the context of the intervention."

Another participant agreed that it can be useful for evaluators to reflect the diversity of the community, since they would certainly know the context, but said external evaluators do have a role to play. An Equitas staff member said that while evaluations are based on many observations, sometimes the issue of different perspectives must be taken into account.

Formal Education Sector (Primary and Secondary School)

What to Measure

Group members showed a diagram illustrating the importance of the teacher as role model, and said teacher training is a critical element for this target sector. "We want to develop the teacher with a democratic conscience and a commitment to social justice."

The group said leadership skills must be developed to spread within the entire school community. Community engagement could be measured in terms of how often, or how effectively, a teacher draws on external resources and demonstrates cultural competency by engaging with different members of the community.

Observing the type of dialogue that occurs between teachers, and between teachers and students, was recommended, along with determining whether lessons are well planned, what professional development is available to teachers, and whether unions are involved.

Challenges and Limitations

Teachers may be hesitant to delve into HRE because they need to adhere to the expectations put forward by the school administration, the group said. If this were the case, school administrations would also have to be engaged. In some parts of the world, teachers operate in negative school systems, within which the state actually "works against teachers."

Sometimes, teachers come into classrooms with limited cultural and social experience, which limits their ability or willingness to incorporate human rights into their teaching. It is also challenging when, as in the case of Japan, the school system has been changed to produce students with good test scores. This underlines the case for integrating HRE into the curriculum.

While participants agreed that they wanted to measure a teacher's connection to the community, for example through capacity building, and the degree to which a teacher is inspired to teach HRE, they could not immediately think of how these indicators might be measured. "We have problems reaching teachers in the first place," said one group member.

Motivation is also a critical issue. The group identified various factors that currently de-motivate teachers including the "diminishing role of the teacher in society" and the concern over workload. However, the group said, "if we can reach teachers, HRE may well empower and motivate them."

Other Comments

One member of the group suggested that teacher development could be considered a project on its own, be it pre-service or in-service. "Maybe we should look at ways to target different parts of the formal education sector, given that this sector is so very diverse."

He proposed that a broad cross-section of educators unite to create a consensus report highlighting key human rights principles and concepts for teacher education programs, above and beyond the guidelines published in June 2005.

Policy and implementation "are worlds apart," the group member said, but if such broad guidelines were implemented worldwide, they would give human right educators more legitimacy. He acknowledged the huge problem of HRE implementation in schools and in teacher training colleges. With some dishonesty, he said, "Institutions just use their old degrees and call it HRE."

Group members said HRE improves the quality of education and makes it relevant. They agreed that education should be relevant both to the society and the student. By introducing HRE into the curriculum, educators are not deviating from this goal. "Still, we have to prove this gain" to parents, teachers and others in the school community. "We are not being idealistic but pragmatic in connecting quality and relevant education to HRE." They asked how science or math, for example, could be delivered with a conscience and with relevance to society.

Comments from Other Groups

Quality education is a challenge in light of global competition, said one participant; education should match Millennium goals. "It is not just about the number of kids in school but about quality." The EFA report *Education For All* shows that link, the participant said. Relatively rich countries were very low on the league tables—tables that rate performance or success—reflecting the fact that students were not consulted about their education needs.

A participant recommended HRE should be less a discipline than a transversal curriculum component, especially at the elementary and high school levels. In his experience, however, the teacher does not know how to infuse the curriculum with human rights knowledge, be it science, math, or literature. At teacher training institutions, teachers-to-be have to learn discipline, pedagogical concepts, and evaluation. Adding an HRE component would be impossible—it has to be infused. A math teacher has to teach math; human rights would be the lowest teaching priority.

The same participant said human right educators must design strategies to get teacher-training institutions on board. An Equitas staff member said that while this was part of a larger discussion, "we need to acknowledge that many teachers are doing a lot of human right work."

University Sector

What to Measure

The group pointed to the "huge differences in undergraduate and graduate students," noting that the latter are often seen as a professional community with expertise. The

match between the current curriculum and the professional needs for human rights advocacy, or other professions that have a human rights lens, is measurable. Group members said remaining questions included whether or not there are curricula enabling graduates to resist or oppose human rights violations, whether they have the skills to act, and whether they have political skills.

The group said the impact of HRE would be much easier to measure at the graduate than at the undergraduate level. The latter works across disciplines and how HRE can be integrated into those various disciplines presents a challenge.

Baseline Data Required

The group said data from individual students is important. They can take responsibility of their own needs assessment, and resolve this with the planned outcome for the course. Institutional development plans could, for example, provide a basis for baseline data at the professional community level. Some participants suggested that Equitas staff get data during the course of training by looking at a professional association's plans.

Challenges and Limitations

Some members of the group said it is difficult to get HRE into the universities across sectors. "We can't evaluate because there is little there to evaluate." Outside law departments, the capacity within sectors for HRE is limited. "How do we get human resources to teach HRE?" they asked.

Problems facing world regions are significantly different. In Europe and North America, for example, HRE is not seen as a priority at the university level, where there is an attitude of "it's not our problem." In Latin America, HRE is a main concern. Governments in "rich" countries are willing to fund HRE in other parts of the world or run courses with participants from other countries, but attracting local or national participants remains a problem.

The group also discussed the partnership between NGOs and higher education. Universities "need external support from NGOs and international agencies to raise the profile of HRE within their sector." While some HRE strategies exist, the group said guidance is needed from the outside.

Comments from Other Groups

A participant said there is a need for partnership between the two sectors, and for those who work internationally to build bridges and facilitate the dissemination of evaluation tools across international boundaries. They may use different human rights terminology, but each sector has the same objective.

Another participant said the Asian Housing Rights project has promoted the role of engineers and architects in society. Such projects have to be integrated with professional and international networks in order "to get the most out of them," he said.

A participant said universities "are closed communities"; few people in them know what is being done for human rights because "it hasn't been done on the inside." University professors need to know what is being done "outside," and peers need to become leaders. Another participant said her organization was working on an on-line HRE information tool aimed at the university level.

The NGO Sector

What to Measure

Participants from this group agreed that understanding of particular human rights concepts, and changes in values and perceptions, knowledge, and skills should all be measured.

They said some NGOs might mistakenly see human rights as "a foreign concept." Training requires a connection between human rights and their particular focus. An evaluation would determine whether this connection had been made—for example, whether an NGO working on water issues has acquired human rights as a concept.

The group expressed interest in determining the level of transfer of human rights knowledge, values, and skills from the individual to the community—whether and how the organization and institution changed over time.

Baseline Data Required

The group said prior knowledge of human rights instruments and concepts should be gathered, including which activities within the organization are related to human rights. A summary of the organization's values is useful if difficult to measure, and could include what the NGO considers human rights to be, and whether it uses human rights language and terminology within its community.

Other important information to know about an NGO are the challenges within its society and its HRE capacity before and after training.

Challenges and Limitations

The group identified value measurement and an increase in concept comprehension as major challenges, since some people incorrectly represent themselves as individuals who respect human rights. It is important to account for cultural differences in evaluation responses—for example in cultures where it is customary to "to show more than you actually know."

Participants suggested that data obtained during and after the program could be more reliable than that acquired only before the program.

Group members noted the challenges presented by the allocation of time, resources, and capacity to do evaluations, as well as whether or not human rights language was used. They asked how informal evaluation techniques, such as one-on-one conversations or the candid information obtained from "bathroom talk," could be readily incorporated into the evaluation process, since participants are sometimes less candid in a group or during formal evaluation.

The group said people need a safe environment to express themselves; if there is trust, "they will tell you what they believe." Data should also be shared with participants to build more trust.

One participant said that in her organization's training of police, they address the fact that "we don't know who they are" with a few targeted questions on the registration form about their human rights experience and about content expectations. The responses are reviewed at the start of the training to better focus the course.

Activities 2 and 3
Evaluation Techniques and Evaluation Indicators

These Activities were not covered specifically, due to a reassessment of priorities and time resources available. However, Activities 2 and 3 were covered indirectly within many of the other activities over the three days.

Activity 4:
Planning Follow up to the Symposium

In this final session, participants identified strategies and next steps for advancing HRE evaluation and research, and mechanisms to continue sharing information following the symposium. The activity was in the form of a large group discussion.

An Equitas staff member presented an overview of the Equitas Community site, www.equitas.org, available in English and French. He explained that it was a safe closed site with varied forums, including one for the symposium and one for the International Human Rights Training Program, where only those registered had access to exchange information with other forum participants. The forums provide topics for feedback and profiles of participants. He encouraged everyone to participate regularly to exchange ideas, upload documents, post research, and ask for feedback. He said that like www.wikipedia.org, the site had an option for a wiki, in which people have the freedom to edit a document on line. Other possible functions include live chat rooms and blogs. Equitas Director Ian Hamilton explained the value of the community Web site: it enables the group "to continue the discussions we've had over the last three days. When we arrive at some conclusions, we have a venue to make them available to each other."

Given the energy levels of the group participants agreed to focus the final afternoon on developing mechanisms for follow-up. The facilitator asked, "What are some relevant activities that we can suggest, based on what we heard over the last two days, that would be important to the broader HRE community in improving HRE evaluation?"

Participants presented their top ideas to the larger group:

- *Develop a coherent and appropriate theory of HRE that is useful for preparatory work. One participant said it would be helpful to articulate a theory that underpins HRE. The theory of HRE evaluation, he said, would be informed by the theory of HRE.*
- *Develop a handbook of useful, appropriate, and proven methods, tools, and guidelines for existing HRE evaluation work.*
- *Create a repository of measurement tools (such as attitude inventories, surveys, and protocols) for use across HRE projects.*
- *Explore established evaluation frameworks (empowerment, utilization, and participatory evaluations) and draw from efforts in other fields (attitudinal studies that may be closely aligned) that could be applied to human rights programs and are in keeping with human rights principles.*
- *Develop an inventory of HRE-appropriate evaluation materials.*

- *Develop model evaluations for different target audiences.*
- *Share broadly the most relevant evaluation documents and tools of the symposium, using a web page or electronic discussion list, and consider translating some of this information.*
- *Collect and disseminate good practices in HRE evaluation, such as practical tools and methods that could serve as inspiration to others.*
- *Create simplified tools for less empowered communities and share good practices among practitioners.*
- *Train frontline local community human rights educators to use basic evaluation tools and methods to observe change in their participants.*
- *Develop practical and realistic instructions on timeframes, resources, and indicators, and identify HRE programs in which evaluation or impact assessment are useful or not useful for different areas.*
- *Link human rights education evaluation procedurally and substantively to participatory methods and address dominant contextual problems.*
- *Clarify HRE evaluation indicators in HRE programs and track them in a continuous and participatory way.*
- *Expand or enhance capacity of HRE evaluation at all levels and in all aspects, in terms of human and financial resources as well as time allocation. "No more lip-service," one participant said.*
- *Engage experts in learning evaluation to help develop HRE evaluation methodology. As most of the available material is from a business or governmental perspective, one participant suggested a human rights-specific methodology. "We need to get these people to work with us," he said.*
- *Give equal attention to evaluating and understanding HRE processes and outcomes. Evaluation and outcomes seem to be divorced from the process, one participant said.*
- *Establish groupings of standard indicators, both generalized and thematically specific.*
- *Ensure that enough consideration is paid to proper evaluation from the design stage in every HRE activity. Evaluation is not always systematic, one participant said: "now we know how important it is to commit to this."*
- *Develop strategies for getting commitment. One participant said, "we are all at different places when it comes to evaluation. We have discussed what it is and how it needs to be done—now we need to find resources to implement these ideas." He encouraged a commitment to capacity building and the sharing of information. "Are we ready?" he asked.*
- *Identify experts who can provide needed advice on evaluation.*
- *Build the capacity for teacher education and training in the higher education sector through an international consensus panel that would identify key universally applicable HRE principles and concepts from across the globe in a focused document.*

- *Develop a university-based interdisciplinary research database on HRE, including HRE evaluation.*
- *Develop existing evaluation materials on HRE in a language that different levels and contexts can access.*
- *Develop creative pedagogy and innovative HRE practices.*
- *Create an online database of storytelling and specific HRE case studies from around the world, with links to human rights schools and biographies of HRE facilitators.*

Pavel Chacuk encouraged participants to provide input to the Compendium of Good Practices in HRE being developed jointly by the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. With an open nomination process, he said this compendium would accept submissions on successful tools and methods specific to the school system. He said a regional European meeting on the first phase of the World Program for Human Rights Education would be held in Strasbourg November 5–6, 2007 to assess progress of the World Programme for HRE.

The facilitator said the majority of the proposals for follow-up action were focused on HRE tools. One participant said the ideas identified in this session formed a type of action plan or roadmap, beginning with the importance of human rights theory and evaluation, followed by the development of models, and then online databases.

Ian Hamilton said Equitas staff sees the next step to be the development of guidelines that would make evaluation tools more accessible to HRE practitioners. He suggested "using the community website to draw on the expertise of this group" and working in partnership to incorporate the many different perspectives and contexts. He encouraged participants to ensure HRE evaluation becomes a priority on the agendas of upcoming events.

A participant suggested that in addition to the Equitas handbook, a training session be provided.

Another participant said, "Don't reinvent the wheel." There are many evaluation societies and programs available to draw from, she said. Another suggested the handbook enrich current evaluation work with a human rights perspective. One participant provided the example of a Routledge 2006 publication by Todd Landman entitled, *Studying Human Rights*.

Participants discussed the various reasons behind evaluations. One participant said that in addition to pleasing donors and organizations, evaluations were done to benefit the target groups and ensure their needs were met.

One participant said that as human rights educators "we are already doing it (HRE evaluation) if we are in touch with our communities; it's just not neatly packaged or shared." She suggested practitioners document cases of successful implementation.

The donor requirement has made evaluations an afterthought, said one participant. "We need to move away from this idea so that it is not an afterthought but part of the design…to improve our program and our partners."

One participant stressed the importance of evaluating whole programs rather than a particular project within a larger program.

Ian Hamilton expressed his excitement about the work accomplished over the previous three days and stressed that this was not the closing of a conference but rather "a commitment to continue to explore" the issues of HRE evaluation. He thanked all those involved in making the event possible, expressing great appreciation for the Equitas partnership with the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the support from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the great work accomplished by the Equitas team. Elena Ippoliti of the UNOHCHR thanked Equitas for making this meeting possible and expressed the UNOHCHR's commitment to follow up with a joint project "for the collection of better tools for HRE."

The symposium closed with participants completing an evaluation of the three-day process. A report has been generated that includes participants' responses to this evaluation instrument, as well as the verbal feedback from Day 1 and the short questionnaire implemented at the end of Day 2 in order to reassess strategies and the direction for the third and final day of the symposium. The instruments and resulting report assess participants' perceptions of whether the symposium objectives were met as well as other aspects including logistics and general impressions of the overall event.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Bibliography: Resources on Human Rights Training Evaluation

General Evaluation

OECD. 2002. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.* (Also available in French and Spanish)
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf

OECD. 2006. *Guidance for managing joint evaluations.* DAC Evaluation Series.
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/28/37512030.pdf

The World Bank Group. 2004. Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches. Independent Evaluation Group. (available also in French, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic and Russian)
http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/ecd/tools

UNESCO. *UNESCO Guidelines for Developing Terms of Reference for Evaluations: A Results-Based Approach*.
http://portal.unesco.org/unesco/ev.php?URL_ID=24293&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201&reload=1105373511

UNICEF. 2005. Monitoring and Evaluation: Quick Reference.
Extracts from the Programme Policy Manual (revised edition)
http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/ME_PPP_Manual_2005_013006.pdf

Voyer, Pierre. *Planification axée sur les résultats et évaluation participative (en éducation)* Workshop paper presented at the conference ′La gestion par résultats et la gestion participative: approches parallèles ou convergentes′. (Available in French)
http://www.sqep.ca/archives/presentations/Voyerp_colsqep01.pdf

WHO. *School and Youth Resources and Tools for Assessment and Monitoring.*
http://www.who.int/school_youth_health/assessment/en/

Educational Evaluation Methodologies

Braun, Henry et al. 2006. Improving Education Through Assessment, Innovation and Evaluation. American Academy of Arts and Sciences. An assessment on access to universal primary and secondary education.
http://www.amacad.org/publications/braun.pdf

Mesure et évaluation en éducation. An international periodical with articles from Canada and French-speaking countries in Europe, on the most recent research and analyses on education evaluation and methods. (Available in French)
http://www.umoncton.ca/raicheg/sitemee/revue-infolect.htm

Donald L Kirkpatrick's training evaluation model - the four levels of learning evaluation
http://www.businessballs.com/kirkpatricklearningevaluationmodel.htm

IDRC. *Evaluation @ IDRC* Sources from the IDRC on evaluation.
http://www.idrc.ca/ev.php?URL_ID=26266&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. March 14, 1994. *What the Program Evaluation Standards Say About Designing Evaluations*. Functions of Education Evaluation.
http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/DesigningEval.htm

Nickols, Fred. 2000. *Evaluating Training: There is no "cookbook" approach*
http://home.att.net/~nickols/evaluate.htm

Evaluation Specific to HRE

Amnesty International. July 1999. *Evaluation: A Beginners Guide*. A guide for the effective organization of human rights programs and curricula for beginners.
http://web.amnesty.org/library/pdf/POL320031999ENGLISH/$File/POL3200399.pdf

Andreassen, Bard Anders et all. November 9, 2003. *Evaluation Human Rights Masters Programmes.* MEDE European Consultancy. (Final Report) Evaluation of the African LLM program based at the Human Rights Centre based at the University of Malta.
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/projects/eidhr/pdf/evaluations-hr-masters_en.pdf

Birzea, Cesar et al. *Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools*. 2005. UNESCO, Council of Europe, CEPS. (Reference Guide)
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/Source/Pdf/Documents/2006_4_Tool4QA_EDC.pdf

Bregant, Aleksander and Alenka Bregant. *Evaluation of the 1st Regional HRE Training Session for SE European Countries.* February 2003.
http://www.mirovni-institut.si/eng_html/projects/Evaluation.pdf

Chiout, Hannelore and Ellinor Haase. *Recommendations for an Evaluation of the 'European Year of Citizenship Through Education (EYCE) in Sinaia, Romania, 27-28 April 2006.* March 29, 2006. DARE Network
http://www.darenetwork.org/documents/EYCE_evaluation_April06.pdf?PHPSESSID=8b1e773fb1a2eebe6c2707cad7f8d876

Claude, Richard Pierre. *Methodologies for Human Rights Education*. A project of the Independent Commission on Human Rights Education.
http://www.pdhre.org/materials/methodologies.html#METH

George Lind. December 17, 2003. *Education for Moral-Democratic Learning: The Assessment of Competencies*. (Paper presented at the IBE/GTZ seminar in Geneva, Switzerland)
http://www.uni-konstanz.de/ag-moral/pdf/Lind-2003_education-for-moral-learning_UNESCO.pdf

HREA. Research and Evaluation. HREA catalogue.
http://hrea.org/pubs/#research

Kenny, Karen et al. September 2001. *Evaluation of Voter Education in the Context of EU Electoral Support*. European Commission (Final Report prepared by PARTCIP GmbH for the Commission of the European Communities)
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/reports/sector/951598_final.pdf

Kerr, David. *Evaluation of the Council of Europe '2005 European Year of Citizenship Through Education'*. (Report Summary)
http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-data/summaries/evaluation-of-the-council-of-europe.cfm

Kissane, Carolyne. 2005. *Pedagogical and Evaluation Concepts of Human Rights Education*. (Conference Paper Abstract)
http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p69334_index.html?type=info

Mihr, Anja. 2004. *Human Rights Education: Methods Institutions, Culture and Evaluation.* (Discussion Paper)
http://www.humanrightsresearch.de/material/Discussion-Paper-Band_4.pdf

Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission. November 2002. *An Evaluation of Human Rights Training for Student Police Officers in the Police Service of Northern Ireland. (Report)*
http://www.nihrc.org/dms/data/NIHRC/attachments/dd/files/42/psni_training.doc

Osler, A. and H. Starkey and K. Vincent. April 30, 2002.
An Evaluation of UNESCO Publications on Human Rights Education: Report to UNESCO Section of Education for Universal Values
http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/file_download.php/c5a2246dce4fa9135fec3595581497ceEvaluation.doc

Sardoč, Mitja. March 15, 2006. *Evaluation of the OSCE pilot project on Human Rights Education "Our Rights" initiated by the Slovenian Chairmanship of the OSCE in 2005*. (Final Report) Educational Research Institute.
http://www.hrea.org/erc/Library/display.php?doc_id=3083&category_id=4&category_type=3&group= (HREA weblink).

Tibbitts, Felisa. 1997. *Evaluation in the Human Rights Education Field: Getting Started.* Human Rights Education Associates, Netherlands Helsinki Committee. (also available in Spanish)
http://www.hrea.org/pubs/EvaluationGuide

Tibbitts, Felisa and Judith Torney-Purta. 1999. *Preparing for the Future: Citizenship Education in Latin America*. (Monograph) Human Rights Education Associates.
http://hrea.org/pubs/IDB-monograph/civics.pdf

UNESCO. 30-31 January 2003. *Experts Meeting: The Practice of Rights in Education: A Renewed Commitment to Human Rights Education*. UNESCO Headquarters, Paris. (Final Report)
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001307/130703e.pdf

University of Minnesota Human Rights Center and the Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights.
Partners in Human Rights Education Evaluation Program. Report designed to assess the impact of a human rights curriculum developed by the Partners in Human Rights Education Program.
http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/edumat/HREEval.shtm

University of Minnesota Human Rights Library. Resource of HRE evaluation guides and reports.
http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/links/education2.html

Program Evaluation:

Caritas Internationalis. 2002. *Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual*. See Section 2, Module 6: Skills for Peacebuilder – Programme Analysis, Design and Evaluation.
http://www.crs.org/publications/pdf/Peb1202_e.pdf

Commonwealth Secretariat. 2004. The Gender Management Systems Toolkit. A guide for implementing the GMS program on gender equality. (see Trainers Guide Front Matter,Unit 3)
http://www.thecommonwealth.org/Internal/33896/33903/36970/the_gms_toolkit

Freeman, Ted. January 2005. *Country Programme Evaluation in an Era of Change*. UNICEF. (Evaluation working paper)
http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/CPE_in_an_Era_of_Change_2005.pdf

Kardam, Nüket. *Women's Human Rights Training Programme: 1995-2003*. (Evaluation Report) Women for Women's Human Rights (Turkey)
http://www.wwhr.org/files/Evaluation%20Report.pdf

McNamara, Carter. *Basic Guide to Program Evaluation.* Free Management Library.
http://www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm

OECD. 1999. *Evaluating Country Programmes.* OECD/DAC Evaluation and Effectiveness Series No.2. Vienna Workshop
http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/OCED_DAC_Series2.pdf

UNICEF. September 20, 2003. *Understanding Results Based Programme - Planning and Management: Tools to Reinforce Good Programming Practice.*
http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/RBM_Guide_20September2003.pdf

University of Wisconsin. Summer 1998. *Program assessment toolkit: a guide to conducting interviews and surveys*. (pilot edition) LEAD Center.
http://homepages.cae.wisc.edu/~lead/pages/products/toolkit.pdf

Wright, Clayton R. 2005. *Evaluation of the Protection Learning Programme.* UNHCR. Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit. Program taken by UNHCR staff.
http://www.unhcr.org/research/RESEARCH/427b40ca2.pdf

Evaluation in Development

Canadian International Development Agency. March 2001. *How to Perform Evaluations : Participatory Evaluations.* A guide to the participative evaluation, which includes a list of activities and effective methods. (Also available in French)
http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUImages/Performancereview4/$file/participatory_Evl.pdf

Earl, Sarah, Fred Carden and Terry Smutylo. 2001. *Outcome Mapping: On Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs.* IDRC (downloadable book; also available in French and Spanish)
http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9330-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Edward T. Jackson and Yusuf Kassam, eds. 1998. *Knowledge Shared: On Participatory Evaluation in Development Cooperation.* IDRC/Kumarian Press (downloadable book)
http://www.idrc.org.sg/en/ev-9377-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Gosling, Louisa. 2003. *Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment*. Save the Children UK.
http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/scuk/jsp/resources/details.jsp?id=594&group=resources&section=publication&subsection=details

Hunt, Paul and Gillian MacNaughton. May 31, 2006. *Impact Assessments, Poverty and Human Rights: A Case Study Using the Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health.*
http://www2.essex.ac.uk/human_rights_centre/rth/docs/Impact%20Assessments%209Dec06%5B1%5D.doc

International Development Research Centre. *Evaluation Resources.* A website that includes a list of evaluation reports, guidelines, tools and methodologies and IDRC projects and programs. (also available in French and Spanish)
http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-26597-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Landman, Todd and Meghna Abraham. February 2004. *Evaluation of Nine Non-Governmental Human Rights Organizations*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.
http://www.euforic.org/iob/detail_page.phtml?&username=guest@euforic.org&password=9999&groups=IOB&&page=docs_eval_content

Marisol Estrella, ed. 2000. *Learning from change: issues and experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation.* IDRC/ITDG Publishing (Book summary)
http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9404-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

UNDP. 2002. Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. UNDP Evaluation Office.
http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/eo/evalnet/docstore3/yellowbook/documents/full_draft.pdf

UNHCR. 2006. The UNHCR Tool for Participatory Assessment in Operations.
http://www.unhcr.org/publ/PUBL/450e963f2.html

UNICEF Evaluation Office. April 2002. *Children Participating in Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): Ethics and Your Responsibilities as a Manager* (Evaluation Technical Note Series)
http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/TechNote1_Ethics.pdf

United Nations Evaluation Group. 2006. *Evaluation Capacities Development Task Force: Core Training Programme for Evaluators in the UN System*.
http://cfapp1-docs-public.undp.org/eo/evaldocs1/uneg_2006/eo_doc_700103502.doc

Tools:

Global Strategic Planning Meeting of Teacher Training for HRE. 2005. Evaluation Questionnaire.
http://www.hrusa.org/workshops/HREWorkshops/usa/eval.pdf

Events:

Council of Europe. *Learning and Living Democracy: Evaluation Conference of the 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*
Includes a summary of conference workshops and evaluations Democracy. (also available in French)
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/majour_events/eyce_sinaiaconference_EN.asp

International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). June 11 - July 6, 2007. *Building Skills to Evaluate Development Interventions*. Annual IPDET session held in Ottawa, Canada.
http://www.ipdet.org

Mahler, Claudia, Anja Mihr and Reetta Toivanen, eds. 2004. *Democracy, Minorities and Human Rights Education in Europe.* A summary and evaluation of the workshop on the influence of minorities in Human Rights education in Europe held at Humboldt University March 5-6 2004.
http://www.uni-potsdam.de/u/mrz/news/Documentation_Workshop.pdf

PDHRE - People's Movement for Human Rights Education Human Rights Education. March 1-9, 2004. *Human Rights Education and Learning training Workshop*. Bamako, Mali. A summary of the workshop for social justice activist from West African French-speaking countries, who are interested in integrating human rights education and learning at the grass roots level in their countries. (Only available in French)
http://www.pdhre.org/Mali-2004.html

University of Minnesota Human Rights Library. *Global Human Rights Education Workshops on Emerging Practices, Evaluation, and Accountability.* Working session summary held in New York, June 2005. Includes a list of surveys, reports, evaluations and resources.
http://www.hrusa.org/workshops/HREWorkshops/index.html

Evaluation Organizations and Institutes

The Evaluators' Institute
http://www.evaluatorsinstitute.com/current_program.php

Human Rights Impact Resource Centre (HRIRC)
http://www.humanrightsimpact.org

INEE website
Assessment, monitoring and evaluation
http://www.ineesite.org/page.asp?pid=1041

International HIV/AIDS Alliance (monitoring and evaluation + resources)
http://www.ngosupport.net/sw4799.asp

International Program for Development Evaluation Training
http://www.ipdet.org

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc

Western Michigan University. Evaluation Center (Evaluation Checklists)
http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Dr.	Ruth	Anderson	United States of America	Facet Innovations
Mr.	Saul	Carliner	Canada	Concordia – Educational Technology
Mr.	Pavel	Chacuk	Poland	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
Mr.	Kevin	Chin	Canada	McGill University
Ms.	Gail	Dalgleish	Canada	YMCA Pointe St-Charles
Dr.	I.	Devasahayam	India	People's Watch Tamil Nadu
Dr.	Dave	Donahue	United States	Mills College – California
Ms.	Pearl	Eliadis	Canada	Legal Advisor and Senior Consultant, Human Rights, National Institutions and Democratic Development
Ms.	Emily	Farell	United States	Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights
Ms.	Andrea	Galindo	Switzerland	International Service for Human Rights
Ms.	Elena	Ippoliti	Switzerland	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
Dr.	Andre	Keet	South Africa	South African Human Rights Commission
Mr.	Selim	Kfoury	Canada	Consultant
Mr.	Abraham	Magendzo	Chile	UNESCO Chair in Human rights
Ms.	Stephanie	Manson	Canada	CIDA
Dr.	Anja	Mihr	Italy	European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation
Ms.	Catherine	Moto Zeh	Cameroon	EIP Cameroun
Ms.	Joyce	Muchena	Kenya	Oxfam Novib
Ms.	Audrey	Osler	United Kingdom	Centre for Citizenship and Human Rights Education at the University of Leeds
Mr.	Herlambang	Perdana Wiratraman	Indonesia	Faculty of Law, Airlangga University

Mr.	Jeff	Plantilla	Japan	HURIGHTS OSAKA
Ms.	Ana Maria	Rodino	Costa Rica	Inter-American Institute for Human Rights
Ms.	Kristi	Rudelius-Palmer	United States of America	University of Minnesota, Human Rights Center
Ms.	Sally	Salem	Egypt	Freelance youth trainer
Ms.	Shirley	Sarna	Canada	Commission des droits de la personne et de la jeunesse du Québec
Mr.	Johannes	Strobel	Canada	Concordia – Educational Technology
Ms.	Felisa	Tibbitts	United States of America	Human Rights Education Associates

Virtual Participants

Mr.	Johnson	Awuor	Kenya	Education Rights Forum – ERF
Mr.	James	Nduko	Kenya	Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC)
Ms.	Joyce	Omondi	Kenya	
Mr.	Volodymyr	Shcherbachenko	Ukraine	East Ukrainian Center of Civil Initiatives

Equitas Staff

Mr.	Ian	Hamilton	Canada	Equitas
Ms.	Silke	Brabander	Canada	Equitas
Ms.	Geneviève	Côté	Canada	Equitas
Ms.	Enid	Dixon	Canada	Equitas
Mr.	Radhanath	Gagnon	Canada	Equitas
Mr.	Frédéric	Hareau	Canada	Equitas
Mr.	Paul	McAdams	Canada	Equitas
Ms.	Vincenza	Nazzari	Canada	Equitas
Mr.	Daniel	Roy	Canada	Equitas
Mr.	Rob	Shropshire	Canada	Equitas
Mr.	Peter	Wallet	Canada	Equitas