

Evaluation of JRS Peace Education Program in Uganda and South Sudan

Evaluation Carried out by:

Vick Ikobwa, UNHCR Regional Peace Education Adviser, Nairobi, Kenya

Sr. Roxanne Schares, SSND, JRS Education Resource Person for Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

Fr. Elias Omondi, SJ, Program Officer for Peacebuilding, Jesuit Hakimani Center, Nairobi, Kenya

November 2005

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Glossary	3
Acknowledgment	3
Executive Summary	4
Part I.....	5
Introduction.....	5
1.1 The Main Objectives of the Evaluation	5
1.2 Constraints or Limitations of Evaluation.....	5
1.3 Methodology of Evaluation	6
1.4 The Contextual Analysis.....	6
Total.....	7
1.5 Historical Background of the Peace Education Program.....	10
1.6 Components of the Peace Education Program.....	11
Table 1.6 PEP Concepts, Skills, Attitudes and Values	11
Part II	13
Findings of the Evaluation.....	13
2.0 The Challenge of Evaluating Peace Education.....	13
2.1 The Implementation: Objectives and Activities	13
Table 2.1 Project Implementation.....	14
2.2 The Impact Assessment	18
Table 2.2a Indicators for PEP School Component	18
Table 2.2b Indicators for PEP Community Component	18
2.3 Strengths of the Program in General.....	19
2.4 Evaluation of Community and School PEP.....	20
2.4.1 The Community Program	20
2.4.1.1 Strengths of Community Program	20
Table 2.4.1.1 Cases of Domestic Violence Reported to RC OPM	21
2.4.1.2 Areas for Improvement and Further Development in the Community Program.....	22
2.4.2 The School Program	23
2.4.2.1 Strengths of the School Program	23
2.4.2.2 Areas for Improvement and Further Development in the School Program.....	24
2.5 PEP Coordination.....	25
Part III.....	26
3.0 Recommendations or Suggestions for Improvement and Sustainability:.....	26
APPENDICES	29
Appendix 1- List of Interviewees	29
Appendix 2 –Summary of Peace Education Community Beneficiaries in Uganda and S Sudan	31
Appendix 3 - Terms of Reference.....	35
Appendix 4 References.....	37

Glossary

CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DED	German Development Service
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IGA	Income Generating Activities
IMU	Information Management Unit
JPC	Justice and Peace Commissions/Committees
JRS	Jesuit Refugee Service
MDD	Music, Dance, and Drama
MOEST	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (South Sudan)
SOE	Secretary of Education
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda
PAR	Participatory Action Research
<i>Payam</i>	Sub-county unit in South Sudan
PEP	Peace Education Program
Peace workers	Includes peace advisors, peace facilitators and peace group coordinators
PTA	ParentTeacher Association
RWC	Refugee Welfare Council (Uganda)
LC	Local Council (Uganda)
SBEP	Sudan Basic Education Program
SCBRC	Sudan Catholic Bishops Regional Conference
SMC	School Management Committee
SPLA/M	Sudan People's Liberation Army/Movement
SRS	Self-Reliance Strategy
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank everyone who collaborated with us in making this exercise a success: from the JRS staff, to the government officials, school administration, teachers and students, religious leaders, non-governmental organizations, community groups and leaders and other individuals. Without your support our work would not have been possible.

We congratulate the peace education program personnel, at the JRS, community and school levels, for their dedication and commitment in planting seeds of peace, some effects of which we have witnessed and others we may not even live to see. We believe that the little we do to transform our societies and improve the quality of life will never be in vain, since the fruits of it will be enjoyed by us or the future generation.

The reconstruction of Sudan is at the most crucial moment and concerted efforts for peace are vital in uniting the Sudanese people who have been traumatized and divided by many years of conflict and violence. The peace education programme could be a meager contribution but

one that will remain a critical yeast for the transformation of the society and the full bloom of a new Sudan.

Executive Summary

The Peace Education Program (hereafter referred to as PEP) has had a positive impact on both the community and the schools, the two major components of the PEP. Initiated in northern Uganda 1999, the program reaches out across all levels of the society from children in schools, to the youth, the military, the community leaders to religious leaders and government officials in both northern Uganda and South Sudan. There is a national peace advisor who coordinates the program while peace advisors and their facilitators conduct various activities such as trainings through workshops, sensitization of various groups, and mediation of domestic conflicts.

At the community level, there are peace groups which practice and advocate for PEP values, while in the schools the peace teachers are trained to teach peace education, encourage peace activities through peace clubs and peer mediation at peace tables that have been set up in many schools. There were several testimonies on how PEP had changed people's lives, as individuals and as a community. PEP has had an influence in cultivating better co-existence between the refugees and the nationals, the IDPs and the locals, the various ethnic communities, etc. There were behaviour changes expressed by the decreased numbers of domestic conflicts, alternative ways of resolving conflicts other than violence, decreased conflicts at the public places (water points, markets, etc.) assisting the vulnerable and the poor in the community, mediating over individual conflicts, etc.

However, there are still various areas that need improvement in the PEP. There is need to re-structure PEP in order to integrate it much more into other JRS activities. As currently structured, PEP seems to be an independent parallel program that is coordinated by the national peace advisor without much communication with - Project Directors in the field. In fact, most project directors feel left out of the planning and implementation of PEP activities. While peace advisors, facilitators and peace teachers have been trained in peace education and are committed to inculcating peace values, there is still need for an indepth training that will increase their knowledge, skills and creativity in conducting PEP.

At the school level, it would be important for JRS to advocate for a more integrated approach to peace education: every teacher to be trained in peace education, the PEP to be integrated in every subject and the schools to make a deliberate commitment to a culture of peace. Within the education sector in southern Sudan, JRS should increase its advocacy role for peace education within education forums (such as EDRF) and, where possible, collaborate with the Sudan Basic Education Program (SBEP), which is a consortium of NGO's led by CARE and funded by USAID and have the mandate of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) to support basic education in south Sudan.

As part of the exit strategy, both the religious sector and schools remain the most stable institutions that could sustain the PEP in South Sudan. One possible way could be to work through the JPC programs in different dioceses in South Sudan and empower the personnel to carry out peace education more effectively. The SBCRC and the CRS are willing to collaborate with JRS in sustaining the PEP in South Sudan.

Part I

Introduction

The Peace Education Program (PEP) evaluation for JRS Uganda/South Sudan took place from October 17th to 28th, 2005 in the field with other interviews held before and after in Nairobi. The exercise focused on the PEP projects in Adjumani, Moyo, Arua Districts in Uganda and Nimule and Kajokeji, South Sudan. The primary objectives of the evaluation was to assess the impact that the program has had in the communities and schools in northern Uganda (specifically in Adjumani, Moyo and Arua districts) and southern Sudan (Kajokeji and Nimule) since the program was initiated in late 1999, and to propose possible ways forward.

1.1 The Main Objectives of the Evaluation

- Check on progress of peace education program in the projects in Uganda and South Sudan in order to facilitate a direction or re-orientation of the programs in the two areas.
- Draw learned lessons from these programs in Uganda and South Sudan for future actions in similar JRS projects elsewhere.
- Prepare for a new phase in the program in Uganda and South Sudan as may be with emerging new situations like repatriation and reintegration.

The evaluation thus had a task of looking at the historical development of the PEP, the program activities at the community and school levels, the coordination of the program between country office and field, within project with other departments within JRS, the role and responsibility of the staff and personnel in the field, and eventually the future direction for the project in terms of sustainability and exit strategy.

1.2 Constraints or Limitations of Evaluation

1. The team was unable to visit projects in southwestern camps of Uganda as well as Lobone and Yei, South Sudan to see how PEP is carried out there.
2. Insecurity in some areas in South Sudan restricted movement for evaluation.
3. Fluctuating cases of displacements (IDPs, returnees, integration into the army, etc.) meant that some community leaders or teachers could not be interviewed since they were no longer in their original locations.
4. Poor infrastructure limited the number of places that could be visited.
5. There was a time constraint and so only a limited number of peace communities and schools could be visited within the short time.
6. There was no opportunity to observe the actual teaching of PEP or the process of the peace club sessions in the schools or a PEP community workshop being carried out except an observation of the end of one workshop, visit with peace groups and school peace club members and observing some songs and drama.
7. Due to variations in different languages spoken, the evaluation team had in some instances to rely on multiple translations and sometimes the original meaning could be perceived differently.

1.3 Methodology of Evaluation

The PEP evaluation relied on data from in-depth interviews (with individuals and in focus groups), questionnaire responses, document analysis, and observation. In the **school program**, the team of three evaluators visited 15 schools (cumulatively) in northern Uganda and southern Sudan. In these schools, selected children involved in peace clubs were interviewed and some of their activities observed. Additionally selected peace education and non-peace education teachers were interviewed or completed structured questionnaires. In the **community program**, the evaluators discussed with or interviewed members or representatives of peace groups. The activities of 16 of these groups were observed in northern Uganda and southern Sudan.

In addition, the evaluators conducted discussions and interviews with government camp authorities in Uganda, and county and *payam* administrators in South Sudan. Other groups that held interviews or discussions with the evaluators included community stakeholders, county education personnel, religious leaders and Justice and Peace Commission representatives (in South Sudan as well as the Sudan Catholic Bishops' Regional Conference (SCBRC) in Nairobi, Kenya). Also interviewed were the UNHCR Community Services staff in Uganda and the JRS staff in Uganda and South Sudan.

People not reached through focus group discussions completed questionnaires and upon analysis it emerged that the information contained in the questionnaires tended to corroborate that obtained through interviews and discussions. Of the 120 questionnaires given out, 48 were completed and returned indicating a 40 % response rate. Content analysis of various documents (annual reports, project proposals, and specific projects updates and quarterly reports) yielded *quantitative* data in terms of numbers of beneficiaries reached by the program against targets and objectives set. The field interviews, discussions and observations yielded *qualitative* data on the kind of impact the project has had on people's lives.

1.4 The Contextual Analysis

JRS Peace Education Program (PEP) is implemented among refugees in northern Uganda (in the districts of Moyo, Adjumani and Arua, southwestern camps in Uganda and among the Sudanese displaced persons and other nationals in southern Sudan (in Lobone, Yei, Nimule, and Kajokeji). A general contextual analysis of these two regions will help give a better understanding of the reality under which the PEP is being carried out.

Uganda has been host to refugees from Sudan, DR Congo, Rwanda, Somalia, Burundi and Ethiopia. The refugees live in settlement camps alongside the nationals. The majority of these refugees are Sudanese.

Table: 1.4a: Refugees in Uganda by Nationality

Nationality	Numbers	Percentage
Sudanese	175,057	85.0 %
Rwandans and Burundians	19,346	9.4 %
DRC	10,330	5.0 %
Somalis and Ethiopians	850	0.41 %
Total	206,053	100 %

Number of refugees registered by UNHCR

Note – percentage and total number given to not equal the addition of specific numbers given above.

The Sudanese have are settled in the northern Uganda districts of Arua, Adjumani, Moyo, Masindi and Hoima while other refugees are from DRC, Rwanda and Burundi, Somalis and Ethiopians are settled in the southwestern districts of Mbarara and Kyenjojo (JRS Uganda Annual Report, 2004).

These 2004 figures have been fluctuating due to the various political activities in the region:

- The incursions of LRA in the north continue to cost lives and displace large numbers of people;
- Instability of the Great Lakes Region marked by multiple militia forces in the eastern and central Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the counter government insurgencies have increased the number of Congolese refugees;
- The signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Government of Sudan and Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) in January 2005 has led to the back and forth movements of refugees from Sudan though no significant repatriation has been registered to date.

According to the recent survey carried out by the UNHCR/DED 80% of the Sudanese refugees would like to return home if several conditions are met. Such include realization of 'total' peace and the provision of education, health facilities, food security and water. Most refugees would like to return to their place of origin, most of whom are from Torit (57%). However with the recent activities of the LRA in Torit district most refugees are hesitant to repatriate (UNHCR/DED: September, 2005).

Over the years, the tensions in the northern Uganda refugee camps have been between the nationals and the local population or between refugees themselves, as well as a result of insecurity caused by the LRA. These vary from the use of available land, either by agreement or encroachment especially because both communities rely on agriculture and subsistence farming for their survival; intolerable attitudes and behaviour between the two communities due to varying levels of perception and cultural practices; inter-tribal tensions created by the difficult situations in the camps or based on historical differences. There have also been cases of inter-marriages that have either fostered good or bad relationships between the refugee and nationals, or between the ethnic communities represented, with as many as 30 or more in some refugee settlements.

In **southern Sudan** there has been increased hope since the signing of CPA in January 2005. A few thousand Sudanese refugees and thousands more internally displaced in the north of Sudan have begun to return to the country with a desire to build a new Sudan. The aftermath of the war marked by trauma, lack of necessary infrastructure, existence of landmines on key

roads and farm and grazing land, inter-ethnic tensions and tensions between the former combatants and non-combatants, dismantling of basic means of survival such as agriculture, and the breakdown of the social fabric remain vivid challenges for the reconstruction of Sudan. While inter-marriage has been a good catalyst for prejudice reduction amongst marrying ethnic communities, it has equally created tensions within some refugee or displaced families on the choice of the place to resettle (wife's or husband's place of origin). However, as we can see from the tables below the number of returnees has been increasing while there are also internally displaced persons.

Table 1.4b Estimated Population for Specified Years, Kajokeji County

Communities	1997*	2002	2004	May 2005
Indigenous	780,000*	780,000*	114,075	116,147
IDP Camps – Total	49,230	109,230	25,852	25,852
Bomuyre	30,000			
Mangalore	11,630			
Kerwa	7,600			
Limi (2001)	-			
Returnees	-		19,568	55,642
Total	829,230*	889,230	159,495	197,641

(Statistics for 2004 and 2005 as compiled by the SRRC.)

The registered number of returnees increased from 19,568 in August 2004 to 55,642 in May 2005. The chart below gives more details of population by payams, as provided by SRRC Statistical Officer of Kajokeji County.

Table 1.4c Population in Kajokeji County

Payam	August 2004			February 2005			May 2005		
	<i>Resident</i>	<i>Returnee</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Resident</i>	<i>Returnee</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Resident</i>	<i>Returnee</i>	<i>Total</i>
Kangapo I	11,511	3,532	15,043	11,938	6,613	18,551			
Kangapo II	40,730	7,455	48,185	41,262	8,239	49,501			
Liwolo	45,492	3,285	48,777	45,795	3,449	49,244			
Lire	9,419	3,894	13,313	10,051	7,091	17,142			
Nyedo	6,923	1,402	8,325	7,101	2,251	9,352			
Sub-Total	114,075	19,568	133,643	116,147	27,643	143,790	116,147	55,642	171,789
IDP Camps			25,852			25,852			25,852
Total			159,495			169,642			197,641

(Reference: Draft v1 JRS/UNHCR Project Proposal for JRS Kajokeji Education Program-March 2005, p. 13.)

Table 1.4d Estimated Population of Specified Years – Nimule Corridor

S/No	IDP Camp	1997	2000	2001	2004
1	Aswa	3,752	-		-
2	Nimule Town	10,630	12,312	12,312	12,312
3	Masindi		6,596	7,396	7,624
4	Mugali I	12,209	15,610	15,610	15,610
5	Mugali II	7,596	7,428	7,596	7,428
6	Jelei	-	-	500	736
7	Olikwi (returnees)	-	-	3,300	4,695
8	Anzara (returnees)	-	-		3,096
9	Pageri	-	-		6,565
Total		34,187	41,946	46,714	58,066

The two camps indicated above for returnees refer to people who are not indigenous to the area and are possibly on transit to their place of origin once conditions are favourable.

The optimism for peace has been dampened by the continuing near ‘genocidal’ war in Darfur and the south-south tensions between various ethnic communities. The challenge for reconstruction lies first in the resettlement of more than four million people displaced by the 22 years of war. Countering the military culture of war and violence, ethnic and regional discrimination are challenging issues on the ground. Putting in place the necessary infrastructure and amenities remains a big crucial task, while security is still a matter of concern especially in areas where the LRA is in operation and the government structures are not fully operational. LRA movements in the neighboring districts in south Sudan (Torit, Yei, Kajokeji, and Magwi) have led to loss of lives, kidnapping and looting, subsequently resulting in sporadic internal displacements.

In both Sudan and Uganda contexts above, land remains one of the major issues of concern. The initiative of the self-reliance strategy (SRS) by both UNHCR and the Government of Uganda aims at “making refugees self-reliant by having services hitherto provided for them only, integrated into regular government structures and policy so that both refugees and nationals will benefit” (JRS PEP Annual Report PEP 2003). While the government has made an effort in providing land for agriculture and resettlement for the refugees, some of the land is fertile and arable while much of it is not very productive. The use and control of land has caused a lot of tension between the refugees and the nationals, as well as between the refugees themselves.

The situation in southern Sudan is equally worrying. While most people will have access or be able to own land, only 20% have a house to return to (UNHCR/DED: 2005). With the massive displacement during the 22 years of war, some of the land is currently occupied by displaced families, thus a source of tension with the returning original owners of the land. Inter-tribal conflicts have been experienced in both contexts creating volatile stability in the communities. Despite these limitations, the recent survey shows that 80% of internally displaced persons in Sudan would like return to their places of origin (IMU/OCHA: 2005).

1.5 Historical Background of the Peace Education Program

JRS Uganda began to work in the field of peace education in May 1999 in response to the many inherent conflict situations in the refugee hosting areas of Adjumani, Moyo and Arua. Initial peace building workshops were conducted for community leaders in several settlements to ascertain the need and willingness to undertake a peace education program.

In July 1999, UNHCR began with a brief to establish and then enhance the initiatives for peace being undertaken in the refugee settlements and hosting areas. The Participatory Action Research (PAR) took place during the month of August 1999. There already were a considerable number of initiatives for peace being undertaken in the settlements, which included community facilitation and development work, community management, religious services, income generating activities, adult literacy classes, psychosocial programs, and the formal education system.

It was hoped that with the addition of the Peace Education Program (PEP) to the overall Uganda program, the creation of a more peaceful environment would be facilitated and PEP components would be integrated into existing activities. It was at this time that JRS became implementing partner for UNHCR for PEP in Adjumani and Moyo Districts, utilizing the UNHCR PEP materials. The first series of PEP community workshops began in September 1999.

The peace education program in Uganda was a proactive, conflict minimisation and prevention program, which enabled people to develop values, attitudes, and skills, which help them live in a more tolerant environment. It had two components, a structured primary school program and a semi-structure community program. The initial intent for PEP was for it to be integrated into existing activities of various stakeholders in education and community services, thus more likely to reach larger numbers of people and be sustainable.

A number of workshops were conducted during the remainder of 1999 and through 2000. In the first half of 2001, little was seen to be done, so UNHCR invited a consultant to facilitate an inter-agency workshop from 26 August to 2 September 2001 to review the strategy and develop more consolidated work plans. At that time JRS also took over PEP implementation in Arua District and continued in Adjumani and Moyo Districts.

In 2002, JRS developed an implementation structure, which included a national peace education adviser, peace education advisers in every district, and peace education facilitators to carryout workshops and follow up for the communities, and peace education teachers to carry out the program in the schools.

JRS extended PEP implementation in the southwestern camps of Uganda through the coordination of PEP activities in Kyangwali, Kiryandongo, Nakivale, Oruchinga, Kyaka and the urban area. JRS also began to introduce PEP in South Sudan alongside its other project activities: in Nimule and Kajokeji in 2002, Lobone in 2003, and Yei in March 2005. The overall goal of PEP is to improve the quality of life of communities by promoting a culture of peace through inculcation of values (tolerance, cooperation, forgiveness, etc) that would reduce or change intolerant attitudes and behaviour among and between the refugees and the national communities in Uganda, and similarly in southern Sudan among and between the internally displaced populations, returnees and the indigenous populations.

1.6 Components of the Peace Education Program

The overall goal of PEP is to improve the quality of life of communities by promoting a culture of peace through inculcation of values (tolerance, cooperation, forgiveness, etc) that would reduce or change intolerant attitudes and behaviour among and between the refugees and the national communities in Uganda, and similarly in southern Sudan among and between the internally displaced populations, returnees and the indigenous populations. The JRS Uganda 2005 project proposal identifies three main objectives for PEP in both northern Uganda and South Sudan:

The proposals for 2005 are based on three main objectives respectively:

For northern Uganda:

1. To strengthen and build capacity of the existing community-based peace-building initiatives to respond to cases of conflict and human rights violations
2. To raise awareness about basic human and civil rights among secondary students and out of school youths
3. To develop peace-promoting value systems and characters among war affected school children aged 11-15 years in order to participate and contribute to the peace and reconciliation process of Sudan.

For south Sudan:

1. To promote peaceful coexistence between the refugee population and indigenous population by reducing levels of violence and intolerable attitudes
2. To raise awareness about domestic human and civil rights among secondary school youth and community members
3. To develop peace-promoting value systems and characters among war affected school children.

The concepts areas developed through the peace education programme are as outlined in the table below:

Table 1.6 PEP Concepts, Skills, Attitudes and Values

Knowledge areas	Skills areas	Attitudes and Values
Awareness on need for peace and self-awareness that peace is the responsibility of every individual.	Active listening, self expression and two way communication between leaders and community	Self-confidence, respect and positive self image.
Understanding nature of conflict and peace	Assertiveness and demand for rights and accountability from community leaders by community members.	Tolerance, acceptance and respect for individual differences.
Ability to understand and identify causes of conflict and demonstrate non-violent means of conflict resolution.	Affirmative action taken for the cause of the most vulnerable within the community.	Awareness on bias and prejudice.

Conflict analysis	Dealing with emotions	Gender equity
Ability to understand rights and responsibilities.	Problem solving and ability to generate alternative solutions to violence.	Empathy and taking action for the cause of the needy.
Mediation, negotiation processes	Conflict prevention and ability to cooperate and participate in community work on behalf of peace.	Ability to forgive and reconcile. Social responsibility and security for one another.

There are two components of the program:

a) The School Program

The primary goal of PEP in schools is to engender in children and teachers the knowledge, skills, values; attitudes that will enable them live in a harmonious co-existence.

The PEP education component first began in the primary schools. Selected teachers received training to carry out peace education in the schools, whenever possible as sessions during the regular class time, as well as through peace clubs and in other co-curricular activities, i.e. debating, sports, music, drama, and dance, agriculture, environment, peer mediation at the peace table, etc. Each school is to have a peace table where students can mediate among themselves on different conflicts. The peace club students are also encouraged to carryout activities in the communities such assisting the vulnerable by repairing or building houses for them, fetching water, etc. The manuals used are mainly the UNHCR PEP materials.

b) The Community Program

The PEP in communities enhances the awareness about elements of peace through existing structures at civil administration and community level for effective conflict prevention, minimization, resolution and reconciliation.

-Communities (both refugees and nationals, IDPS and indigenous) participate in workshops organized by PEP and conducted by peace advisors and facilitators. The PEP community component focuses on the entire refugee community and nationals living in or near the refugee hosting areas. This component includes sensitisation meetings, a community workshop of five full days, and sessions for follow up. In most cases communities form their own peace groups to propagate peace values through various activities such mediation of domestic conflicts, carrying out charitable activities such helping the vulnerable by building their houses, attending to their needs (food, medication, water), etc. They also raise awareness for peace in the communities through inter-cultural activities, art, drama, helping in funerals, etc.

Part II

Findings of the Evaluation

2.0 The Challenge of Evaluating Peace Education

The immediate difficulty in carrying out an impact assessment is the complexity of conflict dynamics, which affects the program directly or indirectly. Firstly, people affected by a protracted history of armed conflict tend to have various levels of reaction to the situation they find themselves in. This can range from dealing with personal trauma, loss, and separation to finding ways of survival in the new environment, socially, politically or economically. The sporadic pockets of conflict also tend to fluctuate the situation on the ground. Secondly, part of the team carrying out peace education could be among the affected population and this could affect the program positively or negatively. Thirdly, while carrying out an assessment it is difficult to establish the causal link between the intervention carried through organized activities and the perceived achievement by the organization.

The achieved results observed as indicators for peace could be a result of a confluence of divergent and convergent factors, while on the other hand, peace being a long process, positive impacts may not be immediately observed. For example, a positive impact of mutual co-existence between different ethnic groups could be disrupted or rendered fruitless by a series of armed attacks leading to ethnic violence. Equally, the generated energies for peace could be dampened by new rebel incursions, as is the case with LRA attacks in some parts of South Sudan. However, it is important to mention that in one way or another the sum total of the various activities that improve human condition contribute towards constructive social change which gives people the energy to transform their lives.

From the JRS PEP documents the focus of peace education is one geared more towards conflict prevention or conflict minimization that facilitates change of attitudes and perceptions for a peaceful co-existence: “peace education program was developed in order to reduce the most common intolerant attitudes and behaviour that often manifest in conflicts among adults men, women, and youth and school children.” (JRS Uganda Oct. 2005). However, this seems to shift back and forth. The conclusions from this evaluation, as stated above, are based on representative samples which, (, throw some light into the possible interpretation of the general picture of the program.

In the analysis of the findings we distinguish here the PEP implementation indicators from the impact indicators. While the PEP implementation looks at how the activities planned in the project are being carried out, the *impact indicators* put more emphasis on the progress made in line with the objectives and the expected outcome.

2.1 The Implementation: Objectives and Activities

The primary questions asked here are whether the activities planned have been carried out, and what were the development of various trends in peace education over the years, and the reasons for the possible change of direction, if any.

Below is a simple general appreciation of the development of activities carried out based on project proposals, annual reports and other documents.

Table 2.1 Project Implementation

Year	Planned Activities/Objectives	Observations
May to Dec 1999	<p>1) A UNHCR peace education officer carried out a participatory action research with the help of community services and education officers in the sub and field offices. The baseline survey designed the methodology for implementing peace education.</p> <p>2) The program was to be integrated into existing activities in the community.</p> <p>3) Still at nascent stages PEP planned several activities: peace education at both school and community levels with the intention of having community workshops and training of trainers during the first half of 2000.</p> <p>4) It was acknowledged that monitoring and evaluation would be a difficult task, but a mid-term evaluation was recommended for January 2002.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program managed to take off though with some difficulties. The JRS peace program began in May 1999 in Adjumani and Moyo districts with the aim of helping refugees and local population live together in harmony. • By September JRS was asked to work as an implementing partner to UNHCR. • The major challenge that the program faced was that there was not much follow up to the initial workshops that were carried out. • Integration of the program into existing activities was difficult without close monitoring. • No evaluation was carried out as projected in 2002.
2000	<p>A brief 2000 report indicated that as an implementing partner of UNHCR, JRS plans to continue peace education in the refugee settlements in northern Uganda. Emphasis was put on PEP as both a community and school program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JRS in collaboration with UNHCR conducts a series of peace education workshops in Adjumani, Moyo and Arua districts. • The two components of peace education, school and community, continue to be implemented. • There are 230 people trained in 10 peace education awareness workshops and 6 follow up meetings for community workers in Moyo, Adjumani, Kryandongo and Nimule, one workshop for training of teachers. • A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation tool was devised and tested in Adjumani, Moyo, and Rhino Camp. ?? The PEP program had not been introduced into schools yet. <p>Difficulties:</p> <p>The program was still heavily dependent on UNHCR funds, and delay in funds disbursements affects the implementation;</p> <p>No activities were carried out between July and Dec. due to UNHCR budget cuts.</p> <p>3. JRS did not have its funds for peace education.4. The increased activities of LRA in the northern Uganda further deteriorated the security situation, and refugees and IDPs fell victims to their brutality.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this stage it was difficult to judge the impact of the program other than the output indicators. • Over reliance on UNHCR funds meant that activities could not be properly planned for.
2001	<p>There seemed to be no planned activities until September 2001.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In September 2001, UNHCR held an inter-agency workshop to do a more detailed work plan for ongoing PEP activities.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At that time JRS also took over PEP implementation in Arua District and continued in Adjumani and Moyo Districts.
2002	<p>In the project proposal for 2002 (Uganda/S. Sudan) JRS identified six main objectives and activities.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Reduce violence and friction between the IDPs/refugees and host communities; 2. Strengthen community based peace building initiatives; 3. Enhance and encourage women and youth to take active part in peace building process; 4. Establish peace education programs and recruit peace education officers in each program; 5. Devise monitoring and evaluation tools for peace education; 6. Introduce peace education elements into primary and secondary schools. <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More peace facilitators trained both in northern Uganda and South Sudan, • Introduction of peace education manuals and peace centers, involvement of local leadership in the PEP activities, • Targeting of women and youth, formally introducing PEP in Lobone, Nimule, Kajokeji and Rhino Camp, • Hiring peace education officer to run PEP in the above areas, training of more teachers, etc. • Increase facilities for the implementation of PEP (office supplies/, motorbikes, etc). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Southern Sudan, in the later half of 2002, the peace education program was introduced. Several training workshops were carried out much more in northern Uganda (173 workshops) than South Sudan (only 3 workshops in Nimule). <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seemed to be no 2002 report to show the number of activities carried out and the impact assessment. • According to the country director, due to the delay/cut off of the UNHCR funds PEP activities were reduced. • A new national peace was hired to coordinate and follow up on PEP activities. • It seemed that JRS implementation of PEP extended to coordinate activities in the southwestern camps of Uganda • There was no indication that PEP had started in secondary schools
2003	<p>The objectives remained similar as above.</p> <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These included training of more peace facilitators and teachers and sensitization of community leaders, • Introducing peace education manuals and peace centers or groups, • Targeting the youth and women, hiring peace education advisers for Kajokeji, Moyo and Lobone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the annual report of 2003, the objectives and activities were adhered to and activities carried out as planned. There was more training through workshops (a total of 227 workshops in Adjumani, Moyo, Arua, Nimule, Kajokeji and Lobone), teachers were trained and 99 peace groups formed with a total of 2, 433 membership. New facilitators are hired for Kajokeji, Nimule, Adjumani and Moyo. A monitoring and evaluation mechanism was put in place through follow up of workshops and meetings <p>Difficulties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cases of insecurity, 2. Delayed funding from the UNHCR, 3. Lack of sufficient funding facilities, 4. Lack of translated versions of the peace

		<p>manuals, and</p> <p>5. Lack of the rule of law in the Sudan context made which the implementation of some aspects of the program rather difficult.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PEP was gradually developing into a full-fledged program within JRS and not one integrated into the projects, with a separate project proposal for fundraising.
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PEP retained more or less the same objectives and activities and added an extra one: <i>To forge close cross sector coordination with local civil authorities, NGOs, community workers and institutional traditional peace building groups.</i> • This objective was to be carried through joint coordination meetings with NGOs, community workers, peace education officers and facilitators, as well as joint peace building activities. 	<p>Most objectives were re achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 33 previously trained community facilitators were re hired to conduct sensitization workshops. These were introduced to basic skills in counseling and community management and mobilization skills. • A total of 155 community workshops were re carried out. There was a noted positive impact by the community peace groups, an improving coexistence between different communities. • The PEP was s gaining popularity and support among the community members; • Youth and women were becoming more empowered. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, 34 follow up workshops were conducted for an impact assessment; 73 coordination meetings were carried out. <p>Difficulties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insecurity due to LRA activities, 2. Insufficient incentives for the facilitators; 3. Lack of the rule of law in South Sudan; 4. Cultural practices that counter peace ideals. <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still no clear mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation were in place, except for tools to facilitate monthly reporting by facilitators. • The main current approach seemed to be based on follow up meetings and workshops and not any external observation or evaluation. The program was certainly increasing in personnel and activities. • The proposed coordination seemed to imply that JRS took the lead in including other agencies in their (JRS) ‘agenda’ but not necessarily working out a common agenda for a joint action. • The community program seemed to be much stronger than the school, which appeared to be at the periphery of the PEP planning; • PEP was introduced into secondary schools in Adjumani and Moyo Districts, and in Nimule.
2005	The proposals for 2005 are based on three main objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the six months 2005 report workshops were conducted in both southern Sudan (61

<p>For northern Uganda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.To strengthen and build capacity of the existing community-based peace-building initiatives to respond to cases of conflict and human rights violations; 2.To raise awareness about basic human and civil rights among secondary students and out of school youths;. 3.To develop peace-promoting value systems and characters among war affected school children aged 11-15 years in order to participate and contribute to the peace and reconciliation process of Sudan. <p>For south Sudan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.To promote peaceful coexistence between the refugee population and indigenous population by reducing levels of violence and intolerable attitudes; 2.To raise awareness about domestic human and civil rights among secondary school youth and community members; 3.To develop peace-promoting value systems and characters among war affected school children. <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In both regions emphasis was to be on carrying out more peace education workshops, targeting the community leaders, military personnel and civil authorities while at the same time raising awareness on human rights, peace, justice and good governance issues. • There was to be documentation of human rights abuses, establishing of community conflict mitigation teams, • Encouraging of income generating activities, • Publishing quarterly newsletters on the prevailing peace and human rights condition; design printed campaign materials (posters, stickers and campaign slogans). • 20% of the entire refugee population was targeted; • A consultant will carry out a baseline survey for primary schools to access how the children's situation is affecting their behavior and willingness to participate in peace building initiatives. 	<p>community workshops out of 70 planned) and northern Uganda (56 workshops out of 145 planned).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were indicators of positive impacts of the PEP in both the communities and schools: 12 Community conflict and crisis intervention teams were formed both in south Sudan and northern Uganda respectively; the first two editions of the new <i>Peacebuilder</i> magazine were produced (1000 copies per edition); • There was an increased payment of incentives for the 50 facilitators in Sudan and 19 in Uganda. • The school PEP was picking up and giving some positive results, and PEP was introduced into secondary schools in Arua District. <p>Difficulties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LRA continued to cause insecurity in both northern Uganda and southern Sudan especially in the Nimule corridor. 2. There was a high turn over of facilitators as people returned to their original homes, which tended to disrupt the smooth flow of the program. 3. Early marriages and lack of parental support for girl-child education had constrained the ideals pursued by peace education of promoting girl-child rights. 4. Setting up Yei PEP had been more expensive than projected; 5. Lack of JRS presence in the southwestern camps meant less monitoring capacity, although focal persons have been appointed to follow up closely on activities. <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While PEP has narrowed its objectives to three, there seemed to be an increase in activities • In northern Uganda 56 out of 145 workshops had been conducted; would this mean that more workshops were projected than necessary? • There was no indication yet in the report, what percentage of the 20% target had been reached, and whether this 20% was considered a new target group for the year 2005.
--	--

The set objectives and the activities to reach seem to have been consistently the same over the years.

2.2 The Impact Assessment

The impact assessment of peace education seeks to evaluate the qualitative effect of the program based on the objectives and expected outcome. As already noted, evaluating the impact assessment of peace education in conflict settings (whether during or in post-conflict period) is a challenging task. In most cases the projected indicators may not be visibly justified. In fact indicators, as we have seen in the PEP implementation table above, could be evidence that an objective has been achieved but not necessarily a proof that the change has been caused by the intervention. The tables below show some of the indicators to measure impacts for both school and the community

Table 2.2a Indicators for PEP School Component

Possible outcome projected:
Pupils demonstrating behaviour change that enables them prevent conflict and violence.
Possible indicators:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced levels of intolerant attitudes like use of abusive language, exclusion, indiscipline, lack of respect for others etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive change in the perception of the children towards each other and ability to tolerate one another.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of free interaction and acceptance between children by avoiding discrimination based on tribal, ethnic, gender, nationality etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to refrain from using stereotypes in their speeches.

Table 2.2b Indicators for PEP Community Component

Possible outcome:
Adequate conflict mitigation and community response to violence and human rights violation and reduced levels of conflict between/among refugees and nationals, locals and IDPs.
Possible indicators:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community facilitators trained in content and methodology and active in peace education programme and applying knowledge and skills of peace building.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community peace initiatives groups established and actively involved in peace building in the community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic violence cases resolved by type, mode and out come.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive change in attitude reflected in use of language, perception and willing ness to share resources and services among refugees and nationals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint peace related activities organized by refugees and national communities (sports, music dance drama).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of local authorities in peace activities and level of satisfaction of the community with service rendered in peace building.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased willingness to identify and assist the vulnerable within the community.

The findings below are based on the interviews carried out with different individuals such as teachers, peace advisors, peace groups, JRS staff, government officials as well as consultation of various documents availed to the team.

2.3 Strengths of the Program in General

1. Most people interviewed spoke well of PEP. The program has been well received in terms of participation and there were requests for more and more workshops. As one community member observed at Rhino Camp, “Before PEP, we were like people in darkness, with no direction...PEP brought wisdom into our lives.”
2. Increased numbers of community-based, grassroots workshops have targeted various community groups at different levels: local leaders, women, youth, religious leaders, the catechists/church, etc. thus raising awareness amongst thousands of people in various districts (see statistics in table below).

Table 2.3: Cumulative Number of PEP Community Workshop Participants Uganda (1999 -2005) and South Sudan (2002 – 2005)

	Males	Females	Total
Uganda	15,985	9,776	25,761
South Sudan	7,486	4,702	12,188
Totals	23,471	14,478	37,949

3. Through community and school components, all age groups (6 years through adult, including elderly) have been reached. For example, as indicated in the table below, in South Sudan there were 34 follow up workshops conducted for both youth and adults to carry out impact assessment of the program on workshop beneficiaries (JRS Uganda PEP South Sudan Annual Report, 2004).

Table 2.4 General statistics of Youth and Adults Reached

Location	No. of w/shops	Target	ATTENDANCE	
			Male	Female
Nimule	12	Mixed Adult/Youth	313	205
Kajokeji	12	Mixed Adult/Youth	56	18
Lobone	10	Mixed group	194	149
Total	34		563	372

4. There has been an increase in the number of community-initiated workshops in some areas. There were reports of community members requesting and making a contribution toward the workshop, e.g. food, (a step in sustainability). For example, in Adjumani there are 26 community peace education groups with 448 members (261 males and 187 females). Between January and September this year they have had 4 community initiated workshops and 48 groups meetings (PEP Adjumani, 3rd Quarter Report, Sept. 2005).
5. The peace advisers and facilitators show a commendable ability to mobilize the community and get the program running. Most of them have earned the respect and confidence of the community allowing them to mobilize the community and organize activities with sufficient grassroots support. In most communities and schools visited the peace advisers and facilitators were well known to the people, whether teachers, the community peace groups or the leaders at various levels.

2.4 Evaluation of Community and School PEP

2.4.1 The Community Program

2.4.1.1 Strengths of Community Program

PEP seems to have had a remarkable impact on the life of the community. . As noted above the first objective of PEP has always been to improve inter-personal and inter-group relationships and to creating a peaceful co-existence between communities. From the interviews it was evident that there is reduced fighting among youth, e.g. in some contexts the tension between former combatant youth and civilian youth, or inter-tribal conflicts (Imvepi Refugee Settlement has 32 different tribes, Nimule has 17, etc.), as well as among nationals and refugees, between tribes, clans or family couples. In Nimule, Dinkas from Bahr el Gahzal and Dinkas from Bor are now willing to join together for a community workshop. “since 1997 until 2003, was the period of clan to clan fighting which ended on 2/6/03, with the introduction of peace education in the camp. Now, the whole population is living peacefully, in harmony without being tortured” - Chief Adoor Akol Dual in Mangalatore camp, Kajojeji county remarked.

Most peace groups reported less prejudice toward strangers hitherto referred to as the “other” and hence people do not feel as a minority group. It was equally noted that inter-personal relationships had improved, hence less gossiping or jealousy over the wealth (animals, income) of others, reduced theft cases, less anger and violent responses, increase of cordial relationships between couples. At the social interaction level, interview responses indicated - reduced conflict at boreholes/water points, in market places, distribution centers as well as reduced theft.

Other behavior changes reported include reduced drinking in the settlements, which means less fighting and better health of mind and body. There were reports of reduced cases of gender-based violence such as rape and defilement, etc. Women now have a voice and feel more empowered to make decisions in their families and the community. Community members now use non-violent means to address serious issues such as sexual harassment and

land disputes. “ I never thought that the Kuku people of Kajokeji could be so willing to welcome and show me a place to build my Tukul (small grass thatched hut)... I am amazed when I heard them say, peace education has prepared them for such challenging tasks”. Mr. Woja Chaplain, a returnee in Kangapo II sub- county, Kajokeji’.

There were indications that there were reduced cases of domestic violence, and more cases are handled effectively at the community level. Subsequently, there are fewer cases being reported to the police, refugee welfare council, the courts, etc. For example, in the table below there is a clear indication of reduced reporting of cases to the OPM office in Rhino Camp.

Table 2.4.1.1 Cases of Domestic Violence Reported to RC OPM

Reduced Domestic Violence
RC Settlement – cases brought to OPM office:
2001 – 106 cases
2002 – 102
2003 – 72
2004 –
2005 - 36 (to October 2005)

However, in two zones of Adjumani District, OPM Camp commandants reported that there has been little or no decrease in domestic violence.

Another notable positive impact of PEP was the spread of the active peace groups almost in every district. These groups share resources, contribute from food rations, help others, solve conflicts within their communities, pool resources through income generating activities, and visit the sick and help in funerals. They also help the vulnerable (sick, elderly, handicapped) by rebuilding houses, collecting firewood, cultivating the gardens, etc. The peace groups have created a new brand of moral leadership in the community and gained public acknowledgement as one interviewee in the community observed: “Peacemakers have become leaders and leaders are peacemakers.”

In Umwia Refugee Settlement in Adjumani, the evaluators met with the “Friendship Peace Group”. In their discussion, members of the peace group reported that they had help construct a new house for an elderly widow whose house was dilapidated (see attached photo of the old and new house)



Figure 1 Elderly widow's dilapidated house before



Figure 2 New house constructed for the elderly widow.

Some of those interviewed said they were now more willing to forgive. There have been observable changes among some key influential leaders (elders, judges, religious leaders, government officials) who have participated in PEP. For example, in Bamwrye community (Kajokeji) the secretary to the judiciary testified that there has been some positive influence on the way cases are now being handled. Similar observation was made among four judges from the Nimule communities.

2.4.1.2 Areas for Improvement and Further Development in the Community Program

Peace education has made a positive impact in the community; however there are some areas for improvement:

1. There has been a tendency to overemphasize the conflict resolution aspect of the program. This has rather weakened the original proactive approach of prevention or minimization of conflict and encouraged a more reactive one. In responding to conflicts, there is a general concern that *peace workers* do not have the skills to deal with some of the cases brought to them, which require a specialized knowledge or training. Such include defilement cases, counseling one who has attempted suicide, an armed attack or attempted murder, etc. Some of these cases may require several specialized areas, i.e. medical, psychological, judicial, etc.

2. While the income generating activities seem to have had a positive impact on some communities; in others, the introduction of IGA has distracted the primary objective of peace groups. The focus needs to be on peace education/building. For example, in one community the participants of the peace workshop formed a peace group and requested JRS support for an IGA. They were given seeds and hoes, but when the crop failed, the group died.
3. It is equally noted that the PEP has over-relied on the workshops yet the high numbers of workshops and community activities has led to lack of follow up for some community activities. This has also meant that peace advisors and facilitators have a high workload and consequently, the activities tend to lack depth.
4. It is certain that peace advisors and facilitators have done so much in peace education in the communities, they would, however, benefit from further development of their own skills. Most peace advisors and facilitators have only had basic training in peace education, which are insufficient in forming agents of change that have the skills and capacity to explore deeper elements of peace education.
5. Currently, the peace advisers and facilitators rely on UNHCR manuals, which to a great extent they have not been able to use effectively. There is need to develop materials that are context-sensitive by integrating the relevant cultural values and on the ground challenges.
6. In the facilitation of the workshops, the use of participatory methods of group dynamics would be much more productive than presentation of ready-made posters with instructions in English.
7. On the other hand, in as much as peace groups are involved in conflict mediation, it would be important for them to evaluate the scope and capacity of these activities in order to gear them more toward promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence than a set of activities.

2.4.2 The School Program

2.4.2.1 Strengths of the School Program

The PEP in schools has been picking up in the last couple of years. Among those interviewed there were some notable positive impacts from this program. There are reports of better discipline, less fighting or usage of abusive language, more respect, understanding, cooperation, and togetherness among pupils and teachers. “One parent came and asked me: ‘what is happening in the school? My child has changed and become more disciplined.’” (Headmaster, Abila Primary School, Nimule). In fact, PEP is beginning to influence how teachers carry out discipline in the schools by advocating for alternative and constructive forms of discipline in schools. PEP teachers share with other teachers the positive impact of PEP. The program is being informally integrated into some subjects, e.g. religion, social studies, and in some co-curricular activities, i.e. agriculture, environment, MDD, debate, sports, etc.

The peace education program has also helped in the development of the talents of students and created self-awareness among pupils through various activities such as songs, poems, riddles, drama, traditional dances, cross-cultural exchange, interaction and relationship with other schools through inter-school debates etc. These activities have helped in the development of a sense of maturity and responsibility and in so doing enhancing character building. At an inter-school cultural festival, a teacher remarked, “ You would never see this before. A student of one tribe could not dance and since a song of another tribe! Peace education has really brought a new change of attitude among our students and community.”

In addition, the pupils learn to solve their own problems at the peace table. Through the peace clubs in schools the students have been able to create better links with the community. For example, the PTA attended a meeting on the rights of children in one school (100 parents came, out of 1,000 children in the school). Some students help the needy, i.e. share food from club’s garden, fetch water, rebuild houses and collect firewood.

2.4.2.2 Areas for Improvement and Further Development in the School Program

Should the points below be numbered as is the similar section on the community above?

1. The most desirable approach in peace education is where the entire school philosophy and environment reflect peace. It is where the school administration, teachers, curriculum and the school rules enhance and promote peace. In the schools observed during the evaluation, only pupils involved in peace clubs were actively participating in peace education. Even in areas where peace education was taught as a subject in schools, it heavily relied on ‘specialist’ PEP teachers. It would help if deliberate efforts are made to ensure that all teachers, the administrators, and the school community: the School Management Committee (SMC) and executive committee of the PTA have a chance to participate in a peace education community workshop, where all teachers receive this formation, and follow up activities to develop a culture of peace within the school community.
2. To fully internalize and utilize the participatory and activity-oriented approach of peace education, it is very important that the peace education teachers complete all the three phases of PEP teacher training. From the interviews with both teachers and advisors, it seems that most teachers completed only 5 days of what should be 15 days (in 3 phases) of peace education teacher training. Besides, it would be important that these phases are revised to incorporate a more participatory, interactive and creative pedagogy for peace education.
3. The survey established that the teaching of peace education in both Uganda and South Sudan attracts an incentive (monetary or in kind) even when the teacher is already regularly employed. The prevailing perception among teachers involved is that PEP is an extra activity in schools, and they should therefore be compensated for their time. Such a practice could create division amongst teachers particularly if peace teachers earn a higher gross total incentive. It should also be noted that incentives only constitute extrinsic motivation. As steps towards sustainability are explored, it would be useful to work towards ways that intrinsically motivate teachers so as to build their commitment to PEP (as an integral and important school activity) and lessen their dependence on extrinsic motivation (incentives etc).

4. Peace Tables were seen in some of the schools visited in the survey. While in a number of schools there seemed to be a 'system' in place for peer mediation at the peace table, in others it was not clear whether students grasped the use and importance of peace tables. Also children tended to confine their peace club activities to schools. Extending their activities to the communities could pass on symbolic transformational messages to the community. In some schools not all the teachers seemed conversant with peace education in the schools and community, perhaps indicating that there is need for more awareness raising among teachers.
6. The survey also revealed that peace education faces some serious challenges in the process of its implementation. There are no standard manuals that teachers and peace clubs can use. What is currently on use was developed by the UNCHR and meant to be used in a more participatory way for it to be effective and relevant to students. Peace teachers have not learnt how to use the manual as it was originally intended by the UNHCR. Besides, the teachers find it rather confusing that the same manual is used for the lower and upper primary as well as the secondary school level. Part of the reason for this is that the training received has not been deep enough to allow the teachers appreciate the spiral curriculum arrangement used in the design of the UNHCR PEP manuals where concepts remain the same but are taught using different activities and are also broadened in depth as children move through the school years.
7. The other aspect is that the time for peace education in the school timetable is very limited. When computed, there is only one 35 or 40 minutes lesson per class per week (or peace club time), which translates to a very small percentage of the total school hours in a year. This limited time provision for peace education in schools calls upon teachers to creatively supplement their efforts by involving children in other useful out of school peace building community activities that will positively and constructively influence them.
8. Also people have different views on whether the PEP should only be limited to an extra-curricula club activity, or be taught as a non-examinable subject, or be fully integrated into all subjects taught in school. The more effective, but also challenging, approach would be the integration of peace education concepts and values into the entire school program. While this decision does not lie on JRS but the ministries of education in Uganda and Sudan, it would be important to advocate for and explore ways of maximizing the opportunities for peace education currently available.

2.5 PEP Coordination

As already noted above, the PEP has grown to be an vital component of the JRS activities in both northern Uganda and South Sudan. Peace education is well appreciated in both the schools and the communities. However, from the interviews carried out and the documents read, it was evident that PEP has grown into an almost independent project parallel to other projects in the field. The project directors are not involved in the design, the planning and the decision making process of the PEP activities.

PEP advisers in projects are said to be answerable to both project directors and the National PEP Adviser. To some degree this is evident in the field, but even where it is so, there is

confusion. In other places (see Annual reports/project proposal), monitoring is done only by National Peace Education Adviser at project level. On the other hand, PEP facilitators seem to receive different amounts for incentives, e.g. in Adjumani – 35,000/- per month and Rhino Camp – 50,000/- and none are satisfied with the amount, and even hesitate to admit they receive anything. There is certainly a need for the re-structuring of the program so that it is fully integrated into other projects on the ground.

The initiative of the PEP to publish the *Peacebuilder* magazine seems to be appreciated by many. The magazine carries out stories about peace activities and some of the impacts on the ground. It encourages the communities to share their lessons learned on the ground with other communities. However, the magazine risks violating the ethical code of professionalism in media by being an exact replica of UNHCR magazine, the *Peacemaker*. The format and the layout were directly adapted from the UNHCR magazine. Equally, it is important to evaluate the audience reached by the magazine. Some peace groups affirmed that they received a few copies, but always never enough for all the members or for other people interested to read it in the communities. Also the magazine is published in English, which many peace group members are unable to read. A suggestion could be that JRS PEP continue to contribute to the UNHCR magazine and consider an alternative way of reaching out to a larger public by publishing posters, photos, charts, etc. to advocate for peace education values.

Part III

3.0 Recommendations or Suggestions for Improvement and Sustainability:

1. Re-structure the PEP with a clear organigram in order to make it more integrated into the JRS structure. Currently, PEP would appear to be an independent ‘stand alone’ project. The role of the national peace advisor could be re-defined and limited to technical support in the field: training, monitoring, and adapting the PEP material. Other managerial issues (finances and personnel) need to be left to the project and country director. It would equally be important to increase the involvement of the project directors with the country director and peace education advisers in the developing policies, procedures and project proposals, monitoring and evaluation as well annual, semi-annual and third-quarterly reports.
2. While a lot of people at grassroots level have been reached (See Appendix 2, Tables 1 and 2), it would be important now to intensify the targeting of key sectors of the community as ways of building an influential group that will carry on peace education in the communities, (religious and local government and community institutions, schools, non-formal education institutions that exist). Such include the elders, the various levels of community leadership, the religious, women, and youth leaders. This would thus move towards a training of trainers allowing for capacity building, deeper impact, and sustainability.
3. JRS needs to design an exit strategy plan that would ensure sustainability of the program. This could include working out a three to five year plan of strengthening the

sustainability of PEP in South Sudan and reducing the presence in northern Uganda. We have mainly identified two main institutions through which the PEP could be sustainable and work out its exit strategy; religious institutions and schools.

- a. Work with religious institutions (Muslim, Christian, traditional religions) in exploring ways of making the program sustainable for the future. Most of these institutions already have structures in line with peace education/building that could further propagate the values of peace education. For example, the SCBRC have a Justice and Peace Department that coordinates peace building activities on the ground in Sudan. Those consulted in this office, expressed willingness to collaborate with JRS in integrating PEP to their activities. Some of what they suggested include:
 - i. Focus on one or two dioceses where Justice and Peace Commissions (JPC) are rather weak, for example, El Obeid and Yei, and train the diocesan and parish JPC personnel who would then be empowered to carry out the work.
 - ii. Identify the major stakeholders in peace education in specific regions of interest in South Sudan and explore ways of coordinating and collaborating in activities for peace together.
 - b. CRS Sudan also has plans of collaborating with several dioceses in South Sudan in the capacity building of the justice and peace personnel. They have expressed their willingness to work closely with JRS in this endeavour. It would be important for JRS to enter into negotiation with CRS to further discuss ways of integrating PEP in different dioceses, through capacity building of diocesan and parish staff for them to run their own PEP programs. Some possibilities for collaboration with CRS include:
 - i. Carryout a pilot project exploring how PEP can be integrated into one or two dioceses in South Sudan. CRS expressed interest funding a pilot project. Coordinate activities that involve the training of JPC personnel in different dioceses. Even though CRS only works in specific regions in the South (Rumbek, Yei, Torit, etc. and soon an office in Juba it would still be important to see how some of the activities could be carried out in joint projects.
 - c. In schools it would be important to continue to explore ways of integrating PEP into the school education systems and lobbying for the training of all teachers in peace education values.
 - d. Are there other groups that could be mentioned, e.g. payam or county/district educational, government, and security leaders?
4. Move toward an integrated approach in peace education. Some steps towards this could include:
- a. Closer collaboration of all the JRS activities, e.g. pastoral, teacher training, adult literacy, the women programs, etc.
 - b. As part of the exit strategy and sustainability, develop on deliberate and comprehensive effort to coordinate and collaborate with other peace initiatives

by groups such as the churches, community based organizations, NGOs, etc. Some suggestions could include:

- i. Begin by sharing information and networking,
 - ii. Coordinate activities in some areas to avoid duplication or competition,
 - iii. Collaborate in shared training of trainers,
 - iv. Hand over or let go of activities that others can do.
 - c. Collaborate more closely with the Government of South Sudan's Secretariat of Education (SOE), now MOEST and the (USAID funded, CARE led) *Sudan Basic Education Program* (SBEP). JRS could advocate for and participate in consultations so as to contribute towards the development and integration of peace education in schools and teacher training curriculum.
 - d. Build the capacity of the JRS peace education personnel to approach peace education in an integrated manner. This could be pursued by a workshop early 2006 for key JRS peace education workers. It would be important to invite external facilitators and also ensure that the workshop covers several areas of integration including: the community, students, parents, religion, culture, teachers, etc.
5. Address the gender and age parity in the recruitment of peace education workers. During the evaluation it was noted that most peace advisors and facilitators were rather young men, between 23-30 years. This makes it difficult for them to intervene in cases such as domestic disputes or those between much older people. On the other hand, there were very few women peace advisors (only one) and facilitators. An age-group mix and an increase in the number of women peace advisors and facilitators would enhance the peace group capacity for intervention.
6. Encourage development and translation of essential materials while putting in place mechanism for quality control and professionalism. This could be carried out by:
 - a. An indepth training of teachers in the philosophy and culture of peace education
 - b. Identifying specific well-trained teachers who be good resource persons for the design of more contextualized peace education materials that could be used in schools
 - c. Reaching out to several organizations involved in peace education like UNHCR, UNICEF, CRS/Caritas Internationalis, DED, etc, and propose a joint project to produce materials and manuals more appropriate for South Sudan.
7. While *The Peacebuilder* magazine is a commendable initiative, it would be important to re-evaluate the intended impact of the magazine and to consider a possibility of replacing that budget line with other publications that have a wider reach such as posters or banners with peace messages and idioms in English, Arabic, and other relevant languages.
8. Develop other approaches for peace education in addition to the already on-going activities. Such could include:

- a. Cultural practices such as the palaver practice or dialogue around various issues, story telling, cultural dances, drama, community meetings and gatherings;
- b. Use of alternative means of reaching out the message of peace to the public, for example, radio programs or messages for radio, posters, writing for already existing newsletters, newspapers, and magazines, etc. Some of these are already being carried out but could be increased with a push on community to organize and carry them out by themselves.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1- List of Interviewees

Kampala

- 2 JRS Staff (Country Director and National Peace Education Advisor)
- 3 UNHCR Community Services Officers

Adjumani

- 44 teachers (PEP and regular) from the three primary schools visited (Ilere, Magburu and Kureku) and other schools in the district
- 119 Elders, Leaders (Community, Cluster, Committee and RWC) and peace group members from the groups visited (Oliji, Ibibiaoro and Friendship) and representatives of the other groups in the district
- 2 representatives from the Office of the Prime Minister (Government of Uganda)
- 15 staff and Project Director, JRS Adjumani
- 2 Peace Education Advisors (Adjumani and Moyo)
- 132 student members of the peace clubs in the schools visited (Ilere, Magburu and Kureku)
- 10 Community workshop facilitators in the camps visited (Oliji, Ibibiaoro and Umwia)

Moyo

- 45 teachers (PEP and regular) from Chinyi and Belameling primary schools and representatives of other schools in Moyo
- 100 student peace club members in two primary schools: Chinyi and Belameling
- 70 community leaders and members of the Belameling cultural group
- 13 Peace Education community workshop facilitators in Moyo

Arua District

Rhino Camp Refugee Settlement

- 36 + peace group members from Simbili I, II, Wagurua, Yoyongo, Dongoda and Yelulu Refugee Settlements.
- 2 Peace Education Advisors
- 4 Peace Education Community Workshop facilitators
- One beneficiary of peace education workshops and activities

Imvepi Settlement

- 85 Peace Group members (Yinga Peacemakers Group, Dinka Peace Group and representatives of 14 other groups representing Congolese and Sudanese)
- 4 Peace workers (Advisors and Facilitators)
- 1 Deputy Camp Commandant (Government of Uganda)
- 30 opinion leaders (including RWC's , Heads, Deputies and School teachers)

Rhino Camp (Why RC here also and not included above?)

- 9 JRS staff including the Project Director and the Administrator
- 15 teachers (PEP and regular) of Ocea and Kalingo primary schools and Quiver Secondary school
- 125 student members of peace clubs of Ocea and Kalingo primary schools and Quiver Secondary school
- 1 Camp Commandant from the Office of the Prime Minister (Government of Uganda)

South Sudan

Kajokeji

- 14 Teachers (PEP and regular) and 100+ student peace club members in Jalimo, Adasira, Wurta and Koiba primary schools
- 150 + members of Limi Peace Group, Bamwere Peace Group and Community stakeholders
- 3 Government officials in Kajokeji County (i.e. County Executive Director, County Education Director and Bamwere SRRC supervisor)
- 5 Peace Education Community workshop Facilitators in Limi and Bamwere
- 2 JRS Kajokeji Staff – Project Director and Peace Education Advisor

Nimule

- 11 teachers (PEP and regular) from St Bakhita, Matoyo, Abila and Fula primary schools and Fula and Anzala secondary schools.
- Selected members of the community and peace groups from Abila camp
- 15 participants of a Community workshop in Matoyo East

- 8 opinion leaders (Youth leader, Justice and Peace Commission representative, Parish council representative, Youth coach and Court elders\judges)
- 4 Community workshops facilitators
- 1 Payam Administrator
- 2 JRS staff in Nimule (Project Director and Peace Education Advisor)
- JRS staff in Nimule

Nairobi

JRS Regional Director
Justice and Peace Desk, SCBRC (3)
CRS Sudan (1)

Appendix 2 –Summary of Peace Education Community Beneficiaries in Uganda and South Sudan

Table 1 Trainings and Groups

Facilitators Location	No trained		Total	Year	No. Involved to date		Total
	Male	Female			Male	Female	
Uganda							
Adjumani	49	11	60	2001	11	5	16
Moyo	54	9	63	2001	12	1	13
Arua/Rhino/Imvepi	19	6	25	2001	7	1	8
S. Western camps	12	2	14	2001	9	1	10
Urban	10	7	17	2001	0	0	0
Kiryandongo	15	5	20	2002			0
	29	8	37	2005	2	0	2
Ikaffe/Madiokolo	5	3	8	2005	5	3	8
	193	51	244		46	11	57
Sudan							
Nimule	21	7	28	2002	8	2	10
Kajokeji	29	7	36	2003	10	4	14
Lobone	21	7	28	2003	6	1	7
Yei	12	2	14	2005	12	2	14
	83	23	106		36	9	45
School Teachers							
Uganda							
Adjumani	23	7	30	2001	61	16	77
Moyo	22	3	25	2002	28	20	48
Arua/Rhino/Imvepi	40	14	54	2002	20	16	36
Kyangwali	38	6	44	2003	0	0	0
Kiryandongo	10	3	13	2005	10	3	13
Nakivale	24	2	26	2003	2	0	2
Oruchinga	7	5	12	2003	1	0	1

Kyaka	22	6	28	2004	4	1	5
	186	46	232		126	56	182

Sudan

Nimule	40	7	47	2003	24	5	29
Kajokeji	38	4	42	2003	19	5	24
Lobone	39	7	46	2003	6	1	7
Yei	15	3	18	2005	11	6	17
	132	21	153		60	17	77

Community Peace Groups

Uganda	No to date	Membership		Total
		Male	Female	
Adjumani	29	448	356	804
Moyo	26	261	187	448
Arua Rhino/Imvepi				0
Ikaffe	7	132	53	185
Madi Okollo				0
Kiryandongo	1	40	17	57
Kyangwali	3	38	17	55
Nakivale	3	40	28	68
Oruchinga	4	67	31	98
Kyaka	2	12	60	72
Urban	1	37	20	57
	76	1075	769	1844
South Sudan				
Nimule	4	59	62	121
Kajokeji	6	83	65	148
Lobone	3	53	45	98
Yei				
	13	195	172	367

School B Pupils/Students

Uganda	No. Clubs to date	Membership		Total
		Male	Female	
Adjumani	35	448	356	804
Moyo	33	261	187	448
Arua Rhino/Imvepi	15	748	552	1300
Ikaffe				
Madi Okollo				
Kiryandongo				
Kyangwali				
Nakivale	1	40	28	68
Oruchinga	2	28	8	36
Kyaka	2	40	38	78
Urban				
	88	1565	1169	2734
South Sudan				
Nimule	15	865	660	1525
Kajokeji	18	2106	1568	3674

Lobone	6	1914	1106	3020
Yei	39	4885	3334	8219

Table 2 PEP Community Workshop Participants

Year	Location	No. of W/shops	Male	Female	Total
Adjumani					
1999		2	95	45	140
2000		1	21	15	36
2001		29	723	160	883
2002		56	1,323	508	1,831
2003		44	873	560	1,433
2004		36	873	521	1,394
2005		25	516	310	826
Total		193	4,424	2,119	6,543
Moyo/Palorinya					
2000		1	30	5	35
2001		15	313	147	460
2002		32	595	364	959
2003		30	834	691	1,525
2004		82	1,733	1,346	3,079
2005		23	934	543	1,477
Total		183	4,439	3,096	7,535
Arua Rhino/Imvepi					
2000		1	23	7	30
2001		13	189	223	412
2002		41	725	663	1,388
2003		55	1,319	778	2,097
2004		81	2,083	1,176	3,259
2005		43	911	607	1,518
Total		234	5,250	3,454	8,704
Kyangwali					
2001		5	100	25	125
2002		4	30	55	85
2003		3	60	30	90
2004		-	-	-	-
2005		2	50	11	61
Total		14	240	121	361
Kiryandongo					
2001		5	75	24	99
2002		16	216	174	390
2003		4	128	70	198

2004	1	15	15	30
2005	1	20	15	35
Total	27	454	298	752

Nakivale

2001	4	62	15	77
2002	12	149	102	251
2003	5	134	67	201
2004	1	20	16	36
2005	2	41	21	62
Total	24	406	221	627

Oruchinga

2002	7	130	63	193
2003	4	77	56	133
2004	3	67	23	90
2005	1	22	10	32
Total	15	296	152	448

Kyaka

2002	6	144	58	202
2003	2	81	33	114
2004	1	22	6	28
2005	1	26	9	35
Total	10	273	106	379

Urban

2002	4	98	40	138
2003	3	21	113	134
2004	2	42	15	57
2005	2	42	41	83
Total	11	203	209	412

South Sudan 2002-2005

Nimule

2002	3	42	49	91
2003	62	1,440	404	1,844
2004	52	1,158	699	1,857
2005	21	367	410	777
Total	138	3,007	1,562	4,569

Kajokeji

2003	22	342	157	499
2004	72	1,497	1,093	2,590
2005	31	515	489	1,004
Total	125	2,354	1,739	4,093

Lobone				
2003	13	392	247	639
2004	23	724	649	1,373
2005	22	584	358	942
Total	58	1,700	1,254	2,954
Yei				
2005	4	425	147	572
Total	4	425	147	572

Appendix 3 - Terms of Reference

EVALUATION OF JRS PEACE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN UGANDA AND SOUTH SUDAN OCTOBER 2005

I. Objective of the evaluation:

- Check on progress of peace education program in our projects in Uganda and south Sudan to facilitate a direction or re-orientation of the programs in the two areas.
- Draw lessons from these programs in Uganda and South Sudan for future actions in similar JRS projects elsewhere.
- To prepare for a new phase in the program in Uganda and South Sudan as may be with emerging new situations like repatriation and reintegration.

I. General aspects of the evaluation:

The evaluation team will be asked to possibly look into the following general areas of the program in both Uganda and South Sudan:

- ❑ A historical description of the project and the key events that formed the initiation of the program(goal and objectives).
- ❑ An evaluation of the program activities within the project relating to:
 - The impact of the program on beneficiaries- refugees, IDPs, returnees and local community.
 - Strength and weakness of the program.
 - Possible areas for development.
- ❑ The coordination of the program: How is the program coordinated between country office and field, and within project with other departments within JRS, and with other NGOs.
- ❑ Administration: What are the roles and responsibilities of the staff and how effectively do they carry out these responsibilities.
- ❑ Personnel: appropriateness in terms of employment and qualification.

How do their qualification impact on the delivery and quality of their service?
How are they motivated in the work?
How do they foster team building and conflict resolution within JRS projects?

- Future plans: – What are the exit strategies for the program?

Recommendations and way forward for the program

III. Issues to be studied (scope):

A combination of both quantitative and qualitative measures may be employed to assess the program on the three general key themes:

Effectiveness: How efficient is the implementation procedure?

Speed of implementation (how well is the program adjusting according to plan)?

Quality of service delivery (are targets reached and benefits being received by the planned beneficiaries)? **Cost effectiveness** (what is the level of expenditure in terms of workshops and other activities)? **Issues addressed:** To what extent are cross cutting issues being addressed? E.g. gender, environment, good governance issues.

Effects: (Are there unplanned effects of the program? Are they positive or negative?)

Relevance: How the program addresses the needs and targeted problems.

In Uganda, the program design was to address the friction and poor social integration between and among the refugees and national communities in light of the self-reliance for refugees and sharing of common resources. Similarly, in South Sudan there was a problem of peaceful coexistence between the varied ethnic groups with divergence cultural differences that often manifested in violence.

Was the original design well conceived? How valid were the assumptions made and risks anticipated? How well has the program adapted during the implementation?

Are the original problems still relevant in face of emerging situations e.g. repatriation and reintegration?

Sustainability: What are the potentials of the program to carry on without JRS support in terms of: Capacity building for individual program staff and community, government support to the program. E.g. plans of integration into school curriculum:

Uganda, Ministry of Education & sports plans to integrate peace education in the school curriculum by 2006. The Sudan Basic Education Program (SBEP)-Strategic plan secretariat of education - New Sudan too made it a policy to include peace education into the school curriculum. Objective 5 under new programs and cross cutting issues (5.1) To provide peace education to all school children. What role should JRS play in this process?

Appendix 4 References

1. JRS Uganda

- *Project Proposal Uganda/South Sudan: 2002, 2003, 2005*
- *Project Proposals Uganda: 2004, 2005*
- *Annual project Report Uganda: 2000, 2003, 2004*
- *Annual project report Uganda/south Sudan: 2003,2004, 2005(semi-annual)*
- *Third Quarter Report, Adjumani: September 2005.*

2. Nairobi Peace Initiative-Africa (NPI) and the NCCCK-CPBD Project, *Strategic and Responsive Evaluation of Peacebuilding*. (Nairobi: NPI-NCCCK, 2001).

3. Lederach, John Paul, *Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

4. Reyhler, Luc, *Conflict Impact Assessment*. (Leuven: Center for Peace Research and Strategic Studies, 2005).

5. IMU/OCHA “South Sudan IDP and Refugee Return Population Projections for 2006”. (IMU/OCHA, 19th Sept. 2005).

6. UNHCR/DED, “Repatriation Profile of Sudan”, September2005.