

# **Final Evaluation Report**

---

**Glencree**

**Peace Education Programme**

**2004/2008**

**July 2008**

## Table of Contents

□ Introduction.....	3
2 Executive Summary.....	4
3 Background to the Project .....	6
4 Evaluation Methodology.....	8
5 Findings .....	12
6 Conclusions.....	41
7 Recommendations .....	43
Appendices .....	44

## □ Introduction

This is the final evaluation report of the Glencree Peace Education Programme, covering the period July 2004 – March 2008.

The programme was a further development of the peace education work with schools and young people that has been undertaken by Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation over the past decade. The programme was funded by the International Fund for Ireland Community Bridges Programme.

In 2006, Glencree appointed independent consultants, Macaulay Associates, to support and report on a formative evaluation of the project. An interim evaluation report in March 2007 highlighted the change and development that took place during the first half of the programme life cycle and presented a series of findings and recommendations of the interim evaluation process.

This is a final summative report of the programme, which ended in March 2008, when the current funding package had finished. The report includes:

- An executive summary of the main findings and recommendations
- A description of the background to the project
- An explanation of the evaluation methodology
- A presentation of the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation
- A series of recommendations for the future
- A set of associated appendices

## 2 Executive Summary

### Introduction

This is the final evaluation report of the Glencree Peace Education Programme for the period July 2004 – March 2008.

### Conclusions

The main conclusions of the evaluation are as follows:

- 1 The programme developed high quality progressive learning opportunities in Peace Education that were relevant to the National Curriculum.
- 2 Most schools did not take up the opportunity for ongoing, progressive learning opportunities, preferring to participate in one off one-day sessions. There was little preparation, follow up, 'in school' or whole school work. However, the feedback from participating schools was very positive.
- 3 A small number of schools did opt for ongoing, progressive learning opportunities, including 'in school' work. This was due to the commitment of the teachers in those schools to delivering Peace Education within planned coursework and a desire to achieve a whole school impact.
- 4 The North South Schools Link Programme programme provided appropriate and relevant cross-border learning opportunities for young people, their schools, teachers and to some extent their communities. It also provided some excellent cross community learning opportunities.
- 5 The North South Schools Link Programme was generally very effective because there was an ongoing programme with sustained contact providing an opportunity for ongoing, progressive learning and a whole school impact.
- 6 The project was very successful in developing appropriate and relevant learning methodologies and materials on peace education suitable for a range of user groups and in a variety of formats.
- 7 The training and development of a Facilitator Panel had a positive impact on the quality of programme delivery.
- 8 The project was not successful in developing strategic relationships with other agencies to promote the mainstreaming of peace education and this may have been an unrealistic objective. However, there may be potential to work in

partnership with other groups to introduce peace education as part of a broader new curriculum theme.

- 9 Sustained funding for the project was not achieved and the project ended abruptly in March 2008, losing both the personnel and much of the learning that had been gained in the previous three years.
- 10 The programme was disconnected from Glencree. It appears to have been hosted at Glencree rather than being an integral part of the vision and strategy of the Centre. Staff and volunteers felt generally unsupported.
- 11 Although many schools wish to see the programme restored, few are able to pay for it. To develop and sustain this work in this way in the future will therefore require grants and fundraising to subsidise schools.
- 12 There is potential to develop a more intensive whole school initiative working with teachers and pupils in a smaller number of schools to become 'peace promoting schools' and with a greater focus on a multicultural Ireland.
- 13 It is not clear whether the Council of Glencree have a vision or strategy for this type of work in the future.

## **Recommendations**

As result of this evaluation the following recommendations are suggested:

- 1 Glencree should decide if work with children and young people is an integral part of the organisation's vision and strategy for the future.
- 2 If, after its strategic review, Glencree includes work with children and young people as an integral part of the organisation's vision and strategy for the future, the organisation should research and design an effective and sustainable programme, in closer partnership with others, in light of this evaluation and the future strategy paper developed by the former staff team.

## **3 Background to the Project**

### **3.1 Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation**

The Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation, founded in 1974, that is devoted to peacebuilding and reconciliation in Ireland, North and South, Britain and beyond.

The Centre, located in the Wicklow Mountains, has operated a range of programmes to build peace and reconciliation including:

- A Survivors and Former Combatants Programme
- A Political Dialogue and Training Programme
- A Churches Programme
- A Women's Programme
- An International Programme
- Peace Education Programme

### **3.2 The Peace Education Programme**

Glencree has offered learning opportunities on peacebuilding and reconciliation to primary, secondary schools and youth groups for the past ten years through its Peace Education Programme (PEP).

Through a series of programmes, young people visiting Glencree explore their understanding of themselves, others, and their relationship to communities at local, national and global levels.

Workshop activities connect to the Education Curriculum at levels appropriate to the age and subject range of each group.

### **3.3 Strategic Aims**

The programme had five key strategic aims:

1. To develop and provide progressive learning opportunities in Peace Education for young people, their schools and teachers which are relevant to the National Curriculum and appropriate for the learning level of users.
2. To provide appropriate and relevant cross-border and cross-community learning opportunities in Peace Education for young people, their schools, teachers and communities.
3. To develop appropriate and relevant learning methodologies and materials on Peace Education suitable for a range of user groups and provide a variety of formats for sharing the learning of Glencree.
4. To develop and maintain relevant and strategic relationships which enhance and promote the mainstreaming of Peace Education
5. To ensure the capacity of Glencree in the delivery of the Peace Education Programme through the provision of personnel, funding and training

The evaluation process focussed on assessing the extent to which these aims have been achieved.

A set of outcomes and measures or indicators was agreed for each strategic aim. (See the Evaluation Framework in Appendix II).

## **4 Evaluation Methodology**

### **4.1 Terms of Reference**

The terms of reference of the evaluation were to support the development and implementation of a monitoring and evaluation framework leading to the collation of relevant data and to the preparation of an interim and final evaluation report, to assess progress against the strategic aims of the programme.

### **4.2 Research Methodology**

The evaluation methodology employed was as follows:

#### **4.2.1 Internal Stakeholder Meetings**

There were regular meetings with the programme staff to:

- discuss the background of the programme
- discuss the current stage of development
- discuss the particular needs of the monitoring and evaluation framework
- discuss relevance to the wider organisation
- review the proposed approach and agree any necessary refinements
- discuss the timescales involved
- identify and gather initial information and contact details
- agree dates of various meetings.

#### 4.2.2 Desk Review

During an initial desk review the consultant became familiar with the project background and activities to establish a baseline from the information available. This included an analysis of:

- Project plans, programmes, budgets etc.
- Relevant funding application and letter of offer
- Revised operational plans
- Workers reports
- Relevant reports, previous evaluations and existing self monitoring and evaluation documentation
- Organisational structures

The desk review for the final report included an analysis of:

- The self evaluation data collected during the programme
- Staff Strategy Papers including: Reconciliation and Diversity with Young People 2010
- Programme Manuals
- Minutes of relevant meetings
- Facilitator debriefs
- Reports to funders

#### 4.2.3 Evaluation Training and Development Workshop

Two workshops took place involving the key internal organisational stakeholders on the programme.

The first workshop introduced the evaluation model and provided training on monitoring and evaluation processes and the second workshop built an agreed monitoring and evaluation framework including outcomes, measures or indicators and data collection methods for each of the five strategic aims of the programme.

#### 4.2.4 Preparation of Evaluation Framework

Following the training and development workshops the programme evaluation framework with outcomes, measures or indicators and data collection methods was completed.

The evaluation framework provided the detailed methodology for the ongoing self-evaluation of the programme and for the external evaluator's report. The framework is in Appendix II.

#### 4.2.5 Interim Evaluation Review Meeting

An interim evaluation review meeting with members of the staff team and development committee took place on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2006. The group discussed the following issues:

- Highlights of the programme so far
- Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges (SWOC Analysis)
- Progress against strategic aims
- Development and change in the project

The programme for the workshop is in Appendix III and notes including the SWOC Analysis are in Appendix IV.

#### 4.2.6 Strategic Review and Development Workshop

A Strategic Review and Development Workshop was facilitated on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2008 to review progress against intended project objectives over the three years, to consider the draft findings and recommendations of the final evaluation and to discuss the future development of any strategy for Peace Education at Glenree.

#### 4.2.7 Focus Groups

The external consultant facilitated three focus groups:

- (a) A group of teachers (September 2006)
- (b) A group of young people (September 2006)
- (c) A group of programme facilitators (May 2008)

The focus groups questions are in Appendix I and notes from the flip charts from the young people's focus group are in Appendix VI.

#### 4.2.8 Stakeholders Interviews

The external consultant carried out a series of fourteen semi structured interviews with a sample of internal and external stakeholders including staff, programme facilitators and development committee members, schools and funders (eight interviews in 2006 and six interviews in 2008). A list of the stakeholders interviewed and the interview questions are in Appendix V.

#### 4.2.9 Schools Survey

A survey was carried out with a sample of participating schools in May/June 2008. Fifteen schools (12 from the Republic of Ireland and 3 from Northern Ireland) were approached to provide responses to a structured set of questions (see Appendix VII) on their experiences of the Glencree Peace Education Programme.

Responses were received from 11 schools/groups with six in the form of telephone interviews, four by e-mail and one by post. In all cases the teacher who led their school's participation in the programme provided the responses. A list of the schools/group who took part in the survey is included in the Appendix VIII.

#### 4.2.10 Facilitator Survey

An email survey (see Appendix IX) was sent to the programme facilitators in May 2008. Responses were received from four facilitators (see Appendix IX).

## 5 Findings

The main findings under each project aim against the agreed measures and indicators are as follows:

### **5.1 To develop and provide progressive learning opportunities in Peace Education for young people, their schools and teachers which are relevant to the National Curriculum and appropriate for the learning level of users.**

The programme developed high quality progressive learning opportunities in Peace Education that were relevant to the National Curriculum.

The staff team carried out an extensive review of the Peace Education Programme during 2005 and this produced a clear, improved and detailed programme of progressive learning opportunities with clear learning outcomes, methodologies, individual programme manuals with session plans and resource materials. A significant achievement is that the team carried out this review while at the same time delivering the existing programmes.

*“The biggest achievement of the past year has been developing a structured programme, and getting it all so well put together- it is now in place”* (Comment from Review Meeting, 2006)

The intended outcome of a clear model of Peace Education articulated by Glencree was achieved.

*“The past two years have been extremely positive – it has been a huge process and very developmental. The old programme had no delivery structure, no co-ordination, it was very ad hoc and the facilitation skills were not consistent...the programme had to evolve into something new and*

*we have come along way. We have new facilitators, the programmes have been revolutionised, the staff motivation is increased and there are new opportunities – the changes are phenomenal”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

Glencree published a description of the new model including five streams of peace education targeted across the range of the national curriculum.

*“I like the way they have been targeting an input into the curriculum”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“The new programme has been carefully designed to fit in with the curriculum”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

The detailed programmes were of high quality. They included background information, links to the curriculum, programme structure and content, an explanation of the approach to learning, specific learning objectives and learning outcomes, facilitators tools, health and safety guidelines and both student and teachers packs.

*“There has been a dramatic transformation...it used to be a series of exercises with no purpose or learning objectives – it was very ad hoc but it has come on leaps and bounds – there are clear learning objectives now”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

The programme had a constant tension between quantity (bringing in high numbers to generate sufficient income) and quality (achieving educational learning outcomes and learning methodologies) until 2007 when a strategic decision was taken to give greater priority to quality than numbers. During the lifetime of the project over 6,000 young people participated in the programme.

*“In the past there was a pressure of bringing in numbers, which resulted in a limited impact, as the activities lacked depth. The move towards two and three day programmes made sense and it was move towards a whole school approach.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

The revised programme consisted of:

- *Primary Schools - 6th Class Transitions*

A half-day or one-day programme exploring the social and identity issues young people may face as they begin their transition from primary to secondary level schools. This programme aimed to enable young people to deal with this transition and to promote peaceful leadership and team approaches to problem solving.

- *Junior Cycle - Civic, Social & Political Education*

A one-day programme exploring a core concept of CSPE at personal and local levels or a two-day programme exploring a core concept of CSPE at personal, local, national and global levels. Schools chose one of the following concepts to be covered within their programme:

Concept 1 - Democracy

Concept 3 - Human Dignity

Concept 4 - Interdependence

- *Transition Year*

A one-day or two-day skills-based learning programme for Transition Year groups, on either of the following chosen topics.

- Communication Skills
- Group-work / Leadership Skills
- Conflict Resolution Skills

- *Senior Cycle – Religious Education*

A one-day or two-day programme for Senior Cycle Religious Education groups on either of the following chosen topics:

- Section D - Morality in Action
- Section F - A Living Faith; Doing Justice
- Section H - Story

- *Schools' Leadership Programme*

A one-day or two-day programme exploring themes of leadership, conflict resolution, effective communication and teambuilding for prefect / monitor teams. This programme brought a leadership team through a process of team building and developing practical conflict resolution skills in order to enhance peer leadership within schools.

The intended outcome of establishing a range of specific programmes targeted towards identified streams within the National Curriculum was achieved. Specified programmes were delivered to classes across the range of the education curriculum.

*“There are now clear links to the curriculum and clear learning objectives and materials”* (Comment from Review Meeting, 2006)

*“The programme was very helpful generally to students and complemented work on CSPE etc.”* (Teacher Survey 2007)

The programme also managed to create a degree of flexibility to tailor programmes for specific needs.

*“The programme has become more streamlined with specific packages for specific groups instead of just one package”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

The new programmes were well received. One indicator of this was an increase in bookings from schools in 2006.

*“This month sees the culmination of our year of ongoing research and development with the roll out of our new series of five programmes to schools.*

*The programmes were unveiled to the facilitator panel this month and also to the Curricular Advisory Services, Curriculum Development Unit and the Archdiocese of Dublin.*

*We are continuing to receive very positive feedback and support with these new developments and the Peace Education for Schools bookings are now at their highest recorded level.”* (From Council Report, September 2006)

All of the schools surveyed in 2008 described their experience of the Peace Education Programme positively. Comments included ‘excellent’, ‘very valuable’, ‘very fulfilling’, ‘of great benefit’, ‘very enjoyable’ and ‘first class’.

*“It was an invaluable opportunity for our transition year and the wider school community”* (Schools Survey 2008)

*“I was very impressed with the professionalism of the staff and their child centred approach to Peace Education”* (Schools Survey 2008)

*“The programme challenged perceptions that pupils didn’t even realise they had – it was enlightening”* (Schools Survey 2008)

*“The students arrive wondering what to expect and leave reluctantly having made so many friends and having had such an interesting and rewarding experience.”* (Schools Survey)

Schools particularly valued the venue and setting, the facilitation of the workshops and the flexible and interactive delivery that engaged the young people in a meaningful way.

*“I couldn’t speak more highly of the programme and the strengths are too numerous to mention”* (Schools Survey)

*“I would like to thank the staff for a wonderful experience and for helping us open young minds to the concepts of peace, reconciliation and promoting understanding”* (Schools Survey)

There is evidence that the model was continually reviewed and developed with each of the programmes. It was continually reviewed and improved as a result of participant, teacher and facilitator feedback.

*“We now have a more responsive programme and appropriate resources and we are continually reviewing it”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“The development of a facilitator panel was a strong progression”*  
(Facilitators Focus Group)

*“We learned a lot from the facilitators’ reflective debriefing sessions –we were always learning, changing and adjusting according to the needs of the schools and the young people, in order to meet the learning outcomes”*(Facilitators Focus Group)

As well as developing a strong programme, the team also provided progressive learning opportunities in the North South Schools Link Programme and where there was a demand from teachers and schools in programmes delivered at the Centre.

However most schools visiting the centre chose one off day programmes and only a minority of schools took advantage of the opportunity for more progressive learning programmes.

*“I would like to see more progressive learning – a one day programme that is seen as a trip can be a bit shallow...you are just touching on issues, it needs more time.”* (Stakeholder Interview)

Although most participants had only a one-day learning opportunity, the feedback was that the methodologies used were the progressive dimension of these one off sessions, and even these had some impact.

*“The progressive aspect was the non traditional teaching methodologies used”* (Facilitators Focus Group)

*“At one stage they were churning out 2000 young people a year – like a factory. But that wasn’t totally negative –young people can get something out of a one day programme. It was highly successful.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

*“One off can still have an impact. They come for the outing but they leave having got a lot more”* (Facilitators Focus Group)

However, returning schools and schools undertaking the longer programmes were provided with high quality progressive learning experiences.

*“Some schools came back two years in a row and you could build on their learning. When working with the same group again we were better able to plan and to get to know the school better”*(Facilitators Focus Group)

Apart from a core group of 10-12 schools, there was limited development of whole school learning and teacher training.

*“We developed a relationship with about ten main schools that continue to come back to Glencree and that continued the learning process back in the school”* (Facilitators Focus Group)

Some teachers were equipped and confident in the delivery of Peace Education within their planned coursework. However this was dependent on the approach of the teacher and the level of engagement of the school.

*“So much depends on the attitude of the teacher and the attitude of the schools – it influences whether they do preparatory work or not...some schools are more receptive than others and as a result some groups have benefited more than others...it was only progressive when the school carried it on and came back...there is no time for preparatory visits now but schools need more preparation”* (Stakeholder Interview)

The impact of the programme was very limited, although not entirely wasted, if the school reduced it to ‘trip’ status.

*“I felt the schools that had not got enthusiastic teachers lost out in some way. Yet these same students could think of ways they could bring the message of peace to the wider community in many cases. I also felt a one day programme was only a taster for the peace programme for students.”* (Facilitators’ Survey)

*“It can be hit and miss – it depends on the teacher...teachers will put more value on the programme if they see the link to the curriculum rather than see it as a trip...we need to help them understand.”* (Stakeholder Interview)

There was very little development of pre visit or post visit learning in the schools, although some attempts were made to do this. The main barrier was a limited level of human resources focussed on centre-based activities.

*“There was very little work in the schools. Not much preparation or follow up. Some teachers are more interested than others” (Facilitators Focus Group)*

*“Often teachers do not link the programmes with their planned coursework...but now we are trying to develop an agreed programme with schools during a pre-programme phase so that teachers will integrate the programme into their coursework.” (Stakeholder Interview)*

*“Some teachers had done work with their students and told us what and we could build on same. However, there were others who honestly did not realise themselves what we did and so could not prepare the young people for what we had prepared for them. Some had not realised we had progressed in our programmes.” (Facilitator Survey)*

*“Towards the end of my time with the programme, I know we were becoming convinced that we needed to focus much more on the teachers, who had been largely left out of the programme and the process, and in fact we realised we needed to provide teachers with training on how to bring certain approaches back to the classroom.” (Facilitators’ Survey)*

One facilitator, who developed links with schools, reflected on this:

*“As a facilitator, you made contact with the school before they came to the centre, and tried to get a sense in advance of what the school group were like, how they interacted, and what issues were occurring within the group. You also asked the teacher or staff member organising this trip what they wished to get from the programme - did they want it to build from something happening at school? Or a problem that the group had experienced? You then tried to use this information to make Peace Education relevant and meaningful to the group. You structured activities according to their age and experiences, and at the beginning of the programme you drew out what their understandings of different issues were, and what their personal experiences of conflict have been.*

*The programme you designed was to move along a continuum, linking abstract concepts of peace/conflict with both their individual lived experiences and their local/national/global context. By the end of the programme, you wanted the group to have a general understanding of wider national/global issues related to conflict, of their personal responses to conflict situations, of tools that could be used to deal with conflict, and of how models for peace could be practiced within their own group, school or community. You also wanted them to have had a strong personal engagement with these issues - to take them out of the textbooks and into a deep personal learning. You wanted them to leave the programme and years later still remember a moment of realisation or learning that occurred. You wanted them to go away thinking, alive and awake.*

*Did the programmes achieve this? It varied. The time spent with the group was so short, and every facilitator had a slightly different approach. Most of the time I finished the programme satisfied that we had reached the students, and that they had the beginnings of an understanding of what peace might mean, and their responsibility or position in relation to wider conflict issues.*

*There was a hope that the programme would continue developing to the stage where it could work with schools over a longer period of time, to follow up with the learning and build upon it. I know that although everyone working on the programme felt it was enormously valuable work, and that the students we worked with did learn and experience something very important; there was a lot of personal frustration with the short format. We wanted there to be more linkage with the school over a preparation period, and more follow-up afterward, to track the progress of the group. And ultimately, I think we wanted to work with the schools themselves to allow the teachers and schools to learn and grow, and create an environment for thinking and learning about peace.'*

(Facilitators' Survey)

Most schools did not develop a whole school approach because once again the programme did not have adequate human resources to do this in addition to delivering a high number of programmes at the Centre.

*“This is a gradual process...individual schools need a lot of support for a whole school approach.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“We need to make peace education relevant to the schools...issues such as bullying and dealing with conflict.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“We need a more strategic relationship with schools who like the programme – it’s just a trip and the schools do no preparation...we need to build a strategic partnership with the school.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

However the schools responding to the Schools Survey indicated that the programme did have a wider impact within their school to some extent. They stated that following their groups’ participation in the programme pupils who took part were encouraged to promote their learning and experiences to others through mentoring younger pupils, class discussions, presentations and exhibitions to the whole school.

*“One group held a multi cultural event in the school hall with exhibition stands and a slide show presentation of what they had learned at Glencree. This created a real buzz and other pupils became interested in going”* (Schools Survey)

A more effective whole school approach would include greater partnership working with the teachers. Some teachers would welcome this:

*“On my visit, we were asked to leave, which meant I did not get a full understanding of the activities undertaken by the student. The presence of*

*the class teacher in my view is very beneficial, particularly from a support perspective.” (Teacher Survey 2007)*

## **5.2 To provide appropriate and relevant cross-border and cross-community learning opportunities in Peace Education for young people, their schools, teachers and communities.**

The programme provided appropriate and relevant cross-border learning opportunities for young people, their schools, teachers and to some extent their communities. The North South Schools Link Programme also provided some excellent cross community learning opportunities.

*“The programme was very worthwhile and very useful. The young people got a lot out of it – they changed their attitudes and increased their knowledge of issues and the border and increased their understanding of other communities.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

*“Young people were encouraged to explore culture, identity and differences in a safe environment. They were encouraged to talk about issues and topics that may have stretched their comfort zones but which challenged and matured them” (Schools Survey 2008)*

A recurring comment from participating schools was that Glencree provided the only opportunity for pupils to meet others from a different social, political or religious background. Feedback was consistently positive on how the face-to-face interaction developed their life skills, broadened their horizons and led to respect for each other’s cultures and beliefs.

*“I have been on a number of cross-community and peace projects but there is something unique and peculiar to Glencree that makes it stand out from the rest” (Schools Survey)*

*“The spirit of Peace and Reconciliation is alive and well at Glencree”*  
(Schools Survey)

After a series of difficulties and delays in establishing the North South Schools Link Programme during the first half of the programme, significant progress was made in developing a good quality programme in 2006/2008. The thematic areas covered included:

- Identity
- Community
- Diversity
- Project Planning
- Leadership

The two main links were:

- Monaghan and Craigavon
- North West: Merville/Limavady and Letterkenny

At times it was difficult to engage all of the schools required to make the programme effective. For example, where there was an absence of active participation of a Northern Protestant school, this significantly reduced the cross border and cross community learning opportunities for the schools who did participate.

*“We must have the full complement of schools –otherwise there is a level of disappointment and there can be a negative impact of people asking ‘who didn’t let it happen?’ We must have a Northern Protestant school in the programme”* (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)

There was evidence of a significant improvement in the programme from 2006 and this was recognised by the teachers in the participating schools.

*“Now there is a good programme – it is greatly improved. Having more facilitators has helped and the staff are more than willing to co-operate and take on board our comments.”* (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)

*“There was preparatory work with schools on identity and diversity both individually and together, before going to Glencree. There were some good discussions on what it means to be a Catholic or a Protestant in a border county – there was good cross community learning.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“The staff have worked very hard on the programme...they have been eager to listen to us and improve things...they always give us such a warm welcome and Conn has been a very stabilising person for the whole programme.”*(Comment from Teachers Focus Group)

*“Kevin links with the local schools and creates the interest by visiting the school to introduce the programme.”*(Comment from Teachers Focus Group)

This increased emphasis on support work on the ground in local schools in their communities was welcomed:

*“I like the way they have developed cluster groups of schools because this is a good way of building sustainability.”* (Stakeholder Interview)

*“The programme was a great way for teachers to involve the whole school. New issues around difference and identity were brought to a wider school grouping”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

There was some evidence of participating schools developing ongoing cross-border and cross-community relationships themselves.

*“It was not only the pupils who benefited from the cross-community element, but teachers, parents and the wider community embraced it. We*

*had studied and worked beside these people for years but never engaged with them until we went to Glencree. Since returning the community links have continued” (Schools Survey)*

There were several good examples of ongoing impact for schools, local communities and individuals:

*“Prefects who attended Glencree took what they learned and practiced it in the school in their senior/mentoring roles with younger pupils, particularly around bullying, conflict resolution and respect” (Schools Survey)*

*“The programme has been good for relationships between Protestant and Catholic schools in the South. Before this we didn’t know teachers in each other’s schools – we had never been in each other’s schools. But now friendships have developed – it has created more cross community friendships in Monaghan town.” (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)*

*“One parent told me she thought her daughter would never go to college in the North – but she ended up Jordanstown and it was through Glencree because she became more open to cross border mobility.” (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)*

Facilitators commented on the increased impact of the NSSLP because it was an ongoing and more progressive learning programme:

*“A short one day programme only scratches the surface and that is frustrating. There is so much more learning possible on a three day programme and the NSSLP was more effective than a one off session because there was an opportunity for greater learning as the programme was longer” (Facilitators Focus Group)*

*“Compared to the work in Southern schools, the cross border programme was of lower volume and higher quality. It was both cross border and*

*cross community and it resulted in sustainable relationships between schools.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

Most of the Peace Education programmes at Glencree involve a single Catholic school from the South in a programme.

*“It’s mostly single schools that come – there is not much interaction between schools in the schools programme. It’s not part of the programme – children learn about difference rather than with difference. The programme often falls short of expectations – often schools are expecting to learn more about others at Glencree and think they will end up in one group doing peace studies.” (Stakeholder Interview)*

This major ‘single identity’ nature of the programmes limits both the cross community and other intercultural learning opportunities.

*“They need to engage schools from the North more...they need to find a way to articulate why groups should be interested in each other and to address social prejudice and political and cultural differences to avoid becoming bland.” (Stakeholder Interview)*

However some stakeholders believe a reconciliation focus on the North is no longer a priority for schools in the South and the focus should shift towards new intercultural relations.

*“We need more intercultural and inter ethnic participation and contact – for example we could target working with a Muslim school or a mixed school or bring inner city and suburban or rural schools together.” (Stakeholder Interview)*

*“This was very timely for our students in learning to accept and respect others – in particular since they have now had to accept diverse nationalities integrating into schools and home communities” (Teacher Survey, 2007)*

### **5.3 To develop appropriate and relevant learning methodologies and materials on Peace Education suitable for a range of user groups and provide a variety of formats for sharing the learning of Glencree.**

The project was very successful in developing appropriate and relevant learning methodologies and materials on peace education suitable for a range of user groups and in a variety of formats.

*“The methodology and approach was very effective. A lot of work was done to set the scene and to build trust in the group and then with experiential learning we were able to introduce more challenge and the learning was able to go deeper.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

As indicated in 5.1, the project established a clear learning strategy and put a quality control process in place.

Feedback from teachers was very positive:

*“It was appropriate education, geared in terms of content and delivered according to the ages and aptitudes of the young people” (Schools Survey 2008)*

*“The young people participated well in a mix of informal activities and discussions. A lot of thought had been put into stimulating discussion and the students’ reaction is to be eager to participate.” (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)*

*“The children have never had to do this kind of soul searching when they explore their own attitudes. They wouldn’t do this in school. This was the first time in their lives” (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)*

Feedback was overwhelmingly positive in this area. The overall impression was of knowledgeable staff who pitched learning at an appropriate level and whose flexible and interactive approach ensured engagement of the young people. The fact that the sessions were fun and enjoyable as well as challenging and interesting was commented on more than once. There was particular recurring praise for the safe, non-threatening learning environment that was created by the Glencree staff.

*“First class. No one does it better”* (Schools Survey)

*“I have always found the workshops to be effective and informative, with high quality facilitation. The staff are knowledgeable and flexible in their use of learning techniques, to ensure engagement of the young people”*  
(Schools Survey)

*“Games, icebreakers, discussion groups and the various activities all seemed to be varied and effective. One that stands out was a music workshop 3 years ago when they worked as a team to create wonderful rhythms!!”* (Schools Survey)

A recurring theme in the Schools Survey was that the delivery at Glencree was much more effective than a school setting due to the setting, the safe environment, staff expertise and resources.

In addition to the review and development of quality education programmes there was a significant review of key policies to underpin the work such as the Centre’s child protection policy in collaboration with the HSE and in line with “Children First” guidelines.

As indicated in 5.1, Glencree established a range of approved workshop activities that were then adapted for use within each programme area. The learning strategies that had been developed were effective:

*“The approach has shifted from ‘we will deliver a programme for you’ to ‘which of these programmes do you want to do?’ It’s more targeted and focussed on learning needs.” (Stakeholder Interview)*

*“The informal education approach has created a depth of discussion with our students. I was amazed at the depth of discussion the children had about prejudice and discrimination. There is also a good mix of light and informal activities too.” (Comment from Teachers Focus Group)*

*“The principle of our methodology was experiential learning. We used physical activities to provoke thought, to draw out responses and to facilitate reflection and learning. There were no passive participants, no learning being received - rather it was being created within the group. As a process, it was entirely different to the school environment of learning, and for this very reason was a great success with our students. Groups almost always went away from the programme engaged and alive, and more aware of their world.*

*There was a clear framework and a set of outcomes for each programme, but we had flexibility in how we wanted to achieve the outcomes. It was a wonderful framework to work within - although it required a lot of energy, you could see the results in the groups.*

*Our materials and methodologies were constantly being developed and refined, as we shared our practical experiences as facilitators, and also our experience from other areas of work. Regular meetings were held for all facilitators to come together and discuss and share ideas. After every session, facilitators received a debrief from a staff member to review the methodologies used and feedback on their effectiveness”. (Facilitators’ Survey)*

A 15-member Facilitator Panel was recruited in 2005, a facilitators’ training programme was developed and implemented and facilitators were also actively involved in the review and development of the programmes.

These achievements had a positive impact on the quality of delivery.

*“The facilitator’s panel has become involved in the development of the programme – there is a great creativity among the panel and also the staff team – there is a great air of creativity.”* (Stakeholder Interview)

*“When I began on the programme, the training was carried out by first observing existing facilitators for a few sessions, then co-facilitating for a period as assistant to another facilitator, and then moving on to designing and delivering programmes myself. Throughout this process, we met with the staff who explained the programme framework and suggested activities and methods of work. I attended group meetings where strategy and facilitator tools were discussed and shared. We were also given facilitator packs, and received ongoing support from the staff through our debriefing sessions and sharing learning with other facilitators. We did from time to time receive workshops in facilitator tools/ approaches such as Theatre of the Oppressed.”* (Facilitators Survey)

There was also some evidence that the new range of learning support materials have been developed were disseminated to some extent.

*“The resource materials produced are very good. Some have been used in a wider international context now, such as in Haiti.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

*“Individual teachers and schools did use some of the resource packs in their schools, but it was a minority of teachers”* (Facilitators Focus Group)

*“Some teachers were interested in our way of working and expressed a desire to be trained as facilitators”* (Facilitators Focus Group)

#### **5.4 To develop and maintain relevant and strategic relationships which enhance and promote the mainstreaming of Peace Education.**

Although the project attempted to develop relationships to promote mainstreaming there was little success in achieving this objective.

Although the new Glencree Peace Education Model strategically linked into the National Curriculum and the Education Manager started to develop a series of contacts, networks and strategic partnerships to support this work it proved difficult to move towards a meaningful discussion about mainstreaming.

*“This was incredibly difficult. There were several meetings with Department of Education Advisors and they were very supportive but there was little progress on mainstreaming peace education into the curriculum”*(Facilitators Focus Group)

The majority of respondents to the Schools Survey stated that although Peace Education was not specifically part of the National Curriculum, the programme at Glencree did provide relevant material for formal subjects such as Religious Education, Health Education, and the Civil Social and Political Education syllabus.

Several stakeholders concluded that this objective had been over ambitious and that it will be impossible to have peace education, on its own, mainstreamed into the curriculum. However, there may be potential to work in partnership with other groups to introduce it as part of a new curriculum theme.

*“Glencree needs to talk to Amnesty and Concern and the Green lobby who are all trying to do the same thing. It’s unrealistic to expect to get peace education mainstreamed within the curriculum in its own right so the best*

*approach could be to develop something in partnership with others that includes peacebuilding and that fits within the curriculum.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

## **5.5 To ensure the capacity of Glencree in the delivery of the Peace Education Programme through the provision of personnel, funding and training**

Although the project made good progress in terms of personnel and training, sustained funding was not achieved and the project ended abruptly in March 2008, losing both the personnel and learning that had been gained in the previous three years.

*“A mighty amount of work was carried out with limited resources and highly committed workers. We were proud of this work and heartbroken when it had to end.*

*There was a sense of poor management and a lack of strategic planning. It was not a strategic decision to end the programme, and nothing has been put in place to replace it. Staff funding had simply run out.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

The programme was constantly operating under limited human resources (such as administration support) and did not make progress to becoming financially self-sustaining.

Until 2007 there was an ongoing tension between developing and maintaining the quality of the education programmes and the business imperative of the Centre, which required a high volume of paying participants.

*“They face the challenge of trying to retain a volume of business – numbers of young people, while at the same time producing quality work. In centres like this, sometimes quality can suffer in favour of numbers.”*  
(Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“The programme is slave to the economic demands of operational management.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

This ongoing tension had a negative impact on working relationships within the Centre, which in itself distracted from the development of sustainability strategies:

*“There is a clash of priorities between programmes and finances – this creates a sense of tension and stress that is not consistent with the values of the organisation”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

However there were broader, more fundamental organisational issues that undermined the sustainability of the programme.

The programme was generally disconnected from Glenree and staff and volunteers were not adequately supported.

*“The staff are very committed but they are not always valued and some have left here with burn out”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2006)

*“The support offered by senior management in Glenree was at times shocking!!! Especially in terms of the treatment of staff and volunteers.”*  
(Facilitators’ Survey)

Several project workers felt that Glenree was ambivalent about groups of young people visiting the Centre:

*“At time it seemed that Glenree didn’t want kids cluttering up the place”*  
(Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

*“There seemed to be a certain amount of management chaos...staff were being pulled in different directions. I’m not sure if it’s the place to be doing this work, but they seemed to have difficulty in doing work off site.”*  
(Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

It is not clear if the Council of Glencree have a vision and strategy for this type of work.

*“There was no passion and no vision for this work ”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

*“It felt like it was the Cinderella programme at Glencree – they didn’t see the need for it. It was disconnected from Glencree, part of a silo mentality of personality driven programmes and in the end the closure of the programme was very abrupt. We heard in mid March it would close at the end of March.”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

However, it appears this may be part of a wider vacuum around strategic direction at Glencree, which is currently being addressed:

*“Glencree doesn’t have a shared vision. It is not an organisation – it’s more of a loose associate of people who can deliver their work within that framework. Glencree is more of a vehicle. So I fear the learning will be lost completely...Glencree is not a learning organisation “* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

In spite of these challenges there remains a demand from schools and some interest in continuing this type of work at Glencree in the future.

The schools consulted in the survey were unanimous in the belief that the programme should continue and expressed concerns and disappointment at the threat of it not continuing.

*“It was a very beneficial and worthwhile project. We would be very disappointed if the project did not continue and children were denied these wonderful experiences and learning opportunities.”* (Schools Survey)

*“The Glencree project has received very positive feedback from all our students over the years. It would be such a pity if it did not continue in some form.”* (Schools Survey)

*“Nine years of pleasure, friendly and professional staff. We would be devastated if funding cannot be sourced to continue this programme.”* (Schools Survey)

*“The schools involved want to continue to link together, but they are not sure how to do this now without any funding”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

However when the schools were asked if they would be able to pay for the programme in the future, most felt that their school would be unable to meet the extra costs due to budgetary restrictions. There was a common response that teachers would be prepared to lobby and advocate for such funding due to the value of the programme, but that their efforts would be futile due to schools not having budgets for extra curricular activities such as Peace Education. The consensus was that pupils/parents would have to foot the bill but concerns were raised at the inequalities this would lead to, with less well off families being unable to afford it and thus missing out on the opportunities.

*“Schools and pupils could make a donation to go, but we, like others, are feeling the pinch as we lose sources of funding through cutbacks. Our ability to fully subscribe is limited.”* (Schools Survey)

*“I would be willing to put a case to the Board of Governors, but it is unlikely to be successful due to our limited activity budget.”* (Schools Survey)

However, Glencree does not have the resources to provide a subsidised programme of this kind and any such development in the future would require some grant aid and income generation strategy.

*“This type of programme will always need some grant based subsidy. It cannot be self sustaining because most of the schools cannot afford to pay for it”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

*“It will always need subsidised if it is to remain inclusive. Only private schools have the budget to pay for this”* (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

This situation suggests that the project in its previous format is not sustainable.

However, many stakeholders expressed a view on how this area of work should develop in the future. For example, half of respondents to the Schools Survey felt that the programme could focus more on multicultural Ireland.

*“Any future programme has to reflect the changes on the island. It was in the past tied to Protestant/Catholic issues. But there are new challenges as well now with the new Irish and the rapidly changing face of Ireland. The programme needs to accommodate this and sharpen its focus”*  
(Stakeholder Interview, 2008)

The staff team had developed a detailed strategy for future development before the project was closed. The paper “Developing Our Future In Peace Education’ proposed the following areas of work:

- The Schools’ Programme
- Offering an In-School Service
- Developing Cross-Border Relationships

- Teacher/Chaplain Liaison Project
- Developing Peer Approaches to Conflict Resolution in Schools
- Whole School Approach to Peacebuilding
- Primary Schools' Whole School Approach
- Third Level Projects with Colleges and Student Societies
- International conference on peace education
- Glencree Youth work Strategy
- Training for Trainers in Peacebuilding
- Glencree Peaceful Leadership Project
- Sustainable Peace Project with Young People
- Developing the International Context
- Integrating Further Cross-Programme Work at Glencree
- International Youth Conference on Peacebuilding
- Developing Resource Materials
- Evaluation

Other ideas for the future focus on working with a smaller number of schools in a more intensive way, to adopt a whole school approach to developing 'peace promoting schools.'

When asked how the project could be developed in the future one facilitator responded:

*“To expand and develop the scope of the programme, so that perhaps it does not centre on the Glencree site, but rather goes out into the schools, to work with them over a sustained period of time, to develop a process that involves the whole school. To provide training to teachers in how to implement elements of the national curriculum in a way that reflects peaceful principles and active learning. To work with initiatives such as*

*school councils to put peace education principles into practice in our schools. To integrate cross-border elements into all PEP sessions for schools within the Republic of Ireland.” (Facilitators’ Survey)*

Several stakeholders expressed concern that it may be hard to recover from the current circumstances:

*“It was a very well run project. Conn and the team did very well. At times they were overambitious regarding numbers...they were always trying to balance quality and quantity. But they managed to do positive work with schools..the facilitators trained was a fantastic legacy...but the learning might all go to the wall now.” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

*“It’s hard when you have lost people in this way to move forward”*  
(Facilitators Focus Group)

*“It would be stupid to drop it and throw away years of work and all our learning and experience” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

However, other stakeholders believed that any future work with young people would have to be part of a wider vision and strategic review by Glencree, and that the end of this project provides an opportunity to research and design an effective and sustainable programme, in closer partnership with others, which is fully part of the organisation’s future strategy.

*“I hope we could redesign something that addresses youth and education more broadly. We could start again with fuller knowledge by mapping the field and working more in partnership which Glencree hasn’t been good at.” (Facilitators Focus Group)*

*“Should we be doing this work/ is there a need? Is someone else doing it? The vision is very unclear but I think we need to establish something*

*around a whole school approach and work with teachers, but we need to establish what and why” (Stakeholder Interview, 2008)*

*“Either commit to it or don’t do it at all. It needs to be well funded and should have an international aspect that could deal with issues such as Children in Conflict from other countries.” (Facilitators’ Survey)*

## 6 Conclusions

The main conclusions of the evaluation are as follows:

- 6.1 The programme developed high quality progressive learning opportunities in Peace Education that were relevant to the National Curriculum.
- 6.2 Most schools did not take up the opportunity for ongoing, progressive learning opportunities, preferring to participate in one off one-day sessions. There was little preparation, follow up, 'in school' or whole school work. However, the feedback from participating schools was very positive.
- 6.3 A small number of schools did opt for ongoing, progressive learning opportunities, including 'in school' work. This was due to the commitment of the teachers in those schools to delivering Peace Education within planned coursework and a desire to achieve a whole school impact.
- 6.4 The North South Schools Link Programme programme provided appropriate and relevant cross-border learning opportunities for young people, their schools, teachers and to some extent their communities. It also provided some excellent cross community learning opportunities.
- 6.5 The North South Schools Link Programme was generally very effective because there was an ongoing programme with sustained contact providing an opportunity for ongoing, progressive learning and a whole school impact.
- 6.6 The project was very successful in developing appropriate and relevant learning methodologies and materials on peace education suitable for a range of user groups and in a variety of formats.

- 6.7 The training and development of a Facilitator Panel had a positive impact on the quality of programme delivery.
- 6.8 The project was not successful in developing strategic relationships with other agencies to promote the mainstreaming of peace education and this may have been an unrealistic objective. However, there may be potential to work in partnership with other groups to introduce peace education as part of a broader new curriculum theme.
- 6.9 Sustained funding for the project was not achieved and the project ended abruptly in March 2008, losing both the personnel and much of the learning that had been gained in the previous three years.
- 6.10 The programme was disconnected from Glencree. It appears to have been hosted at Glencree rather than being an integral part of the vision and strategy of the Centre. Staff and volunteers felt generally unsupported.
- 6.11 Although many schools wish to see the programme restored, few are able to pay for it. To develop and sustain this work in this way in the future will therefore require grants and fundraising to subsidise schools.
- 6.12 There is potential to develop a more intensive whole school initiative working with teachers and pupils in a smaller number of schools to become ‘peace promoting schools’ and with a greater focus on a multicultural Ireland.
- 6.13 It is not clear whether the Council of Glencree have a vision or strategy for this type of work in the future.

## **7 Recommendations**

As result of this evaluation the following recommendations are suggested:

- 7.1 Glencree should decide if work with children and young people is an integral part of the organisation's vision and strategy for the future.
- 7.2 If, after its strategic review, Glencree includes work with children and young people as an integral part of the organisation's vision and strategy for the future, the organisation should research and design an effective and sustainable programme, in closer partnership with others, in light of this evaluation and the future strategy paper developed by the former staff team.

# Appendices

## Appendix I

### Teachers Focus Group Questions

1. Can you tell me your experience of Glencree's Peace Education Programme to date?
2. To what extent do you think it gives young people appropriate and progressive learning experiences in Peace Education?
3. To what extent is it supporting schools to engage in cross-border and cross-community learning?
4. What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
5. How would you like to see this type of programme being further developed in the future?

**Participants:** Margaret Foley, St Louis Secondary School, Monaghan; Mary O'Hagan, St McCartan's College, Monaghan; Wendy Sloan, Monaghan Collegiate School, Olivia Smyth, Lismore Comprehensive, Craigavon

### Young People Focus Group Questions

1. Draw a picture that describes your experience of Glencree.
2. What have you learned through this programme?
3. How have you changed through this programme?
4. What has been the best part?
5. What would you change?
6. Have you any ideas for the future of this programme?

## Final Year Evaluation

### Programme Facilitator Focus Group Questions

1. Can you tell me your experience of Glencree's Peace Education Programme over the past three years?
2. To what extent do you think it gave young people appropriate and progressive learning experiences in Peace Education?
3. To what extent do you think it supported teachers in the delivery of Peace Education within their planned coursework related to the National Curriculum?
4. To what extent do you think it enabled schools to integrate peace education into the life of their school?
5. To what extent did it support schools to engage in cross-border and cross-community learning?
6. How effective were the learning methodologies and resource materials used in the programme?
7. To what extent did Glencree develop and maintain strategic relationships with other agencies to promote the mainstreaming of peace education?
8. What were the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
9. How would you like to see this type of programme being further developed by Glencree in the future?
10. Have you any other comments you would like to make?

**Participants:** Yaser Alashqar (Facilitator/Youth Worker), Krystal Cooper (Intern/Facilitator), Megan Kelly (Intern/Facilitator), Eamon Rafter (Education Development & Training Officer/Member of Development Committee), Gail Varian (Facilitator/Member of Development Committee) and Irene Wilson Power (Facilitator)

## Appendix II      Formative Evaluation Framework

Aims	Outcomes	Measures/Indicators	Data Collection
<p>1. To develop and provide progressive learning opportunities in Peace Education for Young People, their schools and teachers which are relevant to the National Curriculum and appropriate for the learning level of users</p>	<p>A clear model of Peace Education articulated by Glencree</p> <p>A range of specific programmes targeted towards identified streams within the National Curriculum</p> <p>The model is continually reviewed and developed</p> <p>Young People are having appropriate and progressive learning experiences in Peace Education</p>	<p>Published description of new model including five streams of peace education targeted across the range of the national curriculum</p> <p>A review process established and implemented</p> <p>Level of participation of Young People</p>	<p>Desk Research</p> <p>IFI Reports</p> <p>Internal Council Reports</p> <p>Internal Council Reports</p> <p>Notes of Evaluation Workshops</p>

	<p>Teachers are equipped and confident in the delivery of Peace Education within their planned coursework</p> <p>Schools are integrating peace education into the life of their school</p>	<p>Specified programmes are delivered to classes across the range of the education curriculum</p> <p>Feedback on learning from Young People, Teachers and Curricular Advisors</p> <p>An effective teacher development process has been piloted and evaluated</p> <p>A number of schools are engaging in a whole school approach with the aid of Glenree</p>	<p>Annual Teacher Questionnaire</p> <p>Notes of meetings with Curricular Advisors</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Internal Council Reports</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>2. To provide appropriate and relevant cross-border and cross-community learning opportunities in Peace Education for young people, their schools, teachers and communities</p>	<p>Schools are engaging in cross-border and cross-community learning with support of Glencree</p> <p>Schools are developing ongoing cross-border and cross-community relationships themselves</p>	<p>Number of schools involved in a relationship building process</p> <p>Number of schools participating in the NSSLP programme</p> <p>A number of schools are engaging in a whole school approach to cross-border and cross-community relationships</p>	<p>Internal Council Reports</p> <p>IFI Reports</p> <p>NSSLP programme teacher questionnaire</p> <p>Notes of meetings with teachers and principals</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p>
<p>3.To develop appropriate and relevant learning methodologies and materials on Peace Education suitable for a range of user groups and provide a variety of formats for sharing the learning of Glencree</p>	<p>Glencree has a clear learning strategy and quality control process in place</p> <p>A facilitator training programme has been developed and implemented</p>	<p>Glencree have a range of approved workshop activities developed and adapted for use within each programme area</p> <p>Facilitators are trained within an approved learning framework</p>	<p>Desk Research</p> <p>IFI Reports</p> <p>Notes of Facilitator Training</p> <p>Facilitator evaluations</p>

	A range of learning support materials published and disseminated	Number of materials published  Number of copies distributed	Internal Council Reports  Stakeholder Interviews
4.To develop and maintain relevant and strategic relationships which enhance and promote the mainstreaming of peace education	Glencree are able to integrate the work of Peace Education into the National Curriculum  Glencree has developed partnerships to support this work	The Glencree Peace Education Model strategically links into the National Curriculum  Number of partnerships	Desk Research  Stakeholder Interviews
5. To ensure the capacity of Glencree in the delivery of the peace education programme through the provision of personnel funding and training	A sustainable and adequately resourced Peace Education Programme	Resources for programme implementation	Desk Research  Internal Stakeholder Interviews

# **Appendix III**

## **Glencree Peace Education Programme**

### **Interim Evaluation Workshop**

**14th September 2006**

#### **Programme**

- **Introductions**
- **Highlights of the Programme to Date**
- **SWOC (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Challenges) Analysis**
- **Progress Against Objectives**
- **Development and Change in the Programme**
- **Future Development and Change**
- **Close**

# Appendix IV

## Glencree Peace Education Programme

### Notes from Interim Evaluation Workshop

14th September 2006

#### SWOC Analysis

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Versatility - not restricted to formal education</li> <li>• Resources - centre, environment</li> <li>• People/facilitators/team common goal, ethos.</li> <li>• Programme meets clear needs &amp; has learning strategy</li> <li>• History of growth &amp; development 'our story'</li> <li>• Foundational work developed by others in the past, connecting a vision of many &amp; enthusiasm</li> <li>• Structure / coherence</li> <li>• Programme designed to meet the interests &amp; needs of participants</li> <li>• Curriculum connection</li> <li>• Strong &amp; supportive facilitators panel</li> <li>• Strong cohesive team</li> <li>• Openness to change &amp; develop creatively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under resourced - too much to do, not enough people or materials</li> <li>• Vision is very ambitious - can we do it all?</li> <li>• New programme - new territory</li> <li>• Funding cycle &amp; future funding</li> <li>• Personal costs – burnout</li> <li>• Human limitations</li> <li>• Nervousness about new ideas</li> <li>• Time constraints i.e. testing, piloting etc.</li> <li>• Under resourced re team members (especially administration)</li> <li>• Distance travelled by facilitators</li> <li>• Need for further training</li> </ul>
OPPORTUNITIES	CHALLENGES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning opportunities from other agencies, groups &amp; participants</li> <li>• Changing to a more intercultural environment</li> <li>• Linking to new Glencree programmes, locally &amp; globally</li> <li>• Growing support in schools, agencies &amp; other groups</li> <li>• Curricular linkages growing</li> <li>• Cspe &amp; relationship with cdu</li> <li>• Support of other curriculum advisors</li> <li>• Linking with other organisations i.e. amnesty, trocaire, nyci.</li> <li>• Developing work with traveller community (Pavee Point)</li> <li>• Fort de bilt - peace factory</li> <li>• North/west link - cross border</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources - securing funding, funding cycle &amp; future funding</li> <li>• Organisational challenges - being part of a wider space, needing to fit in &amp; support other work at Glencree</li> <li>• Isolation - constant challenge to remain connected &amp; relevant</li> <li>• Organisational constraints e.g. increasing no. of participants</li> <li>• Invention of peace education (no road map)</li> <li>• Need for continued funding</li> </ul>

# Appendix V

## Evaluation Stakeholder Interview Questions

- 1) Can you tell me your experience of Glencree's Peace Education Programme to date?
- 2) To what extent do you think it gives young people appropriate and progressive learning experiences in Peace Education?
- 3) To what extent do you think it supports teachers in the delivery of Peace Education within their planned coursework related to the National Curriculum?
- 4) To what extent do you think it is enabling schools to integrate peace education into the life of their school?
- 5) To what extent is it supporting schools to engage in cross-border and cross-community learning?
- 6) How effective are the learning methodologies and resource materials being used in the programme?
- 7) To what extent is Glencree developing and maintaining strategic relationships with other agencies to promote the mainstreaming of peace education?
- 8) What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
- 9) How would you like to see this type of programme being further developed in the future?
- 10) Have you any other comments you would like to make?

## Interviewees

1. David Bloomfield, Chief Executive, Glencree (2008)
2. Hugh Doyle, Former Education Programme Manager (2006)
3. Joe Hinds, International Fund for Ireland (2006)
4. Louise Keating, Programme Facilitator (2006)
5. Kevin Moran, Cross Border Field Worker (2006 and 2008)
6. Dorothy Monaghan, International Fund for Ireland (2008)
7. Conn Mulvenna, Education Programme Manager (2006 and 2008)
8. Shane O'Connor, Programme Facilitator (2006)
9. Sorcha Tormey, Former Programme Worker (2008)
10. Gail Varian, Programme Facilitator (2006)
11. Ian White, Council Member (2008)
12. Rosie Wilson, Programme Facilitator (2006)

# Appendix VI

## Young People Focus Group Flip Chart Notes

### **What have you learned through this programme?**

- How to communicate our feelings and opinions
- About prejudice
- How to respect others and appreciate differences
- Don't be shy
- About conflict
- To be more open minded
- About different backgrounds
- About different cultures
- Don't judge people before you know them
- How to play sheep and wolf

### **How have you changed through this programme?**

- Communicate easier and you learn how to listen and respect others views of certain issues
- More open
- You know more about different cultures
- More friends
- More confidence
- Not as shy
- I don't overlook things
- Know more about different religions
- Understand people better
- Trust others better
- Become more outgoing
- Tasks like 'I am...' give you a different view of yourself

# Appendix VII

## Final Year Evaluation

### Schools Telephone Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me about your experience of Glencree's Peace Education Programme?
2. To what extent did it give your students appropriate and progressive learning experiences in Peace Education?
3. To what extent do you think it supported teachers in the delivery of Peace Education within their planned coursework relating to the National Curriculum?
4. To what extent did it enable you to integrate peace education into the life of your school?
5. To what extent did it support your school to engage in cross-border and/or cross-community learning?
6. How effective were the learning methodologies and resource materials used in the programme?
7. What were the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
8. The current Peace Education Programme has now come to the end of its current funding cycle. How would you like to see this type of programme being further developed in the future?
9. To what extent do you think schools would be willing or able to pay an increased amount for such programmes in the future, now that the grant subsidy has ended?
10. Have you any other comments you would like to make?

# Appendix VIII

## List of Schools/Groups Who Responded to the Survey

1. St Colmcilles Community School
2. Riversdale Community College
3. Colaiste Cois Life
4. St Colman's College
5. St David's CBC
6. St Louis Secondary School
7. St Macartans College, Monaghan
8. Monaghan Collegiate School
9. Craigavon Senior High
10. Brownlow Integrated College
11. Compass

# Appendix IX

## Facilitator Survey

As part of final evaluation of the Peace Education Programme, we would appreciate you taking ten minutes to complete this short confidential questionnaire. Please return to the independent external evaluator - Tony Macaulay, 12 Mill Square, Portstewart, BT55 7TB, Northern Ireland or [tonymacaulay@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:tonymacaulay@yahoo.co.uk) by 16th June 2008. Thank you for your assistance.

- 1. To what extent were you trained as a facilitator to deliver the programmes?**
- 2. To what extent did the programme give young people appropriate and progressive learning experiences in Peace Education?**
- 3. To what extent do you think it supported teachers in the delivery of Peace Education within their planned coursework related to the National Curriculum?**
- 4. To what extent do you think it enabled schools to integrate peace education into the life of their school?**
- 5. To what extent did it support schools to engage in cross-border and cross-community learning?**
- 6. How effective were the learning methodologies and resource materials being used in the programme?**
- 7. What were the main strengths of the programme?**
- 8. What were the main weaknesses of the programme?**
- 9. How would you like to see Glencree approach this type of programme in the future?**
- 10. Have you any other comments you would like to make?**

**Respondents:** Megan Kelly, Bobby McCormack, Riona McCormack, Ruth Power.