



Canadian Human Rights Foundation

International Human Rights Training Program 2002

Evaluation Report

October 2, 2002

Canadian Human Rights Foundation
1425 René-Lévesque Blvd West, Suite 407
Montréal (Québec)
Canada H3G 1T7
www.chrf.ca

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	3
<i>Organization of this Report</i>	4
<i>Part I: Program Curriculum and Administration</i>	5
1. Program Goal and Objectives	5
2. Program Methodology	5
3. Program Overview	6
4. Individual Plan for Putting Learning into Action	6
5. Follow-Up	6
6. Changes Made for the 2002 Session of the IHRTP	7
7. Participant Selection	8
8. Participant Profiles	9
<i>Part II: Program Evaluation</i>	11
1. Evaluation Method.....	11
2. Participant Perspective of Curriculum	12
3. Facilitator Perspective of Curriculum.....	16
4. View of the Presentations	16
5. Written and Electronic Documentation	18
6. View of the Facilitators.....	18
7. Administration and Material Needs	18
<i>Part III: Recommendations</i>	20
<i>Conclusion</i>	22
<i>APPENDIX A: General Evaluation Questionnaire Results from Closed-Ended Items</i>	A-1
<i>APPENDIX B: End of Stream Evaluation Results From Closed-Ended Items</i>	A-12

Executive Summary

This is the Evaluation Report for the 23rd annual International Human Rights Training Program (IHRTTP) offered by the Canadian Human Rights Foundation (CHRF). The Program took place at John Abbott College, in the town of Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Québec, from June 9 to June 28, 2002. It brought together 118 participants from 63 countries; 29 resource persons (9 facilitators, 20 presenters and panelists); 16 CHRF staff members; and 7 student interns. In addition, over 15 volunteers contributed time, services or goods. This report is based on data collected using formal and informal evaluation methods.

The IHRTTP is at the heart of the activities of the CHRF. This intensive three-week course is an intermediate level program, intended primarily for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) involved in the advancement of human rights. The program uses a participant-centered approach that encourages reciprocal learning through an exchange of experiences among participants, facilitators and resource persons.

For the last two years, the focus of the IHRTTP has been more oriented towards strengthening the capacity of human rights organizations to undertake human rights education (HRE) efforts (e.g., training, awareness campaigns, information dissemination, and advocacy) aimed at building a universal culture of human rights. This more targeted focus has impacted on the program content and the selection of organizations invited to attend the program.

The results from the evaluation of the 2002 IHRTTP are a clear indication that the refocusing achieved the desired results. Eighty-six percent (86%) of participants stated that the IHRTTP curriculum met their needs. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of participants stated that overall program objectives were met. On average, ninety-seven percent (97%) of participants stated that the objectives of the different Streams (or parts) of the program were relevant to their current human rights work. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of participants agreed that there were effective opportunities to explore women's rights issues in the IHRTTP.

While there is no doubt that improvements and revisions can be made to the program, one indication that the CHRF is moving in the right direction is the one-hundred percent (100%) agreement among participants that they would recommend others from their organization/country to participate in future sessions of the IHRTTP.

This Evaluation Report is based on information gathered from four sources:

- A "General Evaluation" questionnaire which covered all aspects of the Program;
- Participants' "End of Stream Evaluation" questionnaires aimed at assessing the content and process of each of the eight Streams;
- Facilitators' "End of Stream Evaluation" questionnaires aimed at assessing the content and process of each of the eight Streams; and
- Daily debriefing sessions with facilitators.

Organization of this Report

Part I of the report contains basic information related to the IHRTP. More specifically, this part covers objectives, process and content of the IHRTP as well as the practical and administrative aspects of delivering the IHRTP.

Part II describes the results of the IHRTP program evaluation.

Part III provides conclusions and recommendations based on all the feedback received.

Part I: Program Curriculum and Administration

1. Program Goal and Objectives

The overall goal of the 2002 IHRTP was to strengthen the capacity of human rights organizations to undertake human rights education (HRE) efforts (e.g., training, awareness campaigns, information dissemination, and advocacy) aimed at building a universal culture of human rights. The four overarching objectives of the program were to enable participants to:

- analyze the issues and situations encountered in the work of their organizations using a framework based on internationally accepted human rights values and principles
- explore ways in which human rights education can increase the effectiveness of their human rights work
- increase their capacity to apply their learning within their organizations and their society
- facilitate networking and partnership activities essential to furthering the cause of human rights.

2. Program Methodology

The participant-centered curriculum model used by the CHRF was based on principles of adult experiential learning, where participants and facilitators commit themselves to engage in a process of mutual teaching and learning. The basic premise was that the curriculum acted as a framework for drawing out content based on participants' experiences.

Participants were divided into eight groups of approximately 15 members for most of the program. There were two French and six English language groups. The guiding principle for the formation of groups was to maximize diversity in terms of professional background, type of organization, and country of origin while at the same time ensuring a gender balance. Each group was assigned a facilitator whose role was to provide guidance in achieving the objectives of the IHRTP as the participants work through all activities, case studies and an extensive simulation activity. Facilitators were chosen for their ability to effectively support the learning process, their knowledge of human rights and their experience with adult education techniques. At various points during the IHRTP, the eight working groups were combined or divided into different groupings to further promote exchange of experiences and networking among the participants.

3. Program Overview

Week 1

Participants got to know the members of their working group and engaged in activities that established the groundwork for developing a productive group dynamic based on mutual respect. They became familiar with the overall course content and methodology and began a process of reflection on their individual societies, the human rights work of their organizations and their own role within those organizations. Participants also compared their roles as human rights activists/educators and reflected on the universality of rights.

Week 2

Participants began the week discussing issues of globalization, leading to an examination of their roles as human rights workers in the current global context. Through case studies and discussions, participants examined major international human rights instruments in order to explore the applicability of these instruments in their work.

Week 3

Regional workshops provided participants from the same geographic region the opportunity to work together to examine key components of effective monitoring and advocacy and the role of these activities in educating about human rights. Participants synthesized previous themes and examined emerging human rights issues. Participants also became familiar with methods of educational evaluation.

4. Individual Plan for Putting Learning into Action

One of the objectives of the IHRTP was to provide participants with strategies and techniques for retransmitting the knowledge and skills acquired during the Program within their own organization and the community at large. The emphasis throughout the Program was on critical analysis, reflection, and practical application leading to the development of strategies for future action. The Individual Plan was designed to provide participants with a framework for developing a concrete plan for putting their learning into practice with the aim of increasing their organization's capacity to conduct HRE. This component of the Program was piloted in the 2001 session and proved to be successful and will continue to be an important component of the IHRTP.

5. Follow-Up

Approximately 4-6 months after the completion of the IHRTP, the CHRF follows up with each participant via e-mail. In addition to asking about the progress of participants' Individual Plan,

participants are asked whether the IHRTTP experience has been relevant and incorporated into the work of the organization, and whether any networking or partnership activities are taking place as a result of their organization's participation in the IHRTTP.

6. Changes Made for the 2002 Session of the IHRTTP

Many of the changes made for the 2002 session of the IHRTTP aimed at further increasing the focus of the program on HRE as well as addressing the recommendations made at the end of the 2001 session. Other changes were also deemed necessary in order to ensure that the content of the Program would continue to effectively respond to the ever-changing global human rights environment. The highlights of these changes are outlined below.

Stream 5 The Global Human Rights Context

The events of September 11, 2001, in particular, produced an entirely new set of social, economic and political repercussions worldwide. Activities in this Stream were revised in order to better focus on analyzing the changing role of human rights workers in the global context.

Stream 7 Monitoring and Advocacy

Whereas in the 2001 session of the IHRTTP participants only analyzed the effectiveness of an advocacy campaign, in this year's session they had to actually design a campaign on the topic of HIV/AIDS. This topic was selected for a number of reasons: HIV/AIDS is an issue affecting all regions of the world; it is complex, involving different aspects of human rights; education is a key element in addressing this issue; and it provides a good example of how to incorporate important human rights issues and skills training.

Stream 8: Educational Evaluation

Systematic evaluation is essential to ensuring that education activities continue to be effective and useful, but is often neglected in HRE training. This Stream was added to the Program this year to provide participants with some basic skills in designing and conducting evaluations of their HRE activities.

Enhanced Focus on HRE Methodology and Practice Throughout the Program

Some of the ways this was achieved were:

- The addition of "HRE Techniques" in shaded text boxes in the manual, describing the technique and its possible uses;
- Allotting more time for discussing the educational process of the different activities in the program; and

- The addition of a number of human rights education techniques, e.g., a song-writing workshop by The Raging Grannies to demonstrate and practice advocacy techniques; popular theatre to address intercultural and gender issues.

Greater Opportunity for Self-directed Learning

More time was allotted this year for the development of the Individual Plans for Putting Learning into Action (8 hours in all).

Implementation of a Policy Against Sexual Harassment

In order to better address potential situations of conflict which can easily arise in such a culturally diverse group, the CHRF decided to expand on its existing Code of Ethics by developing and implementing a “Policy Against Sexual Harassment, Gender Discrimination and Harassment Because of Sexual Orientation.”

CD-ROM

In the past, participants have repurposed CHRF materials for use in their own contexts. This year, in order to promote this activity, the CHRF distributed a CD-ROM with complete copies of the IHRTP participant and facilitator manuals to each participant. Also on the CD-ROM were other manuals/documents:

- Regional Training Program for Labour Attachés: Protecting Migrant Workers – Strengthening Collaboration in Asia (English)
- Human Rights Monitoring and Advocacy: National Workshop for NGOs (English)
- Training for Human Rights Trainers - Book 1 (English, Russian) and 2 (English)
- Promoting and Protecting the Rights of Migrant Workers: A UN Road Map - A Guide for Asian NGOs to the International Human Rights System and Other Mechanisms (English)
- Programme africain de formation sur Internet et les droits humains (PAFIDH) (French)
- La promotion et la défense des droits des « Petites Bonnes » and companion readings manual (French)
- Analysis of international human rights instruments (English/French)

7. Participant Selection

CHRF partner organizations in the regions and organizations with links to the international human rights community were approached to provide names of potential candidates for the IHRTP. In addition, CHRF staff involved in regional initiatives throughout the year researched organizations that could benefit from the IHRTP. This system of recruiting from trustworthy sources has proven quite successful and has eliminated the need for on-site interviews. The CHRF’s selection process, initiated in 1995 and further refined every year, ensures that the

participants selected are from organizations with the greatest potential for local human rights initiatives. The selection committee also looked at overall gender balance and geographic representation. The criteria below were used in this year's selection process to review the 600 applications that the CHRF received.

Organizations which nominate candidates must:

- be non-profit, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or community-based organizations (CBOs)
Note: Under special circumstances, candidates who are not affiliated with an NGO or CBO may be accepted provided that they can demonstrate how their participation will contribute to human rights work in their country.
- have a demonstrated commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights
- have established a record for effective action
- be involved in human rights education activities such as training sessions, workshops, public awareness campaigns, advocacy, monitoring, etc.
- commit to providing opportunities within the organization for their candidate to apply the knowledge and skills gained in the Program

Candidates from qualifying organizations must:

- be active members of the qualifying organization for at least two years
- be in a position to influence the human rights education work of the organization
- be aware of human rights principles and major international instruments
- be committed to transferring the knowledge and skills gained to colleagues and to others with whom they work
- be sensitive to the issues which arise when working in multicultural groups and respectful of diversity
- be proficient in either English or French

8. Participant Profiles

This year's session brought together 118 participants (69 women, 49 men) from 63 countries in the following regions (Table 1):

Region	Number of Participants
Africa	38
South Asia	12
South East Asia	22
Other Asian countries	3
Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia	23
Canada	8
Caribbean/Latin America	11
Other (Australia)	1
TOTAL	118

Table 1: Participants by region.

Eighty-eight (88) participants were English-speaking and thirty (30) were French-speaking. Eighty-six (86) participants indicated that they were directly involved in HRE, while thirty-two (32) indicated that they were not. The average age of participants was 36, with a range of 21 to 63 years of age.

Although the CHRF strove for gender balance while selecting participants, this was not always possible due to circumstances beyond our control. At this year's IHRTP there were about 30% fewer men than women. Two of the main factors contributing to this difference were: the difficulty experienced by male participants from French-speaking Africa in obtaining visas and the much larger number of women applicants than male applicants from Central and Eastern Europe.

Part II: Program Evaluation

1. Evaluation Method

To ensure that the content and methodology of the IHRTP remained current and relevant, the CHRF reviewed the Program from various perspectives. In addition to the evaluation feedback from participants, input from facilitators, resource people and the CHRF Programs Committee assessed the IHRTP's ability to meet the evolving needs of human rights workers in the changing global context of human rights.

This evaluation assessed the content, methodology and delivery of the IHRTP, focusing specifically on:

- Program objectives and Stream objectives
- Curriculum content, methodology, formal presentations
- Facilitators
- Training materials
- Facilities, logistical arrangements, special events

This Evaluation Report is based on results gathered from the following sources:

- A "General Evaluation" questionnaire which covered all aspects of the course (Appendix A);
- Participants' "End of Stream Evaluation" questionnaires aimed at assessing the content and process of each of the eight Streams of the course;
- Facilitators' "End of Stream Evaluation" questionnaires aimed at assessing the content and process of each of the eight Streams of the course; and
- Daily debriefing sessions with facilitators.

"End of Stream" questionnaires were administered to participants and facilitators during dedicated "evaluation/debriefing" sessions throughout the three weeks. There was a ninety-two percent (92%) return rate for these questionnaires, ranging between eighty-seven percent (87%) for Stream 6 and ninety-seven percent (97%) for Stream 2. Participants also had a dedicated 1.5 hr session to complete the "General Evaluation" questionnaire on the final day of the IHRTP. This was returned by ninety-one percent (91%) of the 118 participants in attendance. This evaluation process involved collecting and processing approximately 1100 completed questionnaires from participants and facilitators over the three-week period.

2. Participant Perspective of Curriculum

In this section of the report, the four overall program objectives act as a framework for looking at the results of the 2002 IHRTTP “General Evaluation” questionnaire. Supporting results from the “End of Stream” questionnaires are reported under their relevant program objective (Appendix B). A large majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that both the overall program objectives (97%) and the individual Stream objectives (93%) were met. Moreover, an average of 97% of participants indicated on the End of Stream evaluations that the objectives were relevant to their current human rights work.

Overall Program Objectives

Objective: The IHRTTP has enabled me to analyze the issues and situations encountered in the work of my organization using a framework based on internationally accepted human rights values and principles.

Ninety-seven percent (97%) of participants indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that this objective had been met. A large part of the analysis of issues and situations rests on the increase of understanding of human rights values and principles. In order to assess these changes, participants were asked about their post-IHRTTP level of understanding of various topics/instruments covered in the program. On average, eighty-seven percent (87%) of participants stated that they had a better or much better level of understanding of the topics/instruments after having attended the IHRTTP. (See Table 2).

International Human Rights System	Better/much better level of understanding post- IHRTTP (%)
Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)	84
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	87
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)	89
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)	86
Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)	86
International Covenant on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CERD)	87
UN Decade on Human Rights Education	89

Table 2: Increased level of understanding post-IHRTTP.

Results from the related “End of Stream” questionnaires indicated a similar level of agreement regarding attainment of this objective. In Stream 2, “Starting from Where We Are,” participants had the opportunity to share personal and professional human rights experiences in order to gain a better understanding of the various contexts and different societies in which their work takes place. Ninety-eight percent (98%) agreed or strongly agreed that the objectives of this Stream had been met, and an equal percentage stated that the objectives were relevant to their human rights work.

In Stream 5, “The Global Human Rights Context,” participants explored different perspectives on the effects of globalization on human rights and democratic development along with strategies to address these effects through HRE. Although ninety-six percent (96%) of participants stated that the objectives of this Stream were relevant to their human rights work and an average of ninety-four percent (94%) agreed or strongly agreed that two of the Stream objectives were met, nineteen percent (19%) felt that the stream did not adequately address the impact of globalization on the rights of women and children.

In Stream 6, “Human Rights Standards and Mechanisms,” participants examined the concept of a rights-based approach and were introduced to international human rights standards. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they gained a hands-on familiarity with international human rights standards and mechanisms and considered the potential relevance of these instruments in their day-to-day work. Ninety-five percent (95%) indicated that the objectives of Stream 6 were relevant to their work. Although these results are very encouraging, participants’ open comments indicate specific areas for improvement in Stream 6. Twenty-five (25) comments related to the insufficient time allotted for analysis of the international instruments. The facilitators also reiterated this point in the debriefing session. Five comments by French-speaking participants indicated the need to address regional mechanisms in this Stream. In addition, resource persons provided very concrete suggestions for enhancing the effectiveness this Stream. Based on this feedback, the CHRF will be able to revise the Stream to better meet the needs of participants.

Objective: The IHRTP has enabled me to explore ways in which human rights education can increase the effectiveness of my human rights work.

When asked to indicate their level of agreement with this statement, ninety-six percent (96%) of participants either agreed or strongly agreed. Participants were also asked if the integrated approach of the IHRTP had increased their capacity to design/facilitate human rights training. An “integrated approach” in human rights program design involves the combination of human rights content (e.g., international instruments, knowledge about HIV/AIDS) with training skills-building (e.g., facilitation/curriculum design skills). Eighty-four (84%) of participants agreed that this approach had increased their capacity, with fifteen percent (15%) indicating “somewhat.”

Again, results from the related “End of Stream” questionnaires indicated a similar level of agreement regarding attainment of this objective. Stream 1, “Introductions,” established the foundations for the Program. Participants were introduced to the philosophy, content, and participatory methodology of the IHRTP. One hundred per cent (100%) of participants indicated that the objectives of Stream 1 were relevant to their current human rights work.

In Stream 3, “Building a Global Culture of Human Rights,” participants explored the potential of human rights education as a tool for global social change and reflect on how HRE can increase the effectiveness of their work. For each of the four objectives of this Stream, ninety-three percent (93%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the objectives had been met. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of participants stated that the objectives were relevant to their work.

In Stream 7, “Monitoring and Advocacy,” participants explored key components of monitoring and advocacy and the role of these activities in educating about human rights. Participants also have the opportunity to become familiar with “simulation” as a training technique. An average of ninety-two percent (92%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that these two objectives were met. Fifteen percent (15%) of participants, however, felt that the third objective, “Exploring opportunities for regional advocacy and education campaigns” was not met. Although participants work in regional groupings for the simulation activity, there may not have been sufficient time or energy at the end of the activity to focus on joint initiatives.

Objective: The IHRTP has enabled me to increase my capacity to apply my learning within my organization and my society.

When participants were asked to indicate their agreement with the above statement, ninety-seven percent (97%) stated that they either agreed or strongly agreed. As the IHRTP aimed at enabling participant organizations to undertake more effective HRE activities, the program placed a strong emphasis on transfer of learning (i.e. application of learning to the work situation). When submitting applications, organizations together with their candidates consider how transfer of learning might take place within their organization after the Program. Participants attending the 2002 IHRTP were asked to develop an “Individual Plan for Putting Learning into Action” as part of the Program. The CHRF collected and reviewed 106 Individual Plans that were produced during the three weeks.

Ninety-nine percent (99%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that preparing the Individual Plan for Putting Learning into Action was a practical method for planning how to implement knowledge and skills acquired during the IHRTP. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of participants also agreed or strongly agreed that they had developed a feasible plan for implementation with their organizations. This is a clear indication of the importance of this activity and also underscores the necessity for follow up on these individual plans.

Objective: The IHRTP has enabled me to facilitate networking and partnership activities essential to furthering the cause of human rights.

When participants were asked to indicate their agreement with the above statement, ninety-nine percent (99%) stated that they either agreed or strongly agreed. The CHRF made efforts to give participants many formal and informal opportunities to network during the IHRTP. Participants were initially divided into working groups based on maximum diversity in terms of geographic region and type of work. Throughout the three weeks, participants had the opportunity to work in different groupings. In some cases participants were divided by region, other times two working groups were joined together or participants were regrouped on a random basis. This was done in order to have participants meet and interact with as many other participants as possible. Informally, participants also took part in a variety social activities that allowed them to get to know each other.

During the IHRTP, the CHRF provided participants with three different tools to help them establish and maintain networks: a participant directory, “Open Space” reports, and lists of

IHRTP alumni from different regions. The participant directory was distributed with contact information for all 118 participants, 9 facilitators, 16 CHRF staff members, 20 presenters/resource people and 7 interns. This proved to be an invaluable networking tool for use in future programming and collaborative initiatives. During two days of the IHRTP (at the end of the first and second weeks), participant-directed workshops took place based on "Open Space Technology." During these sessions, participants had the opportunity to discuss their own relevant issues and network with participants with similar interests. Participants received reports from each session in an "Open Space Proceedings" booklet.

3. Facilitator Perspective of Curriculum

This was the first year questionnaires were used to systematically document feedback from facilitators. Information collected from the facilitators focused primarily on the content and design of the activities. The analysis of this information therefore is not within the scope of this report. Facilitators' feedback will be given careful consideration during revisions for next year's curriculum. Although "lack of time" was a recurring topic among facilitators this year, it was in no way as overwhelming an issue as in 2001. Returning facilitators generally agreed that the new pacing and timing of activities in the 2002 IHRTP was more manageable and conducive to learning than in previous years.

4. View of the Presentations

While adopting a participant-centered approach, the CHRF nevertheless recognizes the need to convey certain types of information through resource persons in a lecture setting. Therefore, lecture-type presentations and panel discussions remained an important part of the IHRTP. The 2002 IHRTP provided participants with access to a number of resource persons presenting a wide range of human rights issues and topics. The diversity and caliber of the resource persons who attended are examples of the extensive network that the CHRF can draw upon in order to deliver effective and relevant programs. The resource persons who took part in the IHRTP this year are listed in (Table 3).

Name	Organization	Country
Maryse Alcindor	Commission des droits de la personne et des droits de la jeunesse du Québec (CDPDJ)	Canada
Hon. Warren Allmand	Past President, Rights & Democracy	Canada
Sneh Aurora	Canadian Human Rights Foundation	Canada
Jean-Clément Bagré	Mouvement burkinabé des droits de l'homme et des peuples (MBDHP)	Burkina Faso
Annie Bunting	York University	Canada
Roger Clark	Amnesty International	Canada
François Crépeau	Université de Montréal, RQDI	Canada
Ahmed El Obaid El Obaid	McGill University, Faculty of Law	Canada
Mario Gomez	University of Colombo, Faculty of Law	Sri Lanka
Elena Ippoliti	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Switzerland
Lucie Lamarche	Université de Québec à Montréal, Département des sciences juridiques	Canada
Philippe LeBlanc	Permanent Delegate of the Dominican Order at the United Nations in Geneva	Canada
Lanie Melamed	Raging Grannies, Montréal Chapter	Canada
Mise au Jeu Montréal	Popular theatre group	Canada
David Patterson	Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal network	Canada
Dimitrina Petrova	European Roma Rights Center	Hungary
Rohahes Iain Philipps	Former Education and Cultural Officer for the Assembly of First Nations	Canada
I.A. Rehman	Human Rights Commission of Pakistan	Pakistan
Cecilia Thompson	Minorities Project Interational	Switzerland
Stephen Toope	McGill University, Faculty of Law	Canada

Table 3: Resource persons at the 2002 IH RTP.

Participants were positive about each of the seven formal presentations that took place during the three weeks of the IHRTP. On average, participants stated that the presentations were good or very good in terms of:

- relevance to participant needs (90%)
- presenter's use of relevant examples (92%)
- presenter's communication skills (92%)

One noteworthy point is that, on average, sixty-eight percent (68%) of participants self-rated their knowledge on the topics before they attended each presentation as good or very good. Despite knowing about these topics, participants still felt that the presentations were relevant to their needs, a sign that the choices of topics and presenters were appropriate.

5. Written Documentation

Ninety-five percent (95%) of participants rated the general quality of the participant's manual as good or very good. Ninety-six percent (96%) of participants rated the texts in the readings manual as good or very good. The on-site Documentation Centre was moved to a more central location compared to previous years to make it more accessible to participants. Participants used this resource to access human rights documents, and ninety percent (90%) of participants rated the quality of assistance in the Centre as good or very good.

6. View of the Facilitators

The team of facilitators plays an integral role in the overall success of the Program. On average, ninety-eight percent (98%) of participants rated their facilitators as either good or very good on their facilitator's ability to:

- Explain clearly and summarize discussions;
- Encourage participation of group members during activities;
- Show connections among different program activities; and
- Balance needs of individuals and of the group.

7. Administration and Material Needs

In the interests of comparing the progression of the IHRTP over time, the ratings of previous sessions of the IHRTP are also provided in Table 4. It is important to keep in mind that while different questionnaires may have been used during the 1998 and 1999 sessions of the IHRTP,

the questionnaire items related to administration and facilities for the 2000, 2001 and 2002 sessions were identical.

Organization and Facilities	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Correspondence and communication prior to arrival in Canada	74	86	87	92	89
Information in Program Handbook	93	97	97	96	98
Directions for finding your way around the College	77	77	95	89	N/A
Communication of information during the program	84	83	91	92	97
Quality of assistance from staff and availability	82	93	93	94	97
Quality of Classrooms	74	79	97	87	95
Plenary session rooms	56	84	89	92	92
Adequacy of accommodations and sleeping quarters	52	88	97	83	95
Food quality and variety	17	36	71	37	60
Food service and convenience	40	68	88	67	82
Communication services on-site	84	63	78	72	86

Table 4: Participants' rating (%) of administration and facilities (Good or Very Good).

Some noteworthy differences between the ratings of 2001 and 2002 are: adequacy of accommodations and sleeping quarters (+12%), food quality and variety (+23%), food service and convenience (+15%). Interestingly, the accommodations and sleeping quarters were exactly the same as in 2001, indicating that participant preference plays a large role in these ratings.

Part III: Recommendations

Revise Stream 6 “Human Rights Standards and Mechanisms”

Stream 6 is an integral part of the IHRTP curriculum, providing an introduction to international human rights protection and to the potential relevance of these international human rights norms and standards to the human rights work of the participants. Although ninety-eight percent (98%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the objective of the Stream was met and ninety-five percent (95%) of participants agreed that the Stream objective was relevant to their current human rights work, comments from participants, facilitators and resource persons identified clear areas for improvement. Recommendations that will be considered include: allotting more time for the analysis of the different instruments and for more in-depth discussion with the assistance of the resource persons. We will also explore using different case studies.

Provide Opportunities for More In-depth Discussion

Some participants commented that due to time constraints, discussions occasionally remained at a “superficial” level. An analysis of participants’ open comments related to this issue revealed that participants felt there was insufficient time for more in-depth discussions in the following Streams:

- Stream 3 “Building a Global Culture of Human Rights” (18 comments)
- Stream 4 “Seeking Common Ground” (12 comments)

All other Streams had five or fewer comments regarding this issue. It must be noted that returning facilitators indicated that the timing and pacing was much improved. However, CHRF will continue to address this issue in order to achieve an appropriate balance between the needs of individual participants and the needs of the group.

Explore Possibility of Implementing Co-facilitators of Groups

This year, the CHRF piloted the use of a co-facilitator in one of the English groups. Informal feedback during daily debriefing sessions with facilitators was very positive about this arrangement. The CHRF considers this a success on two levels, namely: the co-facilitator is an alumnus of the 1999 IHRTP, and the use of former trainees in subsequent trainings is an indicator of program effectiveness. The CHRF will explore the possibility of implementing this again in future sessions of the IHRTP.

Review the Stream Objectives

The CHRF will revise objectives to ensure they reflect the content of each Stream. The aim is to make the objectives clearer to participants. This revision will also allow a more effective evaluation of the IHRTP objectives to take place.

Focus More on HRE as a Tool for Social Change

The unique nature of the IHRTP's integrated approach –human rights content (knowledge, skills, attitudes and values) and process – encourages participants to think not only about the content of the curriculum, but the process as well. The IHRTP currently does this in various ways to get participants thinking about how they will continue their work in HRE: formal discussions on methodology issues, such as the advantages and disadvantages of using case studies; and daily debriefings that discuss how activities can be adapted to different contexts. Greater focus will also be placed on how we carry out HRE, what content we include, what we expect to achieve and how we plan to evaluate results.

Conclusion

The overall results of the 2002 IHRTP were positive. At the conclusion of the 23rd annual International Human Rights Training Program (IHRTP), participants were asked for the most important thing learned during the Program. Participant responses fell into three broad categories: participatory methodology (39%), new skills (e.g., monitoring and advocacy) applicable to human rights work (36%), and a sense of global activism/solidarity (25%), all playing an important role in building their capacity in human rights education. While the CHRF can provide limited support to participants once the program is completed, it is up to the 2002 alumni to carry out their Individual Plans and disseminate their results. Hopefully, the 2002 alumni can follow in the footsteps of their 2001 IHRTP predecessors, sixty-eight percent (68%) of whom implemented their Individual Plans. In addition to promoting the integration of newfound knowledge, skills, attitudes and values into participants' work, these Individual Plans are excellent tools in helping to assess the impact of the IHRTP.

Participants' overall impressions of the IHRTP were for the most part, positive. One participant wrote that, "It is the first time I have participated in this program and my country overall [is] honoured that we were invited to the IHRTP and it has been a tremendous opportunity not only for myself but my country! It is well planned and excellently executed – I can never dream of simulating something this magnitude but it's inspiring! It was a great learning process and I would recommend this program to others! Keep it up IHRTP!" If the CHRF can continue to foster such enthusiasm in its participants, there is no doubt that positive results will emerge.

**APPENDIX A:
General Evaluation Questionnaire Results from
Closed-Ended Items**

Note: The number of respondents are indicated along with percentages in parentheses. The data reflect only the number of people who responded to the questionnaire.

Part A – Course Content and Process

1. International Human Rights Training Program (IHRTP) Objectives

Please rate the following by marking the appropriate boxes.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The IHRTP has enabled me to:				
a) Analyze the issues and situations encountered in the work of my organization using a framework based on internationally accepted human rights values and principles.	1 (0.9)	2 (1.9)	57 (52.8)	48 (44.4)
b) Explore ways in which human rights education can increase the effectiveness of my human rights work.	1 (0.9)	3 (2.8)	50 (46.3)	54 (50.0)
c) Increase my capacity to apply my learning within my organization and my society.	0 (0.0)	3 (2.8)	48 (45.3)	55 (51.9)
d) Facilitate networking and partnership activities essential to furthering the cause of human rights.	0 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	44 (41.5)	61 (57.5)

2. International Human Rights System

Rate your current level of understanding of the following topics/instruments by marking the appropriate boxes.

Topics/Instruments	Same level of understanding as before attending the IHRTP	Better level of understanding than before attending the IHRTP	Much better level of understanding than before the attending the IHRTP
Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)	17 (16.0)	40 (37.7)	49 (46.2)
International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	14 (13.2)	52 (49.1)	40 (37.7)
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)	12 (11.5)	47 (45.2)	45 (43.3)
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)	15 (14.0)	47 (43.9)	45 (42.1)
Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)	15 (14.2)	52 (49.1)	39 (36.8)
International Covenant on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CERD)	14 (13.3)	57 (54.3)	34 (32.4)
UN Decade on Human Rights Education	12 (11.4)	56 (53.3)	37 (35.2)

3. General Comments

	No	Some of the time	Most of the time	Yes
Do you feel that your group followed the program as outlined in the manual?	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)	24 (22.9)	78 (74.3)

Please explain:

4. Methodology

	Yes	Somewhat	No
The integrated approach of the IHRTTP (covering content and process) has increased my capacity to design/facilitate training.	90 (84.1)	16 (15.0)	1 (0.9)

Please explain:

5. Written Documentation

	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good
a) General quality of the Participant's Manual	0 (0.0)	5 (4.6)	27 (25.0)	76 (70.4)
b) Quality of the texts in the Readings Manual	1 (1.0)	3 (2.9)	41 (39.4)	59 (56.7)

Comments:

6. Individual Plan for Putting Participant Learning Into Action

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a) Preparing the Individual Plan was a practical method for planning how to put into practice the knowledge and skills from the IHRTP.	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	47 (44.3)	58 (54.7)
b) The Plan I have developed is feasible for implementation with my organization.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	45 (43.7)	57 (55.3)
c) Feedback from fellow participants was helpful in preparing my Plan.	0 (0.0)	10 (10.0)	53 (53.0)	37 (37.0)

7. Facilitators

	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good
a) Ability to explain clearly and summarize discussions.	0 (0.0)	3 (2.8)	22 (20.4)	83 (76.9)
b) Ability to encourage participation of group members during activities.	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	19 (17.4)	89 (81.7)
c) Ability to show connections among different program activities.	0 (0.0)	2 (1.8)	28 (25.7)	79 (72.5)
d) Ability to balance needs of individuals and of the group.	0 (0.0)	2 (1.9)	15 (13.9)	91 (84.3)

Comments:

8. Having completed the program, what do you feel is the overall level of the IHRTP?

Basic	7 (6.9)
Intermediate	40 (39.6)
Advanced	54 (53.5)

9. What is the single most important thing you learned during the IHRTP?

10. Having completed the IHRTP, please indicate what was most useful for you in the following categories:

Knowledge: _____

Skills: _____

Attitudes: _____

11. Based on the needs you identified in your pre-training assignment, do you feel that these needs have been met by the IHRTP? Why or why not?

12. What is your overall impression of the IHRTP?

Part B – Future Directions

Please answer the following questions to help improve the IHRTP for future participants.

1. Would you recommend others from your organization or country to participate in the IHRTP?

a) Yes, I would refer others to participate. 105 (100)

b) No, I would not refer anyone. 0 (0.0)

Why or why not?

2. Were there effective opportunities to explore women's rights issues in the IHRTP?

Yes 88 (88.0)

No 12 (12.0)

Comments:

3. What do you feel are the advantages of holding the IHRTP in Canada?

4. How can you continue networking with people you met during the IHRTP? Please make suggestions on how the CHRF can assist you in this project.

Part C – Administration, Material Needs, Special Events

Please rate the following by marking the boxes below.

1. Communications	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good
a) Communication with the CHRF prior to arrival in Canada	3 (2.9)	9 (8.7)	44 (42.3)	48 (46.2)
b) Information in Program Handbook	0 (0.0)	2 (1.9)	41 (38.7)	63 (59.4)
c) Communication of information during the IHRTP	0 (0.0)	3 (2.8)	40 (37.4)	64 (59.8)
d) Assistance from and availability of CHRF staff	1 (1.0)	2 (1.9)	33 (31.7)	68 (65.4)
2. Facilities	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good
a) Quality of classrooms	1 (0.9)	4 (3.8)	50 (47.2)	51 (48.1)
b) Plenary session rooms	1 (1.0)	7 (6.7)	54 (51.9)	42 (40.4)
c) Accommodations and sleeping quarters	1 (0.9)	4 (3.8)	57 (53.8)	44 (41.5)
d) Quality of assistance in the Documentation Centre	1 (1.0)	8 (8.1)	46 (46.5)	44 (44.4)
e) Food quality and variety	5 (4.9)	36 (35.3)	49 (48.5)	12 (11.8)
f) Food service and convenience	0 (0.0)	19 (18.3)	57 (54.8)	28 (26.9)
g) On-site communication services (telephone messages, fax, Internet, etc.)	0 (0.0)	14 (13.7)	42 (41.2)	46 (45.1)

3. Special Events	Did not participate	Poor	Good	Very good
a) Program orientation (Sunday, June 9)	4 (3.9)	4 (3.9)	54 (52.9)	40 (39.2)
b) Opening evening (Monday, June 10)	4 (3.9)	4 (3.9)	50 (48.5)	45 (43.7)
c) Host family dinner (Friday, June 14)	8 (7.7)	3 (2.9)	18 (17.3)	75 (72.1)
d) Trip to Saint-Anne-de-Bellevue (Saturday, June 15)	61 (66.3)	5 (5.4)	16 (17.4)	10 (10.9)
e) Trip to Montreal (Sunday, June 16)	24 (25.0)	20 (20.8)	38 (39.6)	14 (14.6)
f) Global feast (Friday, June 21)	2 (1.9)	2 (1.9)	33 (31.4)	68 (64.8)
g) Trip to Ottawa (Saturday, June 22)	26 (26.8)	1 (1.0)	28 (28.9)	42 (43.3)

4. Additional Presentations	Did not participate	Poor	Good	Very good
a) Popular theatre – Mise au jeu (Tuesday, June 11)	11 (10.6)	13 (12.5)	48 (46.2)	32 (30.8)
b) Iain Phillips – First Nations (Thursday, June 20)	18 (17.5)	3 (2.9)	61 (59.2)	21 (20.4)
c) Frank Elbers – HRE and the Global Community (Wednesday, June 26)	10 (9.9)	8 (7.9)	48 (47.5)	35 (34.7)
d) HRI – For the Record 2001 (Thursday, June 27)	5 (6.9)	5 (6.9)	43 (59.7)	19 (26.4)

5. Please make suggestions for improving any aspect of the IH RTP.

Note: The data reflect only the number of people who responded to the questionnaire.

Part D – Demographics

Please provide us with some background information about yourself by marking the boxes below.

1. In which region of the world do you normally reside?

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Africa | N=36 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> East Asia | N=1 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> South Asia | N=12 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Southeast Asia | N=20 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> North America | N=4 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Latin America, Caribbean | N=11 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Central/Eastern Europe, Central Asia | N=23 |
| Country: _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle East | N=1 |
| Country: _____ | |

2. Gender

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) Female | N=63 | <input type="checkbox"/> b) Male | N=41 |
|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|

Group number: _____

Name (optional): _____

Thank you for responding to this questionnaire!

APPENDIX B:
End of Stream Evaluation Results From Closed-Ended Items

Note: The number of respondents are indicated along with percentages in parentheses. The data reflect only the number of people who responded to the questionnaire.

Stream 1: Introductions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We got to know other members of the working group. N=108	0 (0.0)	3 (2.8)	65 (60.2)	40 (37.0)
We began to develop a productive group dynamic based on mutual respect. N=108	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	61 (56.5)	47 (43.5)
We became familiar with the content and methodology of the International Human Rights Training Program (IHRTTP). N=107	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	63 (58.9)	43 (40.2)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=106			No 0 (0.0)	Yes 106 (100)

Stream 2: Starting From Where We Are	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We examined current human rights problems and the principal contributing factors in different societies. N=114	0 (0.0)	2 (1.8)	55 (48.2)	57 (50.0)
We engaged in a reflection on personal concepts of human rights. N=111	0 (0.0)	3 (2.7)	60 (54.1)	48 (43.2)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=113			No 2 (1.8)	Yes 111 (98.2)

Stream 3: Building a Global Culture of Human Rights	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We reflected on motivating factors for respecting human rights and for educating about human rights. N=112	1 (0.9)	7 (6.2)	57 (50.4)	48 (42.5)
We examined the complementary roles of human rights educator and activist. N=112	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	57 (50.9)	54 (48.2)
We reflected on why the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be at the core of all human rights education. N=112	0 (0.0)	10 (8.8)	55 (48.7)	48 (42.5)
We explored the role of human rights education in building a global culture of human rights. N=111	1 (0.9)	11 (9.8)	58 (51.8)	42 (37.5)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=112			No 2 (1.8)	Yes 110 (98.2)

Stream 4: Seeking Common Ground	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We examined the advantages and disadvantages of diversity in human relations and the effects of diversity on concepts of human rights. N=109	1 (0.9)	6 (5.5)	68 (62.4)	34 (31.2)
We examined and compared personal values and deeply held assumptions regarding what is right or wrong, just or unjust, and their influence on individual action and reaction. N=109	1 (0.9)	4 (3.6)	71 (64.0)	35 (31.5)
We engaged in a reflection on the origin of values and on the universality of rights vs. the cultural relativity of rights debate. N=111	1 (0.9)	8 (7.4)	65 (60.2)	34 (31.5)
We examined current human rights problems in terms of the relationship between the power structure of a society, its dominant values, and the treatment of groups and individuals representing different values. N=106	2 (1.9)	14 (13.2)	69 (65.1)	21 (19.8)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=106			No 7 (6.6)	Yes 99 (93.4)

Stream 5: The Global Human Rights Context	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We were provided with a framework for understanding the changing role of human rights workers in a global context. N=109	1 (0.9)	4 (3.7)	70 (64.2)	34 (31.2)
We explored the current impact of globalization on human rights, with a focus on the rights of women and children. N=108	1 (0.9)	20 (18.5)	62 (57.4)	25 (23.1)
We examined issues related to global governance and their impact on civil society. N=111	3 (2.7)	4 (3.6)	72 (64.9)	32 (28.8)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=109			No 4 (3.7)	Yes 105 (96.3)

Stream 6: Human Rights Standards and Mechanisms	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We gained a hands-on familiarity with international human rights standards and tools and considered the potential relevance of these instruments in our day-to-day work. N=100	0 (0.0)	2 (2.0)	55 (55.0)	43 (43.0)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=102			No 5 (4.9)	Yes 97 (95.1)

Stream 7: Monitoring and Advocacy	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We examined the key components of effective monitoring and advocacy and the role of these activities in educating about human rights. N=107	2 (1.9)	8 (7.5)	61 (57.0)	36 (33.6)
We explored opportunities for regional human rights advocacy and education campaigns. N=108	1 (0.9)	15 (13.9)	72 (66.7)	22 (18.5)
We became familiar with “simulation” as a training technique in human rights education. N=108	1 (0.9)	5 (4.6)	57 (52.8)	45 (41.7)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=100			No 3 (3.0)	Yes 97 (97.0)

Stream 8: Educational Evaluation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
We became familiar with using a process for evaluating educational events. N=110	0 (0.0)	4 (3.6)	55 (50.0)	51 (46.4)
Were these objectives relevant to your current human rights work? N=109			No 1 (0.9)	Yes 108 (99.1)