

# **Evaluation for the Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre**

Re-evaluation of the Armenian Human Rights School  
focusing on the effectiveness of the training

Rob Watson  
Frontier Consulting  
Den Haag

November 2008

**Evaluation for the Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre (ACRPC)**  
**Re-evaluation of the Armenian Human Rights School focusing on**  
**the effectiveness of the training**

**Contents**

1.	Introduction and background .....	p 3
1.1	Background - Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre .....	p 3
1.2	Objectives of the re-evaluation .....	p 3
1.3	Methods .....	p 4
2.	Findings .....	p 5
2.1	Context and relevance.....	p 5
2.2	Programme analysis.....	p 6
	a) The training of teachers	
	b) Community leaders	
	c) Human Rights Libraries	
	d) Publications	
2.3	Networking .....	p14
2.4	Efficiency and sustainability .....	p14
2.5	An issue of terminology .....	p14
2.6	The role of ICCO in supporting programme effectiveness .....	p15
3.	Summary of main findings and recommendations .....	p16

**Attachments**

Annexure A	Terms of reference
Annexure B	ACRPC draft Teacher Planning Form for Human Rights Awareness
Annexure C	ACRPC draft Teacher Report Form for Human Rights Awareness
Annexure D	Draft Human Rights Library Monitoring Form
Annexure E	Draft job descriptions of key positions in the training department.
Annexure F	Draft Evaluation Response Form

**Evaluation for the Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre (ACRPC)**  
**Re-evaluation of the Armenian Human Rights School focusing on**  
**the effectiveness of the training**

**1. Introduction and background**

This report sets out the findings and recommendations of a re-evaluation of the Armenian Human Rights School (AHRS) – which is a key programme of the Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre (ACRPC). The re-evaluation was commissioned by ACRPC and one of its donors ICCO<sup>1</sup> after a previous evaluation in June 2006<sup>2</sup> arrived at inconclusive findings on the effectiveness of this programme, particularly the impact of the training of human rights teachers in schools, and on the pupils in these schools. The re-evaluation was carried out between 23rd October and the 1st of November 2008 by Mr Rob Watson – an independent consultant assisted by Ms. Arpineh Galfayan – an experienced civil society advocate and trainer.

The findings of this evaluation are the sole responsibility of the lead consultant, Rob Watson ([rob.watson@frontierconsulting.org](mailto:rob.watson@frontierconsulting.org)) and not of ACRPC or ICCO.

**1.1 Background - Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre**

ACRPC was founded in July of 1988 as an Armenian non-governmental organisation working for the *development of legal culture*. Key programmes are implemented in the areas of training of teachers on human rights, a network of human rights libraries, training of community leaders in the Lori region, publications, legal reforms and legal and constitutional advocacy. With offices in Vanadzor 120 km north-west of the capital, ACRPC works around the country with a network of contributors and participants in their programmes, mostly on a voluntary basis.

Further information about ACRPC and its work can be found on its website [www.acrpc.am](http://www.acrpc.am) or in their well elaborated annual reports.

**1.2 Objectives of the re-evaluation**

The purpose of the re-evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the Armenian Human Rights School (AHRS) training<sup>3</sup> specifically, and to recommend improvements and tools to improve effectiveness of the programme. The previous evaluation in June 2006 (see footnote 2 below) contained many valuable findings and recommendations about the programme, and therefore should be read in conjunction with this report (available from ICCO or ACRPC).

While overall the 2006 evaluation was very positive about ACRPC's work in a number of key areas, and the evaluation well done on the whole, it was not able to answer the key issue of whether the programme was effective or not. This is likely due to the quantitative methodology used and the reliance of questionnaires as a basis for gathering statistical data. This was a commendable approach but both the conditions nor was time available to come to reliable findings. There was also a narrow focus on knowledge transfer to teachers and pupils as the main indicator, rather than the broader impact and achievement of its objectives and ACRPC's mission.

Therefore, a re-evaluation of this specific question was initiated, using a different methodology, and particularly aiming to identify and improve on weak areas, rather than to

---

<sup>1</sup> The Interchurch Organisation for Development Co-operation is a Dutch donor which has been supporting ACRPC since 2001 [www.icco.nl](http://www.icco.nl).

<sup>2</sup> Felicia Tibbitts and Zhirayr Edilyan, June – August 2006. Two reports, one of an evaluation of activities and one of a broader stakeholder analysis are available from ACRPC or ICCO.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.acrpc.am/en/advcourse.htm>

only do an objective external assessment. There were clearly some areas of terminology and issues of programme effectiveness that needed more understanding and both ACRPC and ICCO thought it would be useful to work in a participatory way to support the identification of areas for improvement which would result in better understanding and improvement to the programme and the partner relationship between ACRPC and ICCO.

The full terms of reference are attached as annexure A.

### **1.3 Methods**

The methods of the evaluation were chosen to facilitate discussion and understanding among the evaluation team and ACRPC staff and beneficiaries about their work, and to be able to objectively assess the effects and impacts of the training programme on beneficiaries and communities. This involved interviews with key ACRPC staff, individually and collectively, as well as focus group discussions involving drama, quizzes and discussion with beneficiary and non-beneficiary teachers and their pupils. In the same way, facilitated discussions were also held with community leaders in the Lori region, and representative groups of readers of, and contributors to ACRPC publications, journalists and users of the libraries. Interviews were held with several key international organisations working in this field in Armenia, and the graduate and non-graduate teachers were observed in their classrooms.

The use of drama, quizzes and facilitated discussion proved a useful way in exploring the results of the training in the context of real-life situations in the schools and communities where beneficiaries are working and living. The informal approach helped encourage participation in discussions about the challenges to the programme, and the options for how it could be changed and improved. The openness of ACRPC staff and beneficiaries, as well as the participatory methodology used allowed for a rich debate and the development of shared agreements on many of the main findings.

## **2. Findings**

The Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre (ACRPC) is distinct as it enjoys considerable credibility from a range of quarters as an organisation that is sincere about its mission and one which enjoys considerable benefit from a network of supporters. After visiting a range of actors both internally and in cooperating organisations, this evaluation can confirm that the training programmes of ACRPC are effective, both in terms of meeting its objectives and in achieving its mission to contribute to a legal culture in Armenia. The evaluation explored options for improving results and impact through improved programme strategy and methods.

### **2.1 Context and relevance**

The situation in Armenia in terms of lawlessness, failure of rule of law and protection of human rights is critical. From the Presidents office to the local taxi driver corruption is systemic. There is a fair amount of hopelessness among many in Armenia about what can be done, even among many civil society organisations.

As one senior staff member of an international organisation described it:

“In Armenia people are tired and not interested in talking about human rights as they don’t see a difference. Many NGOs struggle to get support and interest of the community. The trust and active support that ACRPC has generated in this situation is a remarkable achievement.”

Social influence and the deep-rooted nature of the problems need to be understood to fully appreciate the reasons why ACRPC, as one of Armenia’s oldest NGOs, has chosen some of the strategies it has.

Firstly, the choice of combining education with information and legal advocacy shows the importance of human rights education as a long-term and comprehensive approach to contributing to a culture of rights. ACRPC recognises that change will take time, but needs to be built brick by brick – teacher by teacher. Teachers and community leaders are trained and encouraged to promote human rights and the rule of law as a long-term strategy. At the same time ACRPC works with other organisations to address policy and law reform.

Secondly, as an NGO ACRPC has the flexibility to work with governmental and non-governmental organisations. ACRPC has used this position well to network and influence key policies in the Department of Education, including the introduction and funding of human rights education teachers in all secondary schools. This has been a considerable achievement and the training and support provided through the Armenian Human Rights School (AHRS) is highly relevant both for the teachers and the need to promote human rights among teachers, pupils and community members at a local level.

Lastly, ACRPC works through networks of committed supporters at a local level, who are interested in promoting change and human rights, and support the universal values promoted through their work. There is a strong commitment to the vision of ACRPC for a more just rule of law and respect for human rights. ACRPC works in an ethical and transparent way and encourages others to do the same.

This evaluation finds that the programmes aimed at teachers, pupils and community leaders are a highly relevant strategy to address needs in a long-term and comprehensive way. This evaluation found that results were being achieved but in an ad hoc way in a number of important ways including:

**Some results achieved to date<sup>4</sup>**

- approximately one quarter of teachers in Armenia have been trained and have increased human rights knowledge and many have shared attitudes to human rights values.
- approximately 150,000 pupils with increased knowledge and awareness and many have pro-rights supporting attitudes.
- human rights clubs and discussion groups have been established in many participating schools.
- awareness of some abuses of human rights in the schools and communities is being raised.
- local human rights campaigns and community groups are being initiated.
- graduates of the programme are going on to hold influential positions.
- relationships between organisations, government, schools, civil society and community leaders is developing.

This evaluation goes on to discuss options for how the effectiveness of the programme can be increased with improvements to the programme strategy, methodologies and multiplier effects aimed at supporting and monitoring the roles of teachers, pupils and communities as actors promoting human rights.

**2.2 Programme analysis**

During the 20 years ACRPC has been promoting a human rights culture in Armenia it has tried and changed its approaches as it has learned new methods and more successful strategies in its work. In 2001 a significant focus on teachers developed as they were seen to be important vehicles to the young generation of pupils who would be open and responsive to human rights standards. Teachers were seen not only as key to impacting on children, but also as key members of the communities where they are based.

This focus on teachers – and providing thorough and systematic training to them over an extensive period of time, can be seen to have paid off with good results. The other main aspect of the training is a much newer activity aimed at community leaders who can in turn raise awareness of human rights and legal responsibilities through their work at a community level.

The four main areas of the programme under review in this re- evaluation are

- a) teachers of legal subjects (and pupils) at secondary schools,
- b) community leaders in the Lori Region,
- c) the human rights libraries, and
- d) ACRPC publications.

Each is discussed below:

**a) The training of teachers**

The training programme with teachers is clearly having an important impact on teachers, pupils and to some extent on their environments and the human rights problems. The training that the teachers undergo has a clear effect not only on their knowledge of human rights standards and how to teach the subject, but it is also a useful lens for the teachers and pupils to use to understand human rights in their context.

---

<sup>4</sup> These are estimates based on impressions from our interviews and more accurate figures can be gathered through ACRPC establishing a post-training follow-up and monitoring system as discussed and recommended later in this report.

A total 360 teachers have been trained in the past six years. This is a mammoth task, which represents about one quarter of all teachers. With an average of 420 pupils per teacher, approximately 150,000 pupils will have benefited, which is approximately 6% of the population.

The teachers and pupils participating had a clearly enhanced ability to articulate human rights problems in their environment. Pupils with teachers who had benefited from the programme were observed to have a clearer perception of their own power and responsibilities to address human rights problems, and had internalised some key rights principles such as fairness and equality leading to a 'can do' attitude and commitment to collaborative and constructive solutions. Compared to those who had not participated in the training programme, both teachers and pupils were seen to "let go of the old ways of seeing things"<sup>5</sup> demonstrating a much more structured and informed structure to their thinking as they sought to solve human rights problems in their everyday lives.

### **Selection**

Selection of teachers among legal subject teachers around the country is thorough, involving a public advertisement, applications and interviews. Even though there is no formal recognition of the qualification provided by the Human Rights School, there is a high-level of interest among teachers as they are drawn to the subject, methodology and high quality of the training.

### **Content**

The content of the training of teachers is made up of human rights standards, relevant Armenian law and teaching methodology. The emphasis is on knowledge rather than the application - As one teacher put it:

"Knowledge is not enough. What is important is being able to make it work"

There is a need to *analyse the context and needs* and provide opportunity for real-life human rights problems and solutions to be brought in to the training and awareness raising process. In other words, human rights education needs to be based on real situations in the school and community to be *real*. This can be done by analysing the most common human rights problems *that the teachers and pupils can do some thing about* and developing themes or key areas and bringing in human rights law and principles to support action to address the problems. Some of the areas raised during this evaluation which could be considered are: your rights and the police, land rights, the right to education, the right to information and participation in the governance of the community, pensioners rights, employment rights, or the rights of the child.

### **Human rights education methodology**

The methodologies used by ACRPC have changed and improved over the years. In the beginning in 1998, lecture methods were used which were found not to be the most effective, and in 2001 the Collaborative Teaching Method (CTM) was adopted as the main methodology. Training is run over one year, consisting of a two month module and two further shorter courses, plus a substantial amount of distance learning.

Previous teaching methods used in Armenian schools are seen to be outdated and ineffective (ie, the so called Common Front teaching doctrine, where one person speaks and two or more people listen). due to this, some part of the listeners get bored and do not participate in the process. For instance, as one already knows what is presented, the other is of another opinion but cannot object as s/he should listen to the presented long topic, another pupil is interested in another topic, the other is tired and would like to rest, etc. The old approach was not

---

<sup>5</sup> This remark made by a teacher was referring to old-school or traditional thinking in terms of human rights issues like the difference rights between men and women, or how to deal with abuses of power for example.

conducive for human rights education and needed to change and ACRPC has been at the front of discussions with the Ministry of Education about the need to adopt more children centred and effective teaching approaches. Partly due to their work, in 2001 the Ministry of Education introduced human rights as a separate subject<sup>6</sup> and has paid salaries of teachers of this subject in nearly every school. This is a remarkable achievement which provides considerable opportunity for human rights education and the sustainability of this work through the school system.

Although on the whole school principles are slow to embrace the Collaborative Teaching Methods (CTM), there are positive signs that the methodology is gaining support among key decision makers associated with the Ministry of Education and may be taught to all teachers in coming years. Given this position of this teaching methodology in ACRPC's programme, and increasingly in Armenian's schools, it is perhaps useful here to provide some explanation and assess the positive and limiting aspects.

### **Collaborative Teaching Methodology**

The Collaborative Teaching Methodology (CTM) used by ACRPC is a collective teaching methodology - the basics of which were developed by Alexander Rivin (1887-1944).

Rivin's background was engineering. He introduced CTM in 1918 and it was used in the 1930s particularly as a strategy to eradicate mass illiteracy in the Soviet Union. The methodology was never accepted in the formal education system, and was only used by a limited number of individuals, mainly Rivin's students and followers. Rivin believed that his methods are very relevant for teaching any subject at a secondary school level. Later on the collective teaching methodology was developed by V. Dyachenko, M. Mkrtchyan and others.

#### **Key Principles**

The methodology is based on strong belief that people learn best when they teach others. There are seven commonly used methods in CTM mostly based on using pair work or group work. Pair learning is the most widely used method. In this way, the teacher divides the classroom into pairs and assigns tasks to work in pairs: together the pair in turn reads both of their paragraphs of the text, learns them, analyses the contents and summarises them putting a heading corresponding to the contents of the paragraphs for each and then the pair splits and each of the learners makes new pair, in which they present the paragraphs entitled by them and then work on a new paragraph in the same way.

CTM also provides opportunities for using standard participatory teaching methods. For example, the "tact method", which is one of the most common CTM methods, is very similar to normal group work methods used in Human Rights Education where the class is divided into small groups. The groups are assigned different tasks (reading, discussing and understanding different parts of the text) and after finalising their tasks, the participants get new groups in the second tact in which everyone teaches all the others in the group the text learned in previous group. Thus all participants learn all texts.

Some positive aspects of CTM are:

- it has an individual approach to the students: each student takes as much time as needed for learning one issue or topic (it can take 1 hour for one student or even 2-3 hours for another). The teacher makes individual learning plans for each student and facilitates the learning processes of the group. All students learn each topic excellently before moving to the next topic. There is no bell to interrupt the lesson,

---

<sup>6</sup> In 2008-2009 the human rights is taught within the framework of "Social Sciences" not as a separate subject. At the same time, "Human Rights" topics are included in the low grade curriculum, which is a new positive development.

the student can take as much time as needed - usually up to 1,5 hours per subject per day. Learners can take breaks when ever they want.

- it is student centered rather than teacher centered;
- it promotes positive learning environment in the classroom;
- it motivates the students to learn.
- development of a sense of responsibility: the participant acts once as a learner and the other time as a teacher.
- development of self-confidence and assertiveness.

Some of the limiting aspects of the way which ACRPC has been using CTM in human rights education are:

- there has been a focus on memorising and understanding texts, and less attention to bringing the experiences and practices of teachers and pupils into the learning process;
- CTM till now was not used by ACRPC for problem solving of real human rights problems in the community or society but mainly for knowledge transfer;
- the method is difficult to apply fully in the standard school lesson format during 45 minutes and the current content of the Human Rights Curriculum from the Department of Education.

Because of the individual planning of each student with the CTM method it is difficult to fully introduce participatory teaching but the addition of participatory exercises and tools will make it a more effective methodology for human rights education. CTM can be improved by introducing real life examples and human rights problems and generate thinking and practical exercises for options for solutions and action.

Through the joining of both CTM and participatory exercises, the best of both approaches can be used for an effective human rights training process.

In spite of their great appreciation for the CTM as a teaching method, teachers need assistance in the classroom to overcome the limitations they have found to implementing. These limitations are that there is too much content in the text book for the short time allocated, and that the Collaborative Teaching Method does not lend itself to the 45 minute standard class time. It is therefore recommended that teachers be assisted to prioritise the content in the text book, and ACRPC develop lesson outlines for teacher, with learning materials and exercises which the teachers can use in the content of the text book and 45 minute lesson time-frame.

The evaluation found that there was a need to develop a clear curriculum for the teachers training programme. The current Programme Description falls short of being able to understand what subjects are covered, and how they are covered on a day-by-day basis. Examples of where other human rights education programmes have used curriculum were discussed and it was agreed that each section or day would require learning objectives, and a break-down of content, methodology and tools would be specified.

As found in the previous evaluation, the distance education aspect of the training was found to be weakest as participating teachers had difficulty finding the time and motivation to study with their work and family responsibilities. ACRPC is aware of this and will be taking steps to either change this aspect of the programme, or provide support to teachers, perhaps through study groups via the human rights libraries (a possibly expanded role of the human rights libraries is discussed in section C below).

In conclusion CTM is a suitable basis for human rights education in schools, but it is not enough. The method needs to be adapted with participatory methods and include lesson

plans for teachers and exercises and accessible materials to support implementation in the classroom.

### **Materials**

For the training of teachers the text book is as basis and other selected documents are chosen on human rights, Armenian law and related subjects. These appear sufficient. This is not the case for the teaching of pupils however, as there is a high demand among teachers for useful teaching and learning materials.

From observation of the classrooms and visiting the human rights libraries it is evident that few human rights teaching materials exist, and where there are materials, they tend to be from international organisations.

The use of materials can catalyze and motivate teachers and pupils in their awareness raising activities. It can also help simplify and lower risk in some cases where human rights are too sensitive to be raised openly. Therefore the choice of subjects need to be very relevant to the needs of the teachers and pupils, and the issues raised in ways that do not increase risk of local activities.

Accessible materials for the teachers and pupils are best subject specific (based on real human rights problems in the schools or communities) and promote simple clear messages in Armenian. Such materials could be designed for teachers to use in their schools, or could involve pupils developing materials for their own use to raise awareness (as we saw in one school where pupils developed human rights messages on paper and card and distributed them among members of their family and community). Materials could include posters which could be used by teachers as teaching aids, or small pamphlets or stickers that could be distributed by students.

### **Developing support within the school**

From discussions with teachers participating in the programme, the need to engage and develop support of school principals was highlighted. This could involve a number of measures to bring them closer to the programme and help them see their role in supporting and promoting the teaching of human rights and activities of teachers and pupils. One suggestion that seemed most appropriate was to invite school principals to the last day (or days) of the training of the teachers, and to get the teachers to present some of their learning and to discuss the roles that principals can play.

When teachers were asked what they need to be effective in their schools and communities the most common response was for after training follow- up and refresher training, and accessible human rights materials which they and pupils could use to promote awareness of human rights.

### **Teachers and pupils as *actors* for human rights awareness**

One of the main findings of the re-evaluation was that teachers and pupils see themselves as human rights promoters and wanted to be supported to take up this role. This evaluation found that they are often very enthusiastic and well positioned to play an important active role in human rights awareness. Pupils were excited to discuss human rights issues and their role in raising awareness and in addressing the issues. For the teachers and pupils involved with the programme, the subject of human rights was important to them as they see the problems around them, and want to make a positive contribution.

As one teacher encouraged:

“In the past teacher have been seen as a resource for ACRPC,  
But actually, ACRPC is a resource for us teachers”.

In its work till now, ACRPC has not seen pupils as an actor in its awareness raising efforts. It's understood that teachers raise awareness with pupils (estimated 420 pupils per teacher). ACRPC could increase its impact in terms of rights awareness by up to four times (x4) through applying multiplier effects by including measures in the programme to support and activate teachers and pupils to take local initiatives to promote human rights in their schools and communities. This could be achieved through post-training follow-up for support and monitoring, accessible materials for teachers and pupils (as discussed above) and encouraging and sharing information between teachers to highlight reward initiative and encourage others. It is suggested that the impact of each teacher in terms of rights awareness could be increased by 4 times as a achievable target to aim for, through activating teachers and pupils to use multiplier effects such as discussion groups, highlighting human rights messages, campaigns, using media or radio, holding parents or public meetings.

### **The need for post-training follow up for support and monitoring**

Teachers overwhelmingly called for more support and visits from ACRPC after training. Such visits (either by training staff or Librarians based regionally – or preferably both) to support the teacher in their awareness raising efforts, and monitor implantation post training. Teachers interviewed most valued encouragement from ACRPC and other teachers through exchange with other teachers, and recognition (in publications or meetings) for their work. There was a suggestion which was widely supported for annual refresher courses, and increase visits and regional presence (which will be subject to ACRPC planning).

ACRPC knows about the effectiveness of its training programme with teachers, but there is no systematic monitoring and evaluation system (M&E). This was partly due to a lack (or prioritisation) of funds and partly due to a lack of capacity and training in M&E.

Previously, ACRPC has put emphasis on providing a high quality training to teachers, and hoping that teachers are able to be effective with their teaching of human rights with their pupils. They received information about how this was taking place from irregular contact with teachers at the Legal Subjects teachers experience exchange conferences held during 2005-07 or ACRPC events. ACRPC staff are aware of the weaknesses in the programme (the distance education part for example) but there was no systematic way of assessing which teachers were effective after training. During the evaluation there was a suggestion to include *monitoring of classroom teaching* as a regular component of ACRPC training course, and certify teachers after assessing their work in the classroom and with their students. ACRPC needs to consider how feasible this would be given limited resources.

During the evaluation options for a post- training follow-up system for support to teachers and monitoring were discussed. This could at minimum involve visits a period after training (six months for example) to assess implementation (what the teacher has done post-training) and provide support and assistance. This should involve key training staff and occasionally the Chairperson/Project Manager to ensure that the lessons learned are fed back into the design of the training and programme strategy. Successes can be highlighted in ACRPC publications to encourage and promote good practice. Draft Teacher Planning and Reporting forms are attached as annexure B and annexure C which can perhaps be useful.

### **b) Community leaders**

Community representatives are drawn from mostly civil society, teachers, business owners, and students; they are trained over 2 days in groups of 18 to 33 per group. Content includes:

- Introduction to human rights
- The Consitution
- Local government laws and standards
- Civil law – main principles and examples.
- Law of Administration
- Freedom of information – the right of citizens to request information

Methods predominantly involve presentations and participatory methods to discuss the relevant law, discuss the situation in the community, and explore what can be done. In this way 520 participants have been trained in small towns across the Lori region since the programme started in 2004.

The training programme is well targeted to the important information selected to provide an introduction and enough information on recent changes to the law to be topical and relevant. Some exercises are used to discuss participant's experiences with how things work really, but this area of the programme can be further developed.

There is a high level of interest in the subjects covered in the training and the ACRPC's input into these mainly community level organisations and interested individuals is an important contribution. Results can be seen to be taken on an individual level as participants implement depending on their situation. In this way, community organisations are trained in the basics of human rights and awareness raising, and campaigning activities have been initiated.

The impact however, can be more wide-spread if measures are taken to support the groups of community leaders to analyse and plan local initiatives. This would involve defining options for post-training activities with participants, and regularly following- up each group to provide support and encouragement for implementation. Accessible materials and 'hands-on' support seemed to be most needed.

The community leaders would welcome support to analyse the human rights situation in their areas and chose realistic activities given the real constraints in their areas. This is an essential aspect of strategy development that is needed if the community leaders are to work collectively and effectively. This aspect – of post-training follow up for support and monitoring again comes in this programme, with the added need for community level strategy development capacity in ACRPC to support action among the community leaders.

During the evaluation, the following steps were identified as potentially useful:

1. Identify human rights issues in the community which can be changed by the group of community leaders.
2. Select information – law and human rights relevant to support the groups activities.
3. Develop strategy for a) raising awareness, and b) talking the problems.
4. Develop accessible materials and follow- up for support and monitoring.

The knowledge of participants – in terms of their correct answers to a test set of questions – is currently being used to test the effectiveness of the training. This is a useful guide – but only to their knowledge, while of key interest to the programme would be the results and impact of participants in terms of raising awareness of human rights, and initiating local responses.

A further area to be strengthened which was discussed in the re-evaluation was the composition of the community leaders which appears to draw heavily on often weak NGOs which have little authority to make change. The selection of participating community leaders could perhaps more strategically include leaders with a broad constituency and/or influence. The working concept of civil society could be broadened to include more of a balance of other community organisations or influential people beyond NGOs and also interested individuals. The suggestion was made to include religious and other community organisations and those with potential broad impact, such as journalists. The precise involvement will depend on group to group depending on the opportunities in each locality.

If ACRPC is to go beyond the training of community leaders – as discussed in this evaluation – to following- up, providing strategy support, it will have to develop new capacities, new staff skills and roles, and it will involve resources. ACRPC should consider if it is a priority for it to develop in this direction, and if it is prepared to make the changes and develop new capacities. If, for whatever reason, the time is not right for such a development, this activity could be left for a while to enable a focus on the training and support to teachers.

### **c) Human Rights Libraries**

A network of six small human rights libraries has been established since 2001. Apart from the library established in 1996 at the Vanadzor ACRPC offices, the rest are in small towns in the regions, giving access to teachers and other professionals and students interested in human rights materials. New books are donated from international organisations (such as the Red Cross, United Nations or the Council of Europe) whereas a small amount are bought by ACRPC. On the whole, there is a steady demand and use of the libraries.

A key question with regard to the role of the libraries was in what way are the libraries contributing to the mission of ACRPC and in what ways could this improve? Are the libraries just a resource, for use by whoever is interested – or can the role of the human rights libraries be developed to *actively* promote awareness of rights? How can the libraries in Vanadzor and around the country play an important link with teachers and human rights issues in the community? Can the role of “Librarian” in these libraries be developed to actively analyse the needs in the community, and identify target groups for outreach and awareness activities? Currently the role of a Council of Readers is envisioned which would meet once in every one or two months. How could this group support such analysis and outreach?

In conclusion the evaluation supported extending the role of the human rights libraries through re-defining the role of the current Librarian position, to support follow- up after training, monitoring and outreach and awareness activities such as thematic workshops on specific human rights areas (such as your rights and the police, land rights, the right to education, pensioners' rights, employment rights or the rights of the child). A Human Rights Library Monitoring Form has been drafted and attached as annexure D which could be used as a basis for monitoring this role.

### **d) Publications**

ACRPC has a proud history of publishing high quality publications on human rights. A diverse range of people are contributing to the writing and publication of various journals, mostly on a voluntary basis. From university professors, to pupils, religious leaders, journalists and activists – there is a clear sense of purpose to provide a lively analysis of human rights issues and promote a legal culture. The way in which such commitment and the participation of a broad range of society, and of how quality and professionalism is maintained consistently - this is a remarkable achievement.

The newspaper *Legal Culture* is published each two weeks since 2005 and enjoys the broadest distribution, compared to the more specialised magazine *For the Sake of Justice* for top professionals which is published 4 times a year since 1989. In addition, the very useful manual called ‘Compass’ on human rights education with young people, has been translated and printed as well a Human Rights Handbook for Teachers, a monograph called *Human Rights Notion*, and several other small books, reports of experience exchange conferences, a series of posters and factsheets which document some of the key human rights campaigns.

Over time - and as ACRPC re-defines its target groups from top professionals, to teachers, to community leaders to pupils – the presentation of the publications may change based on the interests and needs of the target reader. Things which attract younger readers may be explored, including clearer headings, short paragraphs and sentences, and issues which interest a younger reader.

The need to share information between teachers could perhaps be met in one or more of the regular publications. Perhaps space could be made available for teachers and pupils to share information about their local work and share good practice in implementing and promoting human rights in their schools and communities.

### **2.3 Networking**

ACRPC cooperates with a number of legal and human rights organisations involved in specific areas of rights and litigation. Children's rights claims for example are referred to local NGOs, Human Rights Committee, Association of Helsinki Committee and refugee cases referred to UNHCR. This takes place on a 'needs be' basis and in general, there is no established network of organisations involved with human rights education.

There are many organisations involved with human rights education in some way or another but many lack the credibility and professionalism of ACRPC's work. From discussions during the re-evaluation it was clear that ACRPC was well positioned to take up this role of establishing an informal network of civil society and international agencies and donors, and to share information and good practice.

### **2.4 Efficiency and sustainability**

On the whole, the programme appears well and efficiently managed. Although a review of the financial spending was not expected as part of this evaluation, it is clear that ACRPC has been able to achieve a lot with relatively small amounts of funding. This has been possible due to the 'own-income' inputs as ACRPC owns their own building and have a network of volunteers to make inputs at different levels. This enables the potential of broad reach at relatively low costs.

As an Armenian civil society organisation it is challenged by the loss of staff to international organisations or the private sector. This is at times frustrating, but an organisation like ACRPC cannot compete and will need to find other ways to attract and retain staff. This could partly be met through staff training and development which would provide opportunities which the staff would not gain in other sectors. ACRPC's salaries should be in line with other national civil society organisations to enable them to competitively recruit from staff in Yerevan.

To have the best opportunity for a programme to be successful the most suitable position need to be set through job titles and job descriptions, and suitable staff with the skills and qualities need to be deployed in these positions. To this end, ACRPC should consider its current staffing structure, and prioritise those positions which are most important for the implementation of the programme, as discussed above, and review and appoint existing and if necessary new staff to these positions. Particularly important is the position of head of the training department and those that can support programme implementation and follow-up and monitoring. Draft job descriptions are attached as annexure E which can be used as a basis.

The sustainability of ACRPC's work with teachers is supported by the decision of the Department of Education to create positions for human rights teachers and pay their salaries. ACRPC has long-term plans for the Human Rights School and the Byurakn Secondary School which when realised, will offer opportunities for the institutionalisation and sustainability of ACRPC's work.

### **2.5 An issue of terminology**

One of the interesting questions which arose in this evaluation was around the issue of terminology. In other words, what do we mean by the different use of terms. There was a danger found in assuming what is said in project documents and reports is understood in the same way by different actors. It was found that ICCO was using some terms – such as

outcomes/ results and impact, and what was meant by these terms was not understood by ACRPC staff as they had had little training or experience with these concepts.

So too, there was some misunderstanding in some of the terms used by ACRPC – their mission for example is described as 'promoting a legal culture', which can mean different things to people in different countries. This evaluation sought to understand and develop understanding on some of these important issues. To this end, and to clarify - the concept of a legal culture is very close to a human rights culture “where every citizen is aware of their rights and able to defend them”. In short, ACRPC’s mission is a human rights one, with a focus on working with teachers as a vehicle to promote rights in their schools and communities.

## **2.6 The role of ICCO in supporting programme effectiveness**

Through its support for this work ICCO has made an important contribution to human rights awareness in Armenia, and has helped lay the foundation for a significant contribution to be made to a human rights culture through human rights education.

ACRPC has not developed systematic ways of demonstrating results and impact, nor been able to articulate some aspects of the programme partly due to limited funding, and partly due to a lack of training and exposure to good practice. Programme decisions have tended to prioritise the training of new teachers, as this was thought to offer the most value in practice, rather than putting money into additional activities such as monitoring. In the end both are needed, and cost effective and easy to implement solutions to the additional measure will need to be found. Be that as it may, it will likely need additional funding to support new measures, as well as staff training.

The partnership between ICCO and ACRPC is a good one, particularly if the programme details discussed above can be addressed. Both organisations have much to gain from cooperation more on a strategic level, as where a partner like ACRPC achieves its goals, so does ICCO in many ways. ICCO’s role as partner could best be realised though supporting capacity building and sustainability of ACRPC’s work. The roles that ICCO can realistically play, in addition to funding, can be explored, and could include facilitating access to training and good practice among similar organisations and helping ACRPC to access other funding from the European Union and /or the longer-term funders. ACRPC’s work is highly regarded by the international organisations in Armenia, but it has little access to donors outside the country. ACRPC is developing as an institution and ICCO is well positioned to make a contribution in the coming years to realise this.

### **Note:**

A draft Evaluation Response Form is attached as annexure F in case this is useful for planning.

### **3. Summary of main findings and recommendations**

The participatory method used in this re-evaluation of ACRPC's training programmes were chosen to facilitate discussion and understanding among the evaluation team and ACRPC staff and beneficiaries about their work, and to be able to objectively assess the effects and impacts of the training programmes on beneficiaries and communities. The use of non-formal methods such as drama, quizzes and facilitated discussion proved a useful way in exploring the results of the training in the context of real-life situations and encouraged participation in discussions about the challenges to the programme, and the options for how it could be improved.

The Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre (ACRPC) is distinct as it enjoys considerable credibility from a range of quarters, as an organisation that is sincere about its mission and one which enjoys considerable respect from a network of supporters. This evaluation confirms that the training programmes of ACRPC are effective, both in terms of meeting its objectives and of achieving its mission to contribute to a legal culture in Armenia.

#### **Human rights education with teachers**

This focus on teachers – and providing thorough and systematic training to them over an extensive period of time, can be seen to have paid off with good results. The training that the teachers undergo has a clear effect, not only on their knowledge of human rights standards and how to teach the subject, but it is also a useful lens for the teachers and pupils to use to understand human rights in their context. The teachers and pupils participating had a clearly enhanced ability to articulate human rights problems and a more structured approach to discussing solutions.

Selection of teachers among legal subject teachers around the country is thorough, involving a public advertisement, applications and interviews. Even though there is no formal recognition of the qualification provided by the Human Rights School, there is a high level of interest among teachers as they are drawn to the subject, methodology and high quality of the training.

There is a need to *analyse the context and needs* and provide opportunity through participatory methodologies for real-life human rights problems and solutions to be brought into the training and awareness raising process. Some of the areas raised during this re-evaluation which could be considered are: your rights and the police, electoral rights, land rights, the right to education, the right to information and participation in the governance of the community, pensioners' rights, employment rights and the rights of the child.

The Collaborative Teaching Method (CTM) was found to be a suitable basis for human rights education in schools, but it is not enough. The method needs to be adapted with participatory methods and include lesson plans for teachers and exercises and accessible materials to support implementation in the classroom.

There is a high demand among teachers for useful human rights teaching and learning materials. Accessible materials for the teachers and pupils are best subject specific and promote simple clear messages in Armenian and could include posters, small pamphlets or stickers to name a few examples.

The need to develop the support of school principals was highlighted. This could involve a number of measures to bring them closer to the programme and help them see their role in supporting and promoting the teaching of human rights and activities of teachers and pupils.

One of the main findings of the evaluation was that teachers and pupils see themselves as human rights promoters and wanted to be supported to take up this role. ACRPC could increase its impact in terms of rights awareness by up to four times (x4) through applying

multiplier effects by including measures in the programme to support and activate teachers and pupils to take local initiatives to promote human rights in their schools and communities. This could be achieved through post-training follow-up for support and monitoring, accessible materials (as discussed above) and encouraging and sharing information between teachers to highlight reward initiative and encourage others.

There has been no systematic monitoring and evaluation system (M&E) or way of systematically assessing which teachers were effective after training. This was partly due to a lack (or prioritisation) of funds and partly due to a lack of capacity and training in M&E. Options for post-training follow-up systems for support to teachers and monitoring were discussed. There was a suggestion to include *monitoring of classroom teaching* as a regular component of ACRPC training course, and certify teachers after assessing their work in the classroom and with their students. Successes can be highlighted in ACRPC publications to encourage and promote good practice.

### **Community leaders**

This programme is newer, and so, far less effective than the training of teachers, mostly because of the difficulties and lack of support to implement in difficult human rights conditions locally. However, there is a high level of interest in the subjects covered in the training, and the ACRPC's input into these mainly community level organisations and interested individuals is an important contribution.

Results can be seen to be taken on an individual level as participants implement depending on their situation but impact can be more wide-spread if measures are taken to support the groups of community leaders to analyse and plan local initiatives. This would involve defining options for post-training activities with participants, and following-up regularly to each group to provide support and encouragement for implementation. Accessible materials and 'hands-on' support to mobilise community support and develop workable awareness raising strategies seemed to be most needed.

If ACRPC is to go beyond the training of community leaders – as discussed in this evaluation – to following-up, providing strategy support, it will have to develop new capacities, new staff skills and roles, and it will involve resources.

### **Human Rights Libraries**

A network of six small human rights libraries mostly in small towns in the regions, giving access to teachers and other professionals and students interested in human rights materials.

A key question with regard to the role of the libraries was in what way are the libraries contributing to the mission of ACRPC and in what ways could this improve? Can the role of the human rights libraries be developed to *actively* promote awareness of rights? How can the libraries play an important link with teachers and human rights issues in the community? Can the role of "Librarian" in these libraries be developed to actively analyse the needs in the community, and identify target groups for outreach and awareness activities?

In conclusion the evaluation supported extending the role of the libraries through re-defining the role of the current Librarian position, to support follow-up after training, monitoring and outreach and awareness activities such as thematic workshops on specific human rights. Perhaps ACRPC can consider changing the name of the human rights libraries to human right resource centres to highlight the new pro-active role.

### **Networking**

There are many organisations involved with human rights education in some way or another but many lack the credibility and professionalism of ACRPC's work. From discussions during the re-evaluation it was clear that ACRPC was well positioned to take up this role of

establishing an informal network of civil society and international agencies and donors, and to share information and good practice.

### **Efficiency and sustainability**

On the whole, the programme appears well and efficiently managed and it is clear that ACRPC has been able to achieve a lot with relatively small amounts of funding. This has been possible due to the 'own-income' inputs as ACRPC owns their own building and have a network of volunteers to make inputs at different levels. This enables the potential of broad reach at relatively low costs.

As an Armenian civil society organisation it is challenged by the loss of staff to international organisations or the private sector. ACRPC cannot compete and will need to find other ways to attract and retain staff. ACRPC's salaries should be in line with other national civil society organisations to enable them to competitively recruit staff.

ACRPC should consider its current staffing structure, and prioritise those positions which are most important for the implementation of the programme, as discussed above, and review and appoint existing and if necessary new staff to these positions. Particularly important is the position of head of the training department and those that can support programme implementation and follow-up and monitoring.

The sustainability of ACRPC's work with teachers is supported by the decision of the Department of Education to create positions for human rights teacher and to pay their salaries. ACRPC has long-term plans for the Human Rights School and the Byurakn Collaborative Secondary School (CSS) which when realised, will offer opportunities for the institutionalisation and financial sustainability of ACRPC's work.

### **The role of ICCO in supporting programme effectiveness**

Through its support for this work ICCO has made an important contribution to human rights awareness in Armenia and has helped lay the foundation for a significant contribution to be made to a human rights culture through human rights education.

Both ICCO and ACRPC have much to gain from cooperation more on a strategic level. ICCO's role as partner could perhaps best be realised through supporting capacity building and sustainability of ACRPC's work which could include facilitating access to training and good practice among similar organisations and helping ACRPC to access other funding from the European Union and/or the longer-term funders.

Note: During the re-evaluation a number of tools were developed which can be used as a basis for developing ACRPC tools and systems for programme management and monitoring. They are both teacher planning, and report forms for human rights awareness, a draft human rights library report form and draft job descriptions of key positions in the training department.

A draft evaluation response form is also attached to enable ACRPC set out how it will respond to this evaluation.