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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>FSP</td>
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<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENN</td>
<td>Peace Education Network – Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRCE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAp</td>
<td>sector wide approach to programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD</td>
<td>Teacher Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
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<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

From 2007 to 2012, the Ministry of Education (MoE) of the Government of Nepal worked with Save the Children, UNESCO, and UNICEF to revise the national social studies curriculum. The aim was to promote education for peace, human rights, and civic education (PHRCE) in the wake of a 10-year Maoist insurgency and the transition to a democratic republic. Underlying issues that led to the armed conflict included the exclusion of marginalized groups, with high-caste Hindu elites dominating economic, social, and political power, while Dalits, Muslims, indigenous nationalities, and Madhesi along the border with India were marginalized. The centralized education system, including curriculum content, language of instruction, and access and governance issues, constituted a significant source of conflict (Smith, 2013).

Curriculum revision process

A collaborative and systematic curriculum revision process was undertaken in 2007 to integrate PHRCE into the social studies curriculum, supported by UNICEF funding from the Government of the Netherlands. The initiative built on work by UNESCO to introduce policy-makers to peace education through the use of peace education materials endorsed by the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). Prior to the project, Save the Children US, in coordination with the Ministry of Education in Nepal, also piloted peace education trainings for more than 500 teachers using the INEE peace education materials. The key institutional actors, including the Curriculum Development Centre of the MoE, Save the Children, UNESCO, and UNICEF, developed two Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), which outlined the purpose of the collaboration and the role and commitments of the participating partners.

The MoU for the formal education process outlined the goal of the initiative as follows:

In order to create a culture of peace and an understanding of human rights and civic literacy, the education system needs to incorporate learning opportunities in the national curriculum to (i) prepare students with the skills, attitudes, values, and knowledge necessary to understand and assert their rights within the framework of the rule of law; (ii) develop the values of tolerance and commitment to peace and justice; and (iii) build critical thinking, problem solving and conflict resolution skills to function as citizens in a post conflict environment.

Steps in the curriculum revision process for PHRCE in Nepal

- Formalize multi-year, multi-agency agreements between the Ministry of Education and development partners.
- Establish a writing working group and a consultative group, and identify external consultants.
- Map and analyse existing textbooks for PHRCE content to identify gaps.
- Develop a scope and sequence of content, skills, and value learning outcomes for PHRCE.
- Hold curriculum-writing workshops to revise the national curriculum, textbooks (all grades), and associated teacher guides.
- Complete a similar process for non-formal education.
- Conduct teacher-training sessions to introduce the new content.
- Network with NGOs and communities to support and advocate for PHRCE at community and school level.
- Monitor implementation and evaluate scope, quality, and impact.
The Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) targeted the social studies curriculum for integration of these concepts and skills. This process involved revision of the national curriculum, textbooks, and teacher guides. A parallel revision process for non-formal education was implemented with the Non-Formal Education Centre (NFEC) of the MoE. The CDC director and deputy director appointed a curriculum writing working group comprising CDC staff, social studies teachers, and curriculum writers to undertake the work of developing content for the curriculum and adapting textbooks and teachers’ guides with technical support from partners.

A key agreement in the MoU was the establishment of a consultative group. Members were selected from organizations representing Nepal’s diverse and marginalized groups, whose views had not previously been considered. The aim was to ensure that the revised curriculum incorporated their perspectives, thereby addressing an important contributory factor to the recent conflict. The project also developed a scope and sequence matrix to introduce the major themes of PHRCE materials throughout grade levels, based on a mapping and gap analysis of the existing curriculum and informed by international good practices.

**Key findings of assessment and monitoring**

Two assessments were carried out on implementation of the revision process. Save the Children commissioned the first assessment in 2010 and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) commissioned the second in 2014. While the process largely achieved the planned results, the teacher-training and monitoring components did not enable adequate capacity building of teachers to deliver the new content and skills.

Key elements that contributed to the achievement of results include:

- systematic and collaborative process among stakeholders,
- an inclusive process and inclusive curriculum content,
- policy support from the MoE to align integration of PHRCE with the curriculum revision cycle,
- availability of human and financial resources,
- collaborative development of a conceptual framework,
- the use of international consultants and best practice.

Gaps and challenges identified by the assessments and stakeholders who participated in the process include:

- inadequate teacher training and supervision for effective teaching of PHRCE;
- lack of sustained monitoring of delivery of PHRCE;
- inadequate and minimal coverage of PHRCE in classrooms;
- inadequate linking of PHRCE content, teacher behaviour, and school climate;
- lack of institutional memory and coordination in the MoE and schools;
- gaps in content related to marginalized groups;
- lack of financial resources;
- lack of linkage of PHRCE initiative with comprehensive conflict analysis.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations provided in this section aim to improve Nepal’s implementation of PHRCE to ensure quality, sustainability, and impact. They represent a synthesis of suggestions from stakeholder agencies and individuals who participated in implementation of the process. Stakeholders were also asked to provide recommendations for other countries with an interest in implementing peace education. Additional recommendations are drawn from programme and academic literature.
Recommendations to the government of Nepal and development partners:

- Implement a comprehensive, multi-year teacher-training process for PHRCE integrated into the Child Friendly School training module.
- Complete the process of textbook and curriculum revision, amplify existing supplementary materials, and ensure distribution to Education Resource Centres, schools, and classrooms.
- Implement comprehensive, systematic monitoring and evaluation, leading to improvements in the PHRCE component of curriculum and textbooks.
- Collaborate with university research institutions to conduct research and evaluation on the impact of peace, human rights, and civic education over a multi-year period.
- Increase efforts at the policy level to ensure that the concerns of marginalized groups are reflected throughout the policy-making process.

Lessons learned:

- Start with and maintain a high level of government commitment to the reform.
- Implement a collaborative, systematic, and inclusive process between government, development partners (including the United Nations agencies and international non-governmental organizations) and civil society to integrate peace, human rights, and civic education into the curriculum.
- Undertake a conflict assessment to inform education reform to support peacebuilding.
- Ensure conceptual clarity and sequencing throughout the years of schooling in the content, skills, and values included in the reforms.
- Design and implement a comprehensive teacher-training programme, involving teachers at all levels, including pre-service as well as in-service training.
- Include local communities, parents, children, and civil society in the implementation of peace, human rights, and civic education.
Introduction

This case study examines the process undertaken by the Ministry of Education (MoE) in collaboration with development partners to revise the social studies curriculum in Nepal. The aim was to promote education for peace, human rights, and civic education (PHRCE) in the wake of a 10-year Maoist insurgency and the transition to a democratic republic. It provides a critical analysis of the process, synthesizing information from two assessments of the initiative, and makes recommendations for the future based on challenges and gaps identified by stakeholders. The study also provides recommendations to countries in post-conflict transition which are interested in undertaking similar curriculum reform initiatives. Information is drawn from a number of reports and programme documents developed by the implementing partners, as well as 12 interviews with individuals involved in the process of curriculum reform. Interviewees included representatives of the major agencies involved in the revision process: the MoE’s Curriculum Development Centre, the National Centre for Education Development, Save the Children, UNESCO, and UNICEF. In addition, interviews were conducted with representatives of civil society and non-governmental agencies supporting peace education and representing marginalized groups, and the external international consultant who provided technical assistance.
Background

During the 1990s, Nepal was plagued by political instability following an attempt to establish a multi-party democracy within the framework of a constitutional monarchy. Hopes of democratic governance were undermined by the failure of the elected government to address historic, institutionalized discrimination against rural and excluded communities, which make up the majority of the population (Watchlist, 2005). High-caste hill Hindu elites dominated economic, social, and political power, while Dalit, Muslims, indigenous nationalities, ethnic minorities, and Madhesi along the border with India felt marginalized (Novelli and Smith, 2011). The centralized education system, including curriculum content, language of instruction, and access and governance issues, constituted a major source of conflict.

This situation led the Maoist Party to take up arms in 1996 and launch the ‘People’s War’ with the stated goal of overthrowing the monarchy and establishing a republic. Students and teachers were captured and taken to indoctrination camps. Maoists also attempted to alter the curriculum to remove all references to the monarchy, promote Maoist political ideology, and discontinue the teaching of Sanskrit. Ironically, some of the poorest and socially excluded children, who were attending school for the first time, were the most affected by school closures (Smith, 2010). Following the end of the 10-year Maoist insurgency in 2006, marked by the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, a subsequent popular uprising and referendum abolished the 240-year-old monarchy. An interim constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal was established in 2008. However, the federal structure remains unstable with frequent changes in government, delays to the finalization of a permanent constitution, and unrest in the Terai region along the Indian border (UNICEF, 2012).

Prior to 1951 Nepal had no system of public education. Increased funding from the national budget and donor support have since enabled education to spread to all regions. However, the education system is plagued by politicization of school governance at district and local levels, which has sometimes resulted in lack of teacher discipline, problems of financial management, and continued discrimination against marginalized groups (UNICEF, 2011b). The net enrolment rate for children from primary through secondary schools has increased progressively, from 59.1 per cent in 2006 to 70.1 per cent in 2010, increasing access to education by 11 percentage points and girls’ enrolment by 12 percentage points (UNICEF, 2011b). However, 22 per cent of children are not enrolled in primary school, many of whom come from disadvantaged groups or live in districts with low access to education.

The quality of the public education system is also a concern. In 2011, only 45 per cent of grade 10 students from public and community schools passed the School Leaving Certificate (UNICEF, 2012). However, government allocations to education increased by an average of 20.7 per cent per year, rising from 17.7 billion Nepalese rupees in 2004/2005 to an estimated 38.3 billion in 2008/09 (UNICEF, 2011b). Furthermore, the School Sector Reform Plan prioritized equitable access for all children through education policies that advance child-friendly methodologies. In December 2010, the Ministry of Education (MoE) approved the National Child-Friendly Education Framework for Quality Education (UNICEF, 2011b).

As the country began the transition to a republic, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) underlined the need to introduce ‘human rights-based education ... in the education system and at the community level’, and emphasized its inclusion in the results matrix for the Nepal Country Programme (Smith, 2013). Along with its development partners Save the Children, UNESCO, and UNICEF, MoE acknowledged the need for a systemic response to provide education for peace, democracy, and
human rights for a post-conflict environment (Smith, 2013). To this end, in 2006, UNESCO committed limited funding to promote education content and pedagogy through a series of workshops targeting development partners, civil society, and government. In 2007, the UNICEF Nepal Country Office built on this initiative, allocating extensive human and financial resources to support the process through funding from the Government of the Netherlands. The principal stakeholders were MoE and its relevant agencies, the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC), the Non-Formal Education Centre (NFEC), and the National Centre for Educational Development (NCED) whose mandate includes teacher training to implement education reforms for education for peace, democratic governance, and human rights during the transition to a multi-party democracy. These reforms were planned over a five-year period to coincide with the CDC curriculum reform process, and involved revision of formal and non-formal curricula, textbooks, and teacher training.
2. Development of the curriculum revision initiative

This section provides information about the different rationales the participating agencies brought to the development of peace education. It examines the different definitions of peace education involved and the nature of the cooperation effort agreed between the government agencies and development partners in order to undertake this multi-year effort.

2.1 Rationales for the initiative

In addition to the UNDAF mandate for 'human rights-based education', the government of Nepal, its development partners, and civil society organizations had a range of reasons for supporting and participating in the peace education curriculum reform process. At the outset the process lacked a uniform concept of peace education, with each agency providing its own definition, as well as having its own motivation for supporting the exercise. Subsequent collaboration on curriculum development enabled the participants to develop a joint conception of the content, skills, and values, which thereafter served as the basis for curriculum and textbook revision.

According to the project leader at the MoE CDC, the right to education was violated during and after the insurgency, with multiple human rights violations committed against children. It was therefore incumbent on the government to supply children with peace, human rights, and civic education (PHRCE) to provide them with the information, capacity and skills to minimize future conflict and collaborate and advocate for their own rights. Furthermore, Nepal is partner to several international human rights instruments and has a duty to deliver on its commitments at the level of policies, programmes, and practices (A. Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014).

In 2006–2007 UNESCO led an effort to introduce peace education through sponsored training workshops using materials developed by the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and endorsed by the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). The workshops targeted MoE officials, development partners, and NGOs, and highlighted the need to overcome social inequities and ethnic and geographic discrimination in Nepali society, which were reinforced by the education system. UNESCO's efforts were motivated by its global mandate to support education for all and peace, civic, and human rights education (T. Pant, pers. comm., 25 March 2014). The Organization defines peace education in the following way:

Education for non-violence and peace includes training, skills and information directed towards cultivating a culture of peace based on human rights principles. This education not only provides knowledge about a culture of peace, but also imparts the skills and attitudes necessary to defuse and recognize potential conflicts, and those needed to actively promote and establish a culture of peace and non-violence (UNESCO, 2008).

UNESCO also worked with NCED, the training arm of MoE, to develop a teacher-training manual for primary level education (T. Pant, pers. comm., 25 March 2014).

While these efforts were underway, the UNICEF Nepal Country Office took a decision to prioritize peace education as part of a larger initiative funded by the Government of the Netherlands Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT) programme. The effort fell under Designated Goal 3 of the EEPCT programme: ‘Increased education-sector contribution to better

---

1. This four-year US$201 million global programme funded a number of emergency-affected countries with the objective of rebuilding education systems in the wake of conflicts and natural disasters, and implementing policies to prevent or prepare for future emergencies.
Prediction, Prevention, and Preparedness for emergencies caused by natural disaster and conflict. A significant portion of the funds was allocated to support the government of Nepal in implementing peace education. UNICEF Nepal defines peace education as teaching ‘knowledge, skills, and values that promote peaceful conflict resolution, civic literacy, respect for human rights, an understanding of good governance, and respect for diversity’ (UNICEF, 2007). For UNICEF, the entry of PHRCE education into the national curriculum and the development of teacher-training packages was a means for the education system to disseminate peacebuilding messages imparting human rights information and values to children from an early age. This intensifies the peacebuilding process by promoting a culture of peace and respect for human rights. Inclusive and broad participation from civil society as well as diverse and marginalized communities in the curricular interventions has established peace education as the most effective post-conflict peacebuilding scheme through education in Nepal (UNICEF, 2011b).

UNICEF staff agreed with the UNESCO analysis that education had functioned as a divisive and underlying cause of conflict in Nepal society (T. Pant, pers. comm., 25 March 2014). According to a UNICEF education specialist, the social studies curriculum had failed to address human rights violations associated with the traditional caste system or to promote participation in democratic citizenship, civil rights, or an appreciation for diversity. Two kinds of education existed in Nepal: quality education for those who could afford it and lower quality for those who could not. Recognition of this divide underlined the urgent need for inclusive education, both in policy and practice, and the integration of the above values into the curriculum (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014).

Save the Children was an important development partner in the process and was motivated by its belief in the importance of challenging existing hegemonic, institutional, educational structures in Nepal. Save the Children believed that integrating PHRCE into the curriculum as part of quality education was essential to reforming the education system. While many similar initiatives have been project based, producing only short-term results, Save the Children maintained that PHRCE should be an integral part of quality education (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014).

Several of the NGOs representing marginalized groups which participated in the curriculum revision process highlighted the importance of child rights advocacy as a rationale for peace education. They advocated the teaching of human and child rights in the national curriculum with a view to teaching children their rights as well as their responsibilities, and the skills to advocate for them, especially if they are victims of rights violations (A. Siwakoti, pers. comm., 17 March 2014).

2.2 The collaborative process and Memorandum of Understanding

A collaborative and systematic process of curriculum revision was undertaken in 2007 to integrate PHRCE into the social studies curriculum, supported by UNICEF funding from the Government of the Netherlands. The key institutional actors — the CDC, Save the Children, UNESCO, and UNICEF — developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which outlined the purpose of the collaboration and the role and commitments of the partners.

The MoU for the formal education process outlined the goal of the initiative as follows:

In order to create a culture of peace and an understanding of human rights and civic literacy, the education system needs to incorporate learning opportunities in the national curriculum to (i) prepare students with the skills, attitudes, values, and knowledge necessary to understand and assert their rights within the framework of

2. Child Watabaran Centre Nepal is among the NGOs that advocated teaching children’s rights.
the rule of law; (ii) develop the values of tolerance and commitment to peace and justice; and (iii) build critical thinking, problem solving, and conflict resolution skills to function as citizens in a post conflict environment.

The MoU identified the following outcomes of the collaborative process:

- Analysis of the existing national curriculum for Grades 1–10 for peace, human rights, and civic education content and preparation of desired learning outcomes for all grade levels.
- Development of teaching activities in peace, human rights, and civic education for Grade 3–4 teachers’ guides.
- Field-testing of materials for Grades 3–10.

The CDC determined that the most practical approach was to integrate these concepts and skills into the social studies curriculum. This process involved the revision of the national curriculum, textbooks, and teacher guides. A parallel revision process for non-formal education was implemented with the NFEC of the MoE (see Section 3.5 for a brief discussion).

The commitments of each signatory to the MoU were presented in detail, with all partners committing to participation in a working group. UNICEF earmarked funding for PHRCE in its annual budget with commitments to support all aspects of the initiative, to the extent possible, through a US$20,000 grant to the CDC. This covered funding for fact-finding visits for MoE staff, nominal fees for curriculum writers, and funding for civil society participation, external consultants, workshops, and a resource library for the CDC. Save the Children provided transport costs for the curriculum writers. UNICEF devoted about one-third of the time of a staff member toward this effort for a period of 16 months from 2007 to 2008, and then contracted with Save the Children for a staff member to manage the process part time through 2010. UNICEF continued to commit funds for the process from Government of the Netherlands EEPCT funding, with support from April 2010 to March 2011 for teacher training, curriculum revision expenses, and technical assistance amounting to US$82,000.

The CDC committed to forming a group tasked with revising the social studies curriculum, including teacher guides and textbooks, as part of the regular revision cycle projected over a five-year period (2007–2012). This involved obtaining the necessary approvals from the MoE, which continued to support the process despite changes in government. Save the Children earmarked funding to assist with curriculum revision for Grades 3–5 and committed to providing technical support to field-test the materials. UNESCO committed to continued participation and provision of technical assistance, to the extent possible, but funding beyond the initial amount provided for workshops in 2006–2007 was not available.

From 2009 to 2010, UNICEF contracted with Save the Children to provide for overall project management, including organization of workshops for curriculum development and writing, and capacity-building workshops for CDC, NCED, and NFEC staff, and members of the national consultative group (UNICEF, 2011b).

The collaborative process involved MoE agencies and strong commitment and support on the part of Save the Children and UNICEF. It enabled the partners to jointly identify content, collaborate on the writing of materials, and review and approve draft lesson plans and content for textbooks produced by the writers’ groups (Thapa et al., 2010).
3. Implementation

This section provides a description of the process implemented by stakeholders during 2007–2012 to integrate PHRCE into formal and non-formal curriculum. The information is based on programmatic documents and interviews with participants from the key agencies involved. A critical analysis of the process is provided in Section 4.

3.1 Writing working group, consultative group, and external consultants

The CDC director and deputy director appointed a curriculum writing working group comprised of CDC staff, social studies teachers, and curriculum writers to undertake the work of developing the content of the curriculum and adapting textbooks and teachers’ guides with technical support from partners.

A key agreement in the MoU was the establishment of a consultative group whose members were selected from organizations reflecting Nepal’s diverse and marginalized groups: Dalits, indigenous women, Madhesi, and human rights and child rights advocates from ethnic minorities. The formal involvement of these groups aimed to ensure broad and inclusive participation from civil society at each step of the process and to secure the perspectives and contributions of groups not previously consulted in curriculum writing, thereby addressing one of the main contributory factors to the conflict.

The role of the consultative group was to:

- Participate in ongoing workshops and provide stories, case studies, and cultural, ethnic, and linguistic perspectives for incorporation into the revised teaching materials and textbooks. Textbook writers do not normally have access to stories and ‘insider’ cultural information relating to such groups, which makes it difficult to write engagingly about their culture and situation.
- Review the materials written by the working group to ensure that the products of the work accurately reflect the diverse perspectives and experiences of their constituencies (Smith, 2013).

Another key provision of the MoU was the agreement to use external consultants with significant international experience in developing similar curricula in other countries. UNICEF contracted with a peace/human rights education INGO, Street Law, Inc., to provide multi-year technical assistance to ensure quality control and exposure to global good practices in peace, human rights, and civic education content and methodology. The involvement of this INGO lasted from 2007 to 2009, and included participation in three curriculum-writing workshops and technical assistance for the development and review of lessons and teacher-training materials.

UNICEF also committed to fund a fact-finding visit abroad for MoE officials to observe exemplary programmes in peace, human rights, and civic education. The Institute of Human Rights Education (IHRE) in Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India, was selected for the visit, as it provided examples of curriculum materials and approaches best suited to Nepali culture and context. The IHRE had developed and implemented materials in 19 states in India, which focused on improving understanding of human rights, appreciation of differences, caste discrimination, age-appropriate stories of rights violations, and methods of civic participation for redress of grievances. A delegation from MoE and the CDC visited Madurai in 2008 and met with curriculum writers, teachers, and students to gain insights on ways to incorporate similar approaches to the curriculum-writing process in Nepal (Smith, 2013).
3.2 Mapping and analysis of the existing curriculum

An academic expert in human rights and civic education was commissioned to analyse the formal curriculum from Grades 1–10 in order to assess the current content, skills, and attitudes with respect to peace, human rights, and civic education, and to identify gaps. The analysis was presented at the introductory workshop in 2007, and enabled the development of a scope and sequence matrix of PHRCE knowledge, skills, and attitudes at all grade levels. A second analysis of the non-formal curriculum was performed in 2009, which formed the basis for the revision of non-formal education. In addition, the external consultants supplied a recommended scope and sequence matrix based on good practice in a number of other countries in post-conflict contexts, which the writing group adapted (Smith, 2013).

3.3 Curriculum-writing workshops

A series of workshops were held to build consensus and clarity around the content, skills, and learning objectives in the three conceptual areas – peace, human rights, and civic education – sequenced from Grades 1–10 (Koirala, Poudel, and Khadka, 2010). Workshop participants included staff of the CDC and its writers group, NCED staff, representatives from Save the Children, UNESCO, and UNICEF, and the consultative group representing marginalized groups. External resource people from a Philippines peace education programme3 and the Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Centre participated in the first workshop to provide examples of curriculum development and materials. The external international consultant participated in workshops during 2007–2009 to introduce good practices in PHRCE from other countries, both in content and teaching methodology. Additional expertise was sought from national peace education experts from Tribhuvan University in Kathmandu and Save the Children Sweden’s Regional Office. A workshop held in July 2009 brought together relevant MoE agencies, including the CDC, NFEC, and NCED, to ensure collaboration and consistency across the formal and non-formal curriculum and teacher-training materials. This workshop also produced a collaborative roadmap for completion of the revision process designed for all MoE bodies (Dhungana, 2009).

3.4 Integration of content and skills into the curriculum and textbooks

One result of the workshops was a scope and sequence matrix for the integration of key PHRCE themes and materials into different grade levels. For example, themes such as fairness, trust, mutual respect, children’s rights, women’s rights, the identities of others, and the practice of rights and duties were introduced in Grades 4 and 5. More complex themes such as democracy, civic rights, and conflict management were introduced in Grades 9 and 10 (UNICEF, 2011b). Table 1 summarizes the content and skills of the scope and sequence matrix created by the writers group (CDC, 2007).

---

3. Ofelia Durante, the director of the Ateneo de Zamboanga University Research Centre, Philippines, introduced peace education programme approaches.
Table 1. Major concepts, skills, and attitudes in PHRCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace education</th>
<th>Human rights education</th>
<th>Civic education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Peace and conflict</td>
<td>• Children’s rights and responsibilities</td>
<td>• Celebrating diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Causes of conflict</td>
<td>• Child protection</td>
<td>• Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing emotions</td>
<td>• Child participation</td>
<td>• Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem solving</td>
<td>• Human rights: civil, social, economic, political, cultural</td>
<td>• Democratic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dialogue</td>
<td>• Violations of rights</td>
<td>• Good governance, accountability, transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding points of view</td>
<td>• Discrimination by caste, sex, religion, ethnicity, economic status</td>
<td>• Rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reconciliation</td>
<td>• Redress of grievances</td>
<td>• Constitutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mediation</td>
<td>• International rights and conventions</td>
<td>• Separation of powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assertive communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role of children in peacebuilding</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion and exclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Members of the consultative group comprising representatives from marginalized groups, including Dalits, women, and indigenous nationalities (called Janajatis), supplied case studies to illustrate human rights issues, reviewed the lessons provided by the writers group, and provided continuous input throughout the entire revision process. During the lesson-writing phase, Save the Children translated selected lessons into English and sent them to the international consultants for feedback on content and methodology (J. Zimmer, pers. comm., 6 March 2014).

3.5 Integration of PHRCE into non-formal education

The NFEC of the MoE worked in collaboration with the CDC to revise curricula and other materials, with a view to incorporating PHRCE into two of its programmes that follow an accelerated version of the formal curriculum: the Flexible Schooling Programme and the Open Schooling Programme. Revisions were also made to materials for two independent non-formal education programmes – the Adult Literacy Programme and the Women’s Literacy Programme – with a view to integrating PHRCE themes, content, and skills (Smith, 2013). The NFEC developed a training package for non-formal education facilitators, which was piloted in five districts with more than 200 facilitators, most of whom were women. In addition, self-learning materials on PHRCE were developed for new readers and a PHRCE brochure was distributed to 1,000 community learning centres (UNICEF, 2011b).

3.6 Teacher training

Teacher training was not covered in the first MoU. Accordingly, in 2009 a new MoU was agreed between NCED (the agency responsible for teacher development and training), Save the Children, and UNICEF, to establish and define the collaborative framework and activities for the inclusion of PHRCE into teacher-training curricula and materials. The MoU also outlined a plan to provide training of trainers, piloting, and implementation in the formal education system of Nepal (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014).

UNICEF provided financial and technical support and Save the Children managed coordination and technical assistance. A set of teacher competencies was developed corresponding to the themes and content of the revised social studies curriculum. Training manuals and resource materials were produced for primary and secondary levels incorporating PHRCE content, as well as materials on innovative delivery strategies and methods for creating child-friendly, safe, and protective environments. A 10-day PHRCE teacher development module was piloted in two regions in accordance with the teachers’ professional development programme established by the School Sector Reform Plan.
With UNICEF support, NCED then began to roll out PHRCE training for 500 teachers in 20 districts in response to requests from teachers (UNICEF, 2011b).

Following on from these teacher-training efforts, NCED developed a new demand-based delivery system called Teacher Professional Development (TPD). The system requires a demonstration of sufficient interest in PHRCE training before NCED responds to a request via its training centres. The only other way to organize PHRCE teacher training is through targeted training sessions sponsored by either UNICEF or another development partner. This system incorporates a sustainable, long-term strategy for continuous teacher preparation in terms of both content and PHRCE methodology (see Section 4.3) (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014).

In addition, MoE has endorsed teacher training in the children-friendly school (CFS) approach for mainstreaming in every district in Nepal, with the support of UNICEF. At least two trainers have been trained in this methodology, with teacher resource material and student learning materials produced and disseminated. Moreover, the current head of NCED suggests that this training indirectly assists teachers in learning methodologies and classroom practices that support PHRCE. NCED concedes, however, that resource centres charged with teacher training are unable to provide dedicated PHRCE training due to funding limitations and other responsibilities. Staff from UNICEF have suggested that one strategy to promote dissemination could be to insert PHRCE directly into the CFS training manual, currently under development (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014). Additional discussion of teacher-training issues is provided in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.

3.7 Networking and advocacy

Advocacy for the new curriculum revisions was not built into the process and the government did not take a lead in promoting awareness of the new content and skills. Nevertheless, NGOs and civil society have played a role in promoting awareness of PHRCE, through NGO partnerships and the formation of the Peace Education Network – Nepal (PENN), which has worked at the community level to broaden awareness of PHRCE (Shrestha and Sharma, pers. comm., 21 March 2014). In 2010, PENN organized a seminar that brought together hundreds of children and teachers to share and discuss peace education messages (UNICEF, 2011b). By mobilizing internal resources, PENN has continued to organize teacher-training and awareness programmes on a smaller scale.

3.8 Monitoring and evaluation

In 2010, Save the Children commissioned an assessment of the curriculum reforms (Koirala, Poudel, and Khadka, 2010). The purpose was to monitor how and to what extent the new curriculum content was being taught in classrooms, to determine to what extent the revised teacher guides are being used throughout the country, and to analyse initial reception and feedback regarding the revised content for Grades 3–5.

A team of three educators, led by the former head of CDC, reviewed the materials produced and consulted with personnel from CDC, NCED, and NFEC. They undertook site visits to schools in four districts (Chitwan, Kathmandu, Lalitpur, and Kavre) to observe classroom delivery of the new materials, and interviewed district education office (DEO) personnel, resource persons, schoolteachers, head teachers, and members of school management committees (Koirala et al., 2010). To date, neither the government nor the development partners have conducted another monitoring and evaluation assessment of the initiative. Section 4 summarizes the results of this assessment.
4. Analysis of the effectiveness of the reforms

A regional consultation on peace education took place in Kathmandu in 2010 with representatives from four conflict-affected South Asian countries: Afghanistan, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. The participants agreed on a number of elements of good practice for effective peace education curricular reform, based on their country experiences. The identified elements were: (i) systematic and collaborative implementation by agencies and government; (ii) conceptual clarity about peace education including content, skills, and values; (iii) review of content from a conflict perspective; (iv) an inclusive and participatory curriculum development process; (v) teacher education; and (vi) parent and community involvement (Thapa et al., 2010).

The regional consultation also identified a number of challenges to implementation of PHRCE including: (i) weak coordination among different stakeholders; (ii) unclear goals and objectives; (iii) non-replicable methodologies; (iv) inappropriate curricula unadapted to country contexts and needs; (v) limited participation of vulnerable groups; (vi) inadequate formal recognition by government; and (vii) use of traditional learning methods that hinder cooperative learning and child participation.

These good practice elements and challenges serve as points of reference in the following analysis of the Nepal experience, along with stakeholder interviews and the results of the two assessments.

4.1 Key findings

The documents and activities resulting from the collaborative efforts of stakeholders are presented in Table 2 (Thapa et al., 2010; Ananda Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). UNICEF provided financial support and Save the Children provided coordination through a separate contract with UNICEF, which ran up to 2010.

Table 2. Results of the revision process to integrate PHRCE into the social studies curriculum and textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents completed for the revision process (2007–2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Grades 1–10: PHRCE curriculum foundation framework, objectives, learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grades 1–2: Teacher activity book on peace education piloted in three districts by UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grades 3–5: Curriculum revision, textbook revision, and teacher guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grades 6–8: Curriculum revision, textbook revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grades 9–10: Teacher guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum revision incorporating PHRCE into non-formal education through teacher materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of training package on non-violent teaching for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manual for teachers for five-day training in PHRCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of support materials for teachers and students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Training of 150 master trainers on non-violent teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completion of initial impact study on peace curricular intervention in schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Grade 7–8 textbooks and Grade 9–10 curriculum and textbooks^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, Kathmandu, plans to support the integration of PHRCE into the curriculum in cooperation with MoE and CDC by the end of 2016 (Rajkumar Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014).
**Findings of the Save the Children assessment report**

A 2010 assessment report commissioned by Save the Children found the following implementation issues:

- **Insufficient use of learner-focused teaching methodologies and contextualization.** At the implementation level, trainers, teachers, and facilitators delivered the PHRCE content using traditional, teacher-focused methodologies rather than learner-focused, participatory, and contextually appropriate methodologies. The team found that students understood the definitions of peace, civic education, and human rights, but not their applications to real-life examples from family, community, contemporary issues, or current political and social contexts. Moreover, while the teachers observed and interviewed were aware of learner-focused methodologies, they did not make use of them to teach PHRCE.

- **Time limitations on coverage of PHRCE content.** The team found that teachers were worried about completing lessons within a stipulated period of time, and consequently did not deliver the content in a timeframe or manner sufficient for student understanding.

- **Teacher reassignment.** The review noted that frequent reassignment of teachers to different schools, subjects, and districts, resulted in a disconnect between teachers trained to deliver PHRCE and those actually assigned to teach it.

- **Lack of collegial teacher interaction.** The absence of any degree of collegial teacher interaction around teaching the new content deterred teachers from attempting appropriate PHRCE methodologies.

The report made a number of suggestions to overcome deficiencies in delivery of PHRCE:

(i) continue funding from development partners to strengthen and improve teacher training in PHRCE;

(ii) prepare students to learn through interactive, learner-focused methodologies;

(iii) create a culture of collegial learning among teachers to promote continuous improvements in delivery of PHRCE.

**Findings of the UNDP assessment**

In 2014, UNDP undertook an independent assessment of PHRCE implementation, motivated by an interest in expanding work on reconciliation and reintegration of youth involved in armed groups. The objective was to map existing peace education initiatives and examine their integration into formal education, curricula, and textbooks since 2010, prior to launching new programmatic interventions (P. Bhatta, pers. comm., 25 March 2014).

A team of researchers from UNDP’s Peace and Recovery Unit visited six districts in four regions of the country: the Far West, the East, the Terai, and the Western hills. The researchers interviewed stakeholders involved in implementation of the PHRCE in 26 schools in these areas, including district education officers, staff at education training centres, teachers, and NGOs involved at local levels. The following findings are based on interviews:

- **Insufficient content provided to students for lessons and exercises.** The research found that teachers perceived the core content of PHRCE lessons to be inadequate, despite recognizing significant new material on peace, diversity, inclusion, child rights, human rights, and the constitution. Teachers noted that the lessons, exercises, projects, and community work all ask questions not covered in the content. Therefore, additional materials are needed for both teachers and students to enhance knowledge of the topics.

- **As an example, a lesson on peace aims to create a dialogue between students and a character called ‘Peace’, but the content of the lesson is not contextualized to address relevant political issues in Nepal. Other material on the teaching of peace deals with student conflict, fighting, and mediation processes used in conflict...**
management. The researchers suggested that this material should make broader linkages to Nepali society and conflict. They also cited an example in Grade 6–7 textbooks, where quotes from the Constitution are given without further explanation. Another exercise asks students to read the Constitution and explain how they would exercise their rights. However, no copies of the Constitution are readily available at school level to complete the exercise.

- **Poorly constructed lessons, shortcomings of scope, and sequencing of content.** The researchers found poorly constructed lessons without case studies and other methodologies to engage students. Despite the attention given by the CDC to developing a systematic scope and sequence matrix of content and skills, the UNDP review was critical of a lack of proper scope and sequence with appropriate exercises and materials. The review found a lack of sequencing concepts from simple to more complex. The assessment also noted that the lack of exercises and materials resulted in part from CDC limitations on textbook size, which cannot exceed 200 pages.

- **Inadequate teacher training and resources.** While PHRCE is integrated into social studies teacher training in a general way, explicit methods for teaching human rights and civic participation are absent. Rather, the current training focuses on teacher behaviour in the classroom and respect for students, which while related to child friendly methodology, does not constitute PHRCE methodology. Finally, UNESCO developed resource packets for teaching PHRCE, but these were not available at the regional resource centres and the materials had not been reprinted.

4.2 Elements contributing to the achievement of goals

Despite the inadequacies identified in the assessments, the stakeholders and assessments identified a number of elements that contributed to the success of the initiative. Most of these are consistent with the good practice guidelines developed at the regional consultation.

**Systematic collaborative process among stakeholders**

The stakeholders agreed that mutual collaboration had proven effective in achieving the goals defined in the 2007 MoU. The MoE cited the experience of working with development partners through sector wide approaches to programming (SWApS) already instituted in Nepal, as a precursor to the PHRCE collaboration. In addition to the MoU, UNICEF and Save the Children signed an agreement in which the former contracted with the latter to provide staff to assist with the coordination and management of workshops and curriculum revision. In the view of UNICEF, this arrangement strengthened the collaborative process over a multi-year period (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014).

**Inclusive process and inclusive curriculum content**

The inclusion of representatives from marginalized groups and civil society in the writing and review process ensured that the content incorporated a broader array of perspectives and addressed aspects of education policy and society that contributed to the conflict in Nepal. In addition, UNICEF noted that inclusive and broad participation in the PHRCE integration process made it the most effective education-related peacebuilding scheme in Nepal (UNICEF, 2010). According to the head of the Dalit Welfare Association, who acted as a member of the consultative group and provided content input throughout the revision process, this constituted the first time his organization had had a voice in such a forum. Other groups, including a feminist Dalit organization and an umbrella organization for marginalized ethnic groups, also participated in the consultative advisory group. According to the international consultants who provided expertise during the first two

---

5. In interviews with representatives from all participating agencies, collaboration was key to the success of the initiative. See Annex 2 for a list of interviewees.
years, the consultative group added a measure of realism to the new content by providing examples of human rights violations from legal and personal perspectives (J. Zimmer, pers. comm., 6 March 2014). A case study of education and peacebuilding in Nepal, prepared as part of the EEPCT initiative, noted that the revision of curriculum and textbooks was undertaken to take account of changing social norms since the end of the monarchy in 2006, including the notion of a ‘Hindu kingdom’, given the diversity of the population and the presence of non-Hindus outside the caste system. The case study concluded that the ‘introduction of peace education material into the curriculum is less important that the overhaul of the curriculum for inclusiveness and non-discrimination’ (Novelli and Smith, 2011: 23; UNICEF, 2011a).

**Policy support from the Ministry of Education to align the integration of PHRCE with the curriculum revision cycle**

According to the former director of the CDC, MoE technocrats played a crucial role by drafting national policies that enabled the CDC to align integration of PHRCE into textbooks, curricula, and teacher guides with the five-year curriculum revision cycle. Policy support involved the whole system and relevant stakeholders. The well-timed mandate for PHRCE, coupled with the availability of incentives for writers and officials, played a crucial role in accomplishing the integration process (A. Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). Grade 3–6 textbooks and Grade 6–8 curricula were revised during 2007–2012. Following the Peace Agreement, the former CDC director expressed concern that the fragility of the government and possible changes in MoE leadership could undermine the entire revision process. However, while changes in political leadership did result in a new ruling party during the implementation period, they did not interfere with the revision process and the MoU, and commitments of stakeholders were upheld (Smith, 2013).

**Availability of human and financial resources**

Provision of multi-year funding from UNICEF to support key aspects of the process (e.g. dedicated staff to assist with project management, payment to writers and the consultative group, and support for introductory and writing workshops) was crucial to achieving results. Funding from UNESCO and Save the Children in the initial stages also provided momentum to the initiative. According to Save the Children, the availability of resources was instrumental to giving the project legitimacy. The involvement of multiple actors and key agreements allowed the development partners to support the government and encouraged them to build their own capacity and engage with other actors.

**Collaborative development of conceptual framework**

A key element of PHRCE was conceptual clarity regarding the content, skills, and values to be taught at each grade level. While the stakeholders held different perspectives at the onset of the process regarding the definition of peace education and the types of skills and concepts to be included, they worked collaboratively to develop a coherent conceptual framework (Koirala, Poudel, and Khadka, 2010). One participant from a children’s rights NGO commented that content focusing on unity in diversity, and marginalization and discrimination as violations of children’s rights, was particularly strong throughout the scope and sequence (A. Siwakoti, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). In spite of this, one international consultant working with the writers noted a lack of holistic understanding of the entire curriculum, regardless of the design of the scope and sequence (J. Zimmer, pers. comm., 6 March 2014). This suggests that work undertaken to establish a clear understanding among stakeholders of the conceptual PHRCE framework may have been insufficient.

**Use of international consultants and good practice**

The two-year participation of the INGO Street Law, Inc. was designed to introduce good practice into PHRCE content and methodology during workshops and writing sessions. Most stakeholders found the demonstration lessons and feedback and guidance during the lesson development process to be very helpful. Furthermore, use of an international
consultant helped ensure that the work of national stakeholders matched international standards (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014). From the perspective of the international consultant, teaching methodologies in Nepal were not sufficiently interactive and participatory, and it was necessary to present good practices in teaching PHRCE from other countries. During workshop debriefings, the consultant focused on making curriculum writers comfortable with new methods and content (J. Zimmer, pers. comm., 6 March 2014).

4.3 Gaps and challenges

There is wide agreement among stakeholders about important gaps in the PHRCE process. Frequently cited examples are inadequate teacher training and lack of a monitoring and feedback process, including classroom monitoring, teacher feedback, and further revision of textbooks and teacher guides. Elements identified as leading to success also had their deficiencies, such as lack of sufficient collaboration and funding to complete the process. This section presents a summary of gaps and challenges, with some suggestions from stakeholders on ways to overcome them.

Inadequate teacher training

A long-term plan for teacher training in PHRCE methodology was prepared but not fully implemented due to changes in the delivery of teacher training by NCED (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014; S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014; A. Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). Training in PHRCE requires that teachers understand the relationship between content and teaching methodologies and learn how to use interactive, learner-centred activities (Koirala, Poudel, and Khadka, 2010). However, classroom observations from the 2010 Save the Children assessment and the 2014 UNDP review confirm that teachers have not been using participatory strategies to teach the new content (Koirala, Poudel, and Khadka, 2010; P. Bhatta, pers. comm., 25 March 2014). Peace education methodology emphasizes cooperative learning and child participation, and traditional learning methods may prove inadequate without appropriate teacher training (Thapa et al., 2010).

According to one stakeholder, this methodology gap is due in part to the absence of behaviour change goals for teachers and students at the design stage of the process. While the initiative aimed to support curriculum development and textbook revision, the longer-term scheme for teacher training in PHRCE methodology was planned but not implemented (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014).

UNICEF staff expressed concern that the PHRCE teacher-training module developed by NCED has failed to reach many social studies teachers due to the implementation of a new demand-based model for teacher training. Under the new TPD system, teachers must submit a request to NCED for a three-day PHRCE training session at one of the 34 education training centres (ETCs). The teacher-training module is not taught as part of the regular ETC curriculum. Supply-based training is thus unlikely to be implemented under the present system unless supported and funded by development partners.

To compensate for the absence of training a number of NGOs have launched peace education initiatives and training in supplementary activities, including through children’s clubs (UNICEF, 2011a). Specific training in PHRCE has been conducted by organizations such as Caritas and the Asia Foundation (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014). In addition, PENN is conducting training and activities. However, training materials are not shared among all stakeholders (T.R. Pant, pers. comm., 25 March 2014) and their efforts are not coordinated with government or undertaken with the approval of NCED (A. Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). One possible solution recommended by UNICEF and the UNDP study would be the insertion of a comprehensive PHRCE teacher-training module...
into CFS training, mandated and mainstreamed by NCED with UNICEF financial support (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014).

**Lack of sustained monitoring of PHRCE delivery**

At present, there is no systematic monitoring and evaluation process in place to assess delivery of new PHRCE content. In addition, lack of a feedback mechanism or systematic feedback sessions with teachers hinders improvements to classroom teaching and materials (B.N. Sharma, pers. comm., 21 March 2014; H.B. Shrestha, pers. comm., 21 March 2014). Aside from the assessment and field observations performed for the 2010 Save the Children review, NCED and development partners have not been involved in quality control or monitoring. UNICEF’s current country programme, unlike its previous programme, does not include funding or follow-up for peace education, which has limited its capacity to support necessary monitoring. Furthermore, there is an absence of coordination or quality control in the delivery of PHRCE (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014). One international consultant suggested that more teacher trainers be trained, followed by a sustained period of monitoring and coaching and a period of review, with a view to increasing quality control. Piloting of new materials would be followed by a review to incorporate necessary revisions (J. Zimmer, pers. comm., 6 March 2014).

**Inadequate and minimal coverage of PHRCE in classrooms**

As noted earlier, the UNDP review found that teachers are not teaching PHRCE due to a lack of training or sufficient classroom time (see Section 4.1). Moreover, if they do teach content they skip the examples and case studies from the teaching materials that would enhance student understanding of the content (P. Bhatta, pers. comm., 25 March 2014). A staff member of a children’s rights NGO and PENN, who undertook classroom observations in schools outside Kathmandu, found that teachers skipped concrete examples and interactive methodologies (A. Siwakoti, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). A Nepal case study on education and peacebuilding, prepared in conjunction with the EEPCT programme, notes that PHRCE is accorded little prominence in schools and receives only minimal attention from education officials. The study notes that ‘this compounds the problem that although teachers may attempt to show students how to manage conflict situations through textbook methods, they need to radically alter their normal teaching methods to make this an effective lesson in the classroom. It is a subject that it is not susceptible to the prevalent “rote learning” approach’ (UNICEF, 2011a: 35). The case study further notes that, despite any initial enthusiasm which teachers might show for new interactive methodologies, they are likely to revert to traditional teaching methods due to low morale, lack of supervision and support, and existing classroom conditions.

Despite widespread awareness of the new revisions, the NCED agrees that orientation and training are limited and are not provided to all teachers. Whether and how well the content is taught depends on the individual motivation of teachers, rather than systematic implementation or monitoring of delivery. NCED therefore emphasizes the need for support from local education authorities and school management to make the necessary changes in pedagogy (A. Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014).

**Inadequate links between PHRCE content and teacher behaviour and school climate**

There is a need to link PHRCE content with classroom methodology, specifically teacher behaviour. Teachers are key actors in promoting peace education, not just in terms of teaching content but also through classroom management, disciplinary policies, attitudes, treatment of students, and avoidance of corporal punishment (Thapa et al., 2010). This points to a need for a comprehensive reform process linking PHRCE with key school reforms (P. Bhatta, pers. comm., 25 March 2014; Thapa et al., 2010).
Lack of institutional memory and coordination
Lack of institutional memory affected both the CDC and central government agencies throughout the revision process. This was due in part to transfers of staff members to other agencies, which hampered capacity building and hindered government efforts to promote cooperation between the different parties (A. Paudel, pers. comm., 17 March 2014). Institutional memory in UN agencies has also been inadequate (T.R. Pant, pers. comm., 25 March 2014).

Gaps in content related to marginalized groups
Despite the strong participation by excluded groups in the writing process and the inclusion of content related to the discrimination of marginalized groups, concerns were expressed about exclusion of content from teacher guides and textbooks. For example, a Dalit member of the consultative group suggested that content be included on the history and contributions of Dalits and the challenges they face (e.g. inequality of education opportunities). The writers did not accept the suggestion although some ideas were deferred for possible inclusion in materials for higher grades. The Dalit member also recommended broadening the representation of the writers group, rather than restricting marginalized group representatives to serving on an advisory group (G. Sunar, pers. comm., 16 March 2014).

Other content gaps
Despite efforts to establish coherence in content, several participants noted gaps in the conceptual framework or content. For example, the writers appeared to lack a holistic understanding of the scope and sequence of the curriculum. The head of one participating NGO observed that the curriculum reform process did not address the trauma experienced by students and their families as a result of the turmoil and violence of the insurgency, and stressed the need for content related to psychological support (S. Tamang, pers. comm., 22 March 2014).

Lack of resources
While the provision of adequate resources at the start of the initiative was instrumental in sustaining momentum, the level of commitment dropped off with the cessation of UNICEF funding for peace education. Without external funding, motivation to engage in additional training, monitoring, and supervision work diminished. To counter this effect, PHRCE should be viewed as an integral part of quality education, especially relevant to post-conflict contexts (R. Dhungana, pers. comm., 18 March 2014).

Lack of linkage with comprehensive conflict analysis
The PHRCE reform process predated the education and peacebuilding initiative by UNICEF. As such, it was not informed by findings from a comprehensive conflict analysis. In-depth knowledge of conflict dynamics, conflict drivers, and the contribution of the education system to the conflict would have improved the process and outcomes of the initiative (Novelli and Smith, 2011). A case study on Nepal which analysed the drivers of conflict within the education system concluded that ‘the introduction of specific peace education material into the curriculum is less important than the total overhaul of the curriculum in relation to concepts of state-building, notably inclusiveness and non-discrimination’ (UNICEF, 2011a: 35).
5. Recommendations

The recommendations provided in this section aim to improve Nepal’s implementation of peace, human rights, and civic education (PHRCE) with a view to ensuring quality, sustainability, and impact. They represent a synthesis of suggestions from stakeholder agencies and individuals who participated in implementation of the process. Stakeholders were also asked to make recommendations for other countries interested in implementing peace education. Additional recommendations are drawn from the programme and academic literature.

5.1 Recommendations for the Government of Nepal and development partners

i. **Implement a comprehensive, multi-year teacher-training process for PHRCE integrated into the Child Friendly School training module.** Further commitment from the Ministry of Education is important to ensure that a comprehensive teacher-training and supervision process is carried out to improve teacher capacity to deliver PHRCE. Implement a collaborative approach among NCED and development partners and NGOs, mainstreamed through the social studies component of the TPD process, with UNICEF support. Ensure that sufficient training is provided to teacher trainers and disseminated systematically through the ETCs. Revise the existing training materials as necessary to ensure that content, methodology, and classroom practices are integrated to create a coherent, holistic approach. Ensure that training addresses the relationship between textbook content and activities in the teachers’ guides. Build a system of classroom monitoring and supervision into the training process to ensure teachers have adequate support to use the new methodologies. Accountability systems should be established at all levels of implementation including school monitors, school management committees, ETCs, and DEOs.

ii. **Complete the revision of textbooks and curriculum. Amplify existing supplementary materials and ensure distribution to education resource centres, schools, and classrooms.** Complete the integration of PHRCE content and skills for Grades 9–10 and update materials as needed. The CDC should undertake an inventory of materials and ensure their availability. Include representatives from marginalized groups in the process as writers, not just advisors. Develop the work through a conflict analysis lens to ensure that materials reflect an understanding of conflict dynamics and triggers.

iii. **Implement a comprehensive, systematic monitoring and evaluation system for PHRCE.** Using findings from previous assessments, undertake an evaluation to measure how PHRCE is being implemented in the classroom and ascertain the impact of the revised curriculum on students, schools, communities, and the education system. The results of monitoring and evaluation should form part of a feedback cycle to improve classroom delivery and inform teacher training and subsequent revision of PHRCE materials. Where exercises are too difficult for the average teacher, the text should be amended to cover the same concepts, skills, and values in a more teacher-friendly way.

iv. **Collaborate with university research institutions to conduct research and evaluation on the impacts of PHRCE over a multi-year period.** Research should address the broader goals of PHRCE to determine longer-term impacts in terms of building a culture of peace. The Peace and Development Studies Department at Tribhuvan
University would make a natural partner for the MoE and development partners in this regard.

v. **Review education policy reforms to ensure inclusive education.** Reforms in access to education should be implemented simultaneously with PHRCE to assist progress toward a more equitable society and address conflict drivers in the education system (S. Joshi, pers. comm., 19 March 2014). Policy reforms should ensure that the teaching cadre throughout the country is more representative of marginalized groups. Likewise, scholarships for Dalit students should be increased to reflect their share of the population (G. Sunar, pers. comm., 16 March 2014).

### 5.2 Recommendations for other countries

These recommendations are based on suggestions from stakeholders interviewed for the case study and good practice suggestions developed at the 2010 regional consultation of four South Asian countries to establish a PHRCE curriculum in conflict-affected countries.

i. **Implement a systematic government-led process to integrate PHRCE into the curriculum.** The process should be collaborative and inclusive, and involve development partners and civil society. The process should have clear goals and outcomes, and incorporate conflict-sensitive principles. Members of marginalized groups should be involved in the planning and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation must be built into the process. The government must commit to multi-year implementation with sufficient funding to ensure the achievement of goals. The process of curriculum reform should be linked to national education planning and policy. An MoU among the partners with clear roles and responsibilities will strengthen the process.

ii. **Undertake a conflict assessment to inform education reform for peacebuilding.** Before commencing the process of curriculum reform, government and partners – including representatives from marginalized groups – should perform a conflict assessment to ensure that all subsequent PHRCE programming is developed through a conflict analysis lens. In-depth knowledge of conflict dynamics is fundamental for developing policies, planning, and programming that seek to contribute to long-term peacebuilding.

iii. **Ensure the conceptual clarity of the content, skills, and values embedded in the reforms.** Develop a scope and sequence for content, skills, and values, and ensure it is integrated across all grades and based on a common understanding of PHRCE among key stakeholders, appropriate for the country context, and realistic in terms of implementation.

iv. **Design and implement a comprehensive teacher-training programme involving teachers at all levels including pre-service as well as in-service training.** Interactive, learner-centred, and participatory methodologies are central to the teacher-training approach. Training should include monitoring and supervision of teachers, and incorporate a feedback cycle to improve classroom delivery and inform teacher training and subsequent revision of PHRCE materials. Training curricula of teaching colleges should incorporate preparation for teaching PHRCE, which might require a shift towards interactive and participatory pedagogies.

v. **Include local communities, parents, children, and civil society in implementation of PHRCE.** Ensure that the design and implementation process engages with members of civil society and seeks their input. Peacebuilding initiatives at local levels can support and amplify PHRCE in the formal curriculum.
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Annex 1. Documents and resources

These English-language resources and documents provide detailed information about the implementation process for integrating peace, human rights, and civic education into the formal and non-formal education curriculum and textbooks in Nepal.

**Document:** Assessment of Peace Education 2010


**Description:** This assessment of the PHRCE process summarizes the accomplishments of the initiative to integrate PHRCE into the formal curriculum by CDC, Save the Children, UNICEF, and UNESCO. It includes gaps in delivery from observations of classrooms in four districts in Nepal.

**Document:** Memorandum of Understanding 2007

**Description:** This document outlines the goals and objectives of the Nepal Ministry of Education, CDC and development partners regarding the implementation of the curriculum revision process. It can serve as an example for other countries showing how to develop a multi-year collaborative process to integrate peace, human rights, and civic education into the social studies curriculum.

**Document:** Memorandum of Understanding 2009

**Description:** This document is a follow-up to the 2007 MoU, and outlines the roles and responsibilities of the MoE NCED and development partners with regard to implementing teacher training for peace, human rights, and civic education.

**Document:** Nepal Case Study on Education and Peacebuilding


**Description:** This study is one of three case studies developed by UNICEF and forms part of a global study on the relationship between education and peacebuilding. It was prepared as part of the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT) programme funded by the Government of the Netherlands. The study examines the political, economic, and social context in which the insurgency and related conflicts took place in Nepal, and the role of education both as a trigger for conflict and as an instrument for peacebuilding. It analyses the PHRCE integration process and provides for education policy recommendations for Nepal to promote peace and equity.

**Document:** Review of Peace Education in Five South Asian Countries

**Citation:** Thapa, M.; Dhungana, R.; Mahalingam, B.; Conilleau, J. 2010. *Peace by piece: Mainstreaming peace education in South Asia*. Kathmandu: Save the Children Sweden.

**Description:** This review is an outcome of national consultations on peace education initiatives in four South Asian countries: Afghanistan, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. The document describes the development of peace education in each country and identifies a list of good practices and challenges developed by the participants of the consultation. It also presents recommendations to countries interested in developing peace education.
**Document:** Review of PHRCE Content in Formal Education Curriculum in Nepal  
**Description:** This document examines the content of the formal curriculum in Nepal prior to the revision process. It maps the existing content of the social studies curriculum for Grades 1–10 in the area of PHRCE, with a view to assisting curriculum writers to identify gaps and needed content for the curriculum revision process.

**Document:** Review of PHRCE Content in Non-formal Education Curriculum  
**Citation:** Badri Dev Pande. 2008. Review of national curriculum for peace education/human rights and civic literacy content in non-formal education curriculum, August.  
**Description:** This document examines the content of the non-formal curriculum in Nepal prior to the revision process. It maps the existing content of the School Outreach Programme (Grades 1–3), Flexible Schooling Programme (Primary Level, 8–14 years), Open Learning Programme (Lower Secondary Level), Non-formal Education Curriculum, and Women’s Education Curriculum to assist curriculum writers in identifying the gaps and needed content for the curriculum revision process.

**Document:** Scope and Sequence for Content and Learning Outcomes, Prepared by PE, HR and CE Writers in a two-day workshop, Godawari, Lalitpur, Nepal, 2007  
**Description:** This matrix of content, skills, and learning outcomes in the three areas of peace, human rights, and civic education for Grades 1–10 was produced at a workshop for curriculum writers. The objective was to establish the foundation for the curriculum revision process to integrate PHRCE into the formal curriculum.

**Document:** Workshop Report on PHRCE 2009  
**Citation:** Dhungana, R. 2009. A report on peace, human rights, and civic education acceleration workshop. Kathmandu: Save the Children Sweden.  
**Description:** This workshop report summarizes the outcomes of the workshop, the goals of which included the preparation of: (i) a technical review of materials developed on PHRCE for Adult Literacy and the Women’s Literacy Program for Non-Formal Education; (ii) a technical review of draft lessons on PHRCE for a teacher’s guide for Grades 9–10; (iii) a scope and sequence of the teacher-training curriculum and module 3, and (iv) a joint action plan for the fiscal year 2009/10.

**Description:** This document is the agenda for the first workshop for MoE staff, development partners, writers, and members of the consultative group, held in Kathmandu at the start of the PHRCE curriculum revision process. The goals of the workshop were to: (i) analyse the national curriculum from a PHRCE perspective using a gap analysis; (ii) gain exposure to PHRCE curricula, including content and methodology from other countries with a focus on post-crisis transition examples; and (iii) develop a list of content and learning objectives (including content, skills, values, and attitudes) to be integrated into the national curriculum.
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Pramod Bhatta, consultant, UNDP, 25 March 2014
Rajkumar Dhungana, former education officer, Save the Children, current staff, UNRCPD, 18 March 2014
Sabina Joshi, UNICEF education specialist, 19 March 2014
Tap Raj Pant, National Programme Officer, Education Unit, UNESCO Nepal, 25 March 2014
Ananda Paudel, Director, National Centre for Educational Development, 17 March 2014
Dipu Shakya, consultant, UNICEF, 19 March 2014
Ashok Siwakoti, former staff member of the Forum for Peace Education Network and current member of the Child Watabaran Center Nepal (CWCN), 17 March 2014
B.N. Sharma, Peace Education Network Nepal, 21 March 2014
Harka Prasad Shrestha, Deputy Head, PENN and former Executive Director, NCED, 21 March 2014
Ganjahar Sunar, Dalit Welfare Association, 16 March 2014
Stella Tamang, Director, Bikalpa, 22 March 2014
Judy Zimmer, Deputy Director, Street Law Inc., Washington, DC, 6 March 2014
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The paper

From 2007 to 2012, the Ministry of Education in Nepal – with development partners UNICEF, Save the Children, and UNESCO – revised the Social Studies curriculum in order to promote education for peace, human rights, and civics education, following 10 years of insurgency and the transition to a democratic republic.

Assessments of this curriculum revision process – commissioned by Save the Children, and implemented by the Department of Education (in 2010) and the United Nations Development Programme (in 2014) – found that, while the planned results were largely achieved, the teacher training and monitoring components were not sufficient to build adequate capacity of teachers to deliver the new content and skills.

This study provides a description and a critical analysis of the process, identifies success factors and challenges, and makes recommendations for countries in post-conflict transitions which are considering similar curriculum-reform initiatives.
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