

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE
RIGHTS EDUCATION ACTION PROGRAMME (REAP)
Amnesty International Norway**

Executive Summary

Prepared by

**Felisa Tibbitts
Human Rights Education Associates, Inc. (HREA)**

In collaboration with

Daniel Foong, Tomasz Kasprzak, Andre Keet
and Mohamed Melouk

10 January 2010

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1. REAP programme background

Human Rights Education (HRE) is based on the full range of rights as proclaimed by the United Nations (UN) in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other UN thematic documents. HRE is defined by Amnesty International (AI) as the range of activities specially designed to transmit awareness and knowledge of HR, to foster values and attitudes that uphold the same rights for all, to encourage action in defence of these rights.

The Rights Education leading to Action Programme (REAP) aims at giving Human Rights training to key actors in society, in order to qualify them to become human rights (HR) multipliers, in adherence with the aims and objectives of the UDHR, AI's HRE Strategy and the movement's Action Plans.

The program objectives are to

- contribute to the fulfillment of AI's long term goals and short term objectives
- address clearly defined local needs and aims
- address specified themes
- focus on specified target groups
- avoid duplication of other HRE work

The program has set specific criteria for selection of target groups:

- Training should be given to target groups who are genuinely receptive to HRE and have a basic commitment to HR.
- They should be potential opinion builders or multipliers
- They may be potential violators of human rights as well as potential victims of HR violations.
- Target groups should be relevant for AI's ongoing campaigning work.

As a consequence of these criteria and the fact that the projects have identified their target groups in accordance with local circumstances, the REAP comprises a variety of target groups. They are mainly teachers and educators in formal educational systems, but also NGOs, community leaders, journalists, prison officials, judiciary officers, religious officers and others.

In 2008 REAP consists of running projects in Poland, Slovenia, Moldova, Russia, Turkey, Morocco, Israel, South Africa, India, Thailand and Malaysia. In addition there are activities in the REAP network of HRE coordinators; exchange of information and experience, thematic workshops and "in the field" exchange visits between the projects. Two projects in Latin America have not been continued; AI Mexico, which ran from 2002 to 2004 and a "seed project" in AI Argentina implemented in 2004-2005.

1.2. Methodological considerations

1.2.1. Key areas of investigation

In keeping with the specifications of the Terms of Reference, the impact assessment was designed to collect evidence of the effectiveness of the ‘multipliers’ principle within REAP, specifically in relation to impacts on target groups. This aspect of the evaluation sought to document the preparation of multipliers within REAP, their success in replicating a ‘cascade’ training model, and impacts on individual multipliers and their beneficiaries. The impacts identified include human rights competencies related to knowledge, skills, attitudes/values and any associated behavioural changes. These results would presumably incorporate both short-term outcomes as well as medium-term impacts. These individual impact areas are elaborated in the log frame in the Annex.

In accordance with the requests of the SG, the impact assessment was also intended to document short-term outcomes on Amnesty International’s growth and mobilization. However, the study also explored other potential areas of impact on the sections’ programming, including the development of the HRE programming capacity itself. (Refer to log frame.)

Finally, the impact assessment was to explore the ways in which HRE could prove to be a tool for change. Recognizing that longer-term impacts related to societal changes would be both difficult to document as well as challenging to attribute to REAP programming alone, the study nonetheless investigated potential societal impacts through investigations of REAP’s capacity-development of partner organizations, changes in enabling HRE policy environments, and improvements in AI’s public image within a country. These institutional and policy approaches to social change mechanisms would be completed by findings related to impacts on the individual level, particular for multipliers and other change agents.

1.2.2. Mixed-method research

A mixed-method approach to the research was applied, incorporating both quantitative (survey-based) and qualitative (case study) approaches. The SG had recommended that data collection include both survey administration to HRE Coordinators as well as four site visits involving key informant and focus group interviews with target groups, review of on-site documents and observations (when possible).

The advantages of using quantitative and qualitative approaches are as follows:

- *quantitative approaches* allow us to isolate different aspects of the REAP programme or background characteristics of beneficiaries in order to examine and represent numerically any potential relationship with impact. These impacts then can be compared, in some cases involving statistical tests for significance.

- *qualitative approaches* allow for documentation of stakeholder perceptions and perspectives; a more holistic and integrated rendering of programming processes; and explanations of any impacts (both anticipated and unanticipated) reported

The proposed administration of self-assessment questionnaires and the development of four case studies were reasonable given the availability of data, the time frame and resources

available. These approaches would collectively provide a rendering of self-reported impacts at the individual and institutional levels and allow for such impacts to be analyzed according to the background characteristics of multipliers and beneficiaries, the degree of their participation in REAP trainings, and strategic features of the REAP program, including the political environment in which it was operating.

There are two primary kinds of quantitatively based impact evaluations:

- experimental - involving a randomized selection of primary sources; pre- and post-program data collection; and the use of both treatment and control groups, and
- non-experimental – a non-randomized selection of primary sources; pre- post- program data collection or use of both treatment and comparison groups.

The impact assessment organized for REAP partially meets the qualifications for the non-experimental approach but only for multipliers in the four site visit countries. Otherwise, there are no comparison or control groups against which to compare any impacts recorded for REAP constituents. Thus, we cannot say definitely that the impacts recorded for the beneficiaries and all of the multipliers can be attributed to the REAP program. However, the qualitative information provided by multipliers and beneficiaries in their open-ended responses do add validity to the findings that have been captured quantitatively. Moreover, the results reported would appear to be *prima facie* highly associated with participation in REAP trainings and activities. What the assessment cannot take into account, however, is that multipliers and beneficiaries exhibiting knowledge, attitudes and behaviors reflective of human rights will not have developed these capacities through trainings or experiences organized through programs other than REAP.

The limitations of the above assessment design have been partly addressed through other methodologies within the study. For example, multipliers were asked to self-report ratings on a range of human rights competencies both prior to and following their participation in REAP programming. This self-reporting of pre-REAP competencies is intended to serve as a kind of proxy for baseline data.

In addition, multiple sources were used in documenting impacts. In addition to asking multipliers to self-report impacts, key trainers were surveyed about impacts on multipliers (not on an individual level but according to target group). Beneficiaries self-reported impacts and impacts on beneficiaries were also reported by multipliers (once again according to target group). Impacts on institutions (such as Amnesty International and partner organizations) were documented in site visits through corroborative interviews with differing sources.

Thus, the impact assessment attempted to blend approaches and “triangulate” data sources in order to overcome the methodological limitations of this “one time only” study. However, given these limitations, readers are advised to rely on general findings emerging from this study and to treat more detailed, quantitative findings (for example, findings broken out according to sub-categories of beneficiaries) as more tentative and requiring further investigation.

There is one final reminder in relation to the interpretation of report findings. Although the case studies documented holistically the organization of REAP programming within country contexts, the survey data presented (including breakouts according to country) does not enable the reader to draw any immediate connections between a combination of features of the

REAP programme strategies and reported impacts. Rather, the survey-generated data allows us to isolate and consider one feature at a time, for example, the relationship between a specific impact and a program feature such as level of program supports or number of contact hours. Any interpretation of these findings would ideally take into account a broader knowledge of REAP at each country level.

1.2.3. Methodological limitations of the impact assessment

In addition to a lack of comparison data for beneficiaries and most of the REAP countries, the other primary limitation of this study is selection bias. The non-randomized nature of the study entailed HRE Coordinators selecting multipliers and beneficiaries to complete surveys and participate in interviews during site visits. Presumably, the REAP constituents selected to participate in the study – and who agreed to do so – were those demonstrating investment in and appreciation of the program. These sources would therefore be predisposed to have a generally positive view of the REAP program. The result could be a tendency toward overstating the impact of REAP on the individual level, particularly in ratings on closed-ended questions. This potential bias was accounted for in the study by seeking a triangulation of sources as well as asking survey respondents to include open-ended responses describing the impacts of REAP.

Given that strong possibility of respondent bias, the report findings cannot be considered representative of all those participating in the REAP program. Methodologically, we are not able to generalize any impacts reported for multipliers and beneficiaries. Rather, findings for individual impacts should be treated as “best case” results, that is, ones that we might expect to find when there is motivation and engagement on the part of REAP constituents.

Language is an additional factor that may have influenced the accuracy of reported data. Interpreters were used for interviews conducted during site visits. In countries where English was not a spoken language, the survey was translated into the local language and, in turn, open-ended survey responses were translated back into English. Although Amnesty International sections no doubt took great care in selecting these interpreters and translators we cannot know how technically accurately the English language translations received were and to what degree movement between linguistic and conceptual constructs may have altered the intended meanings of sources.

2. 0 KEY FINDINGS

This section contains highlights from major categories of findings for this study. These categories are impacts upon Amnesty International, societal impacts, and impacts on individual multipliers and beneficiaries associated with REAP. There is clear evidence of impact for each of these major categories across all 10 REAP countries participating in the study.

The main report contains detailed analyses of survey-based findings, including variations based upon country, gender, target group/occupation and hours of participation in REAP. These analyses demonstrate variation in the degree of impacts, taking into account the background features of REAP countries and their constituents. The following highlights should be reviewed in conjunction with the more detailed analyses in order to better understand the relationship between specific REAP strategies undertaken and reported results.

2.1. REAP strengthened sections' capacities to carry out HRE programming.

Thousands of multipliers have been successfully trained across all countries for a range of target groups. Across all 10 countries studied, the average number of key trainers was 10 at the time of the evaluation, representing a 40% increase over the course of the REAP period. The number of training resources available to the sections increased from 1 prior to REAP to 5 at the time of the evaluation. As might be expected, REAP's impacts were especially significant for those countries with less previous experience in carrying out HRE programming.

2.2. HRE activities have positively influenced AI's growth and activism.

The beginning total of AI membership was 6,010 across the 10 countries and the total at the time the evaluation was conducted was 19,158. This represents a three-fold increase in membership over the course of the REAP grant period. It should be noted that REAP was a contributing, although not the sole or primary contributor, to this substantial increase in AI membership. For two countries, however, REAP was seen as a primary contributor.

Similarly, the number of AI local groups increased over the course of REAP programming, from a collective total of 43 groups across 9 countries to 100 at the time of the evaluation, an increase of ten fold. Once again we see that REAP was a contributing, although not the sole or primary contributor, to the reported increase in the number of local groups. For one country, REAP was seen as a primary contributor.

Across all 10 countries, the increase in participation levels in actions/campaigns was rated a 4 (between the rating of "somewhat" and "a great deal"). HRE Coordinators as a whole rated the REAP influence on these participation levels as 3.45 (with 1 representing "not at all", 3 representing "somewhat" and 5 representing "a great deal"). Those sections rating REAP's influence relatively higher - Morocco (4), Poland (5) and Slovenia (4) – linked HRE activities with activism.

2.3. HRE activities have positively influenced some sections of AI in ways other than HRE programming, growth and activism

Other impacts on AI mentioned by HRE Coordinators included:

- Expansion of youth network and programming
- Expansion of campaign programming
- Evolution of trainers and multipliers into leadership positions at AI
- Opportunity to reach new target groups, especially marginalized communities
- Fundraising and core operational support

2.4. REAP has facilitated AI's development of partnerships with governmental and non-governmental organizations.

The number of collaborations increased dramatically as a result of the REAP programming, across different kinds of organizations: governmental, non-governmental, community-based, schools and universities. Eight of the ten HRE Coordinators indicated that these relationships had positively influenced their section's overall programming.

New partnerships engendered through the REAP programme have strengthened the overall programming of AI sections, such as through campaigning capacities, opportunities to participate in events organized by others, a positive cooperation with formerly hostile government authorities, and a greater enjoyment of respect by other institutions.

2.5. HRE programming has positively affected the human rights work of partner organizations.

Eight of the ten coordinators indicated that REAP-related relationships with other organizations had influenced the programming of these other agencies. The types of influences on partners were human rights education and awareness-raising programming and the infusion of a human rights based- approach to programming.

2.6. REAP has had positive impacts on educational policies related to human rights education.

All but one of the Amnesty sections reported that they had lobbied authorities and all of the sections reported positive results, although not all of the actions resulted in changes in formal educational policies.

The results varied but included: Ministry development of HRE training and education modules; the enhancement of HR as a theme in national educational curricula; and the offering of human rights electives within individual schools.

2.7. Positive changes in public opinion of Amnesty International can be attributed to REAP programming.

All but one of the Amnesty sections reported that there had been positive media coverage of their human rights education activities. Each of the sections believed that REAP programming had improved positive public opinion towards Amnesty International.

2.8. There is direct evidence that REAP contributed to a greater realization of human rights, especially for vulnerable populations.

In five of the countries, HRE Coordinators reported direct evidence of a greater realization of human rights, especially for vulnerable populations, over the course of the REAP programme. Testimonials from multipliers and beneficiaries collected as part of the impact evaluation suggest that such effects were realized at the individual level.

2.9. Multipliers rated TOTs as the most influential support provided by AI but all supports usefully contributed to multiplier capacities to carry out HRE.

The multipliers were asked to rate the impacts of a range of Amnesty International supports on themselves personally as well as the work they carried out in human rights education and training. These results show that, across all 10 countries, the multipliers rated the TOTs as most influential (4.38 average, with 1 representing “not at all”, 3 representing “somewhat” and 5 representing “a great deal”). However, access to Amnesty resources, ongoing communication with AI staff, Amnesty campaigns and actions and the AI HRE network each contributed to supporting the work of multipliers.

A main finding of the investigation of impacts in relation to AI supports is that the more contact a multiplier had with the REAP programme, as illustrated through the number of contact hours, the greater the value of all supports offered by Amnesty International. One conclusion might be that the higher the investment made by Amnesty through training of its multipliers, the greater the efficacy of other supports offered.

2.10. The REAP programme had a positive impact on multipliers' knowledge, attitudes and skills related to human rights.

Multipliers indicated in surveys high overall ratings of impact in relation to a range of impact areas including understanding of human rights principles and standards; facilitation and materials adaptation skills; valuing of standing up for their rights and the rights of others; concern for others; and commitment to taking action. The post-REAP ratings were all higher than 4.20, with the highest ratings for the attitudes related to standing up for rights and commitment to taking action (4.80 or higher).

The average gains, as indicated by the difference between pre- and post-REAP ratings, were at least 1 point (on a scale of 1 to 5) for attitudinal areas, and even higher (minimum 1.40 point difference) for impact areas related to knowledge and skill development. The higher the number of hours of participation in REAP trainings, the greater the impact on skill development in facilitation and materials development.

Statistical procedures¹ showed that the multiplier gains were highly statistically significant for all surveyed knowledge, value and skill development areas, with the exception of the skills for developing learning materials and the development of empathy for the human rights of others who are different. However, comparing the REAP multiplier post-REAP ratings for the four case study countries (Malaysia, Morocco, Poland and South Africa) with those provided by comparison groups from the same countries did not reveal statistically significant differences between these two groups, with the exception of two impact areas for Poland.

2.11. In open-ended question responses, the two attitudinal changes most frequently mentioned by multipliers were changes in their opinion/increase in empathy and increased learning/interest in learning about human rights.

Ninety percent of the multipliers surveyed indicated that participation in REAP activities had influenced their attitudes in ways other than those prompted for in the Multiplier Survey. The two most frequently mentioned attitudinal changes relate to what might be considered medium- and perhaps longer-term values related to (a) changes in opinion/increase in empathy (24%) and (b) learning/increased interest in learning about human rights (19%).

2.12. In open-ended question responses, the activity changes most frequently mentioned by multipliers related to the 'multiplication' of HRE.

Eight-two percent of the multipliers who answered this question (78 total) indicated that they had initiated new activities as a result of the REAP programme and 94% of those reporting that they had initiated new activities indicated that they would remain involved with them. The most frequently mentioned new activities related directly to the 'multiplication' of human

¹ Highly significant ($p < 0.01$) using a one-sided t -test.

rights education, the intended outcome of the REAP program. Thus the multipliers completing the survey confirmed that they had served the purpose originally intended for them in REAP.

Seventy five percent of the multipliers also indicated that they had changed the way that they carried out pre-existing activities, with 44% the use of interactive, participatory methodologies. These results demonstrate quite clearly the impact of REAP on multiplier teaching techniques.

2.13. The REAP programme had a positive impact on beneficiaries' knowledge, attitudes and skills related to human rights

Beneficiaries indicated in surveys high overall ratings of impact in relation to a range of impact areas including understanding of human rights principles and standards; valuing of standing up for their rights and the rights of others; concern for others; and commitment to taking action. The ratings were all higher than 4.00, excepting for the beneficiaries' rating of commitment to taking action (3.81). Beneficiaries rated the highest level of impacts on attitudes related to standing up for rights (higher than 4.40)

In comparing the results of impacts reported for beneficiaries and multipliers, we find the impacts on beneficiaries to be less pronounced than those reported for multipliers, although the same general impact areas were validated for both groups. Another interesting difference is that for beneficiaries, hours of participation in trainings was positively associated with impacts in knowledge and in attitudes related to empathy and commitment to taking action. For multipliers, increased hours of participation were not linked with increases in knowledge and attitudes.

2.14. In open-ended question responses, the activity changes most frequently mentioned by beneficiaries related to the 'multiplication' of HRE.

Fifty-four percent of the beneficiaries indicated that they had initiated new activities as a result of the REAP program. As might be expected, the percentage of beneficiaries indicating that they had undertaken new activities was smaller than that of multipliers participating in HRE activities.

The two new activities most frequently mentioned by beneficiaries related to multiplier activities, specifically workshops (20%) and awareness-raising activities (16%). Thus a portion of beneficiaries continued "the chain" of multiplying, which began at the key trainer level and continued through the multiplier and beneficiary levels. There appears to be a relationship between number of hours of participation in REAP trainings and beneficiaries' undertaking new activities.

2.15. In open-ended question responses, the vast majority of beneficiaries indicated attitudinal changes.

Fifty-seven percent of the beneficiaries indicated that they had changed the way that they carried out pre-existing activities as a result of the REAP program. Beneficiaries reported a preponderance of changes in attitudes and values, such as respectfulness, learning and empowerment.

2.16. In open-ended question responses, the vast majority of beneficiaries indicated they were applying human rights in their personal life.

Eighty-eight percent of the beneficiaries indicated that they were applying human rights in their personal life. This impact figure is quite high, and is sustained across all sub-categories of beneficiaries. There are slightly higher impact levels for females as compared to males. The most frequently mentioned outcomes reported by beneficiaries in relation to their personal lives related to specific actions, such as undertaking activities to promote human rights and changed behavior.

3.0. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

Below are some preliminary conclusions based on the abovementioned findings, other quantitative and qualitative findings reported in the main text, and the data collection associated with site visits.

3.1. REAP and its Trainings

The study showed that many impacts are directly related to increased exposure to REAP trainings. The more contact a multiplier had with the REAP programme, the greater the value of all supports offered by Amnesty International. Skill impacts on multipliers, such as facilitation and materials adaptation, were associated with higher levels of participation.

However, although participation in REAP trainings had a positive impact on multiplier's knowledge and attitudes in relation to human rights, there was no evidence that these impacts increased with longer periods of time spent in training. With beneficiaries, there was evidence that increased exposure to trainings had a direct impact on knowledge and attitudinal impacts.

3.2. REAP and its Multipliers

The REAP programs have been able to demonstrate the validity of the “multiplier” approach through HRE activities carried out with multipliers. A factor contributing to the success of this model is the involvement of multipliers who have ready access to multiplication venues, such as classrooms, schools or activities within community-based organizations.

The varying contexts of the REAP programs receiving a site visit revealed the importance of HRE Coordinators being able to accurately analyze opportunities within their country context in carrying out their program.

The focus on teachers/educationalists as multiplier target groups seems wise in many regards. Teacher-multipliers consistently reported the highest level of impacts across all competency areas. These teachers often work in a range of nonformal education venues, and not only through clubs in their schools. A striking finding of the evaluation – although one that is not fully explored - is how rarely secondary school teachers report that they are able to actually integrate human rights themes within their formal teaching. University instructors appear to have more freedom in this regard.

The reported impacts on students-multipliers are not as strong as for teachers, although there is evidence of especially high influence in relation to the cultivation of empathy and attitudes supporting standing up for the human rights of others and taking action.

Qualitative information collected from students during site visits show that the opportunities for students to engage in self-directed activities in clubs can be an especially motivating and capacity-building experience for them. Impacts on a portion of students involved in the program appear to be long-standing and contribute to the cultivation of long-term activism.

Impacts on multipliers associated with NGOs/CSOs are rated just below that for teachers. Civil society multipliers reported especially high gains in relation to the development of facilitation and materials adaptation skills and commitment to taking action. Two additional observations might be made in relation to the use of multipliers from this sector.

The first is that a critical mass of staff people/trainers from these organizations would need to participate in REAP trainings in order to result in systematic programmatic changes in policy. Amnesty International would need to establish formal institutional relationships with such agencies and not merely invite individuals within their network to participate in trainings. Moreover, agencies that might qualify for this relationship with Amnesty would ideally have clearly established internal operational policies – that is be “strong” enough – so that inputs from Amnesty could be disseminated internally.

The second observation is that, given the highly vulnerable beneficiaries that these CSOs tend to work with (e.g., women in rural areas), there is evidence that impacts on the multipliers and beneficiaries have been transformational, resulting in profound changes in personal attitudes and behavior. Such changes were brought about in part because in promoting a human rights-based approach REAP allowed for the human rights message to be internalized within the needs frameworks of the populations in these areas.

There is evidence of impacts on multipliers associated with government agencies, although these appear to be lower overall than for other target groups. Across all 10 countries, these civil servants reported relatively high impacts in relation to the development of facilitation skills and the valuing of standing up for one’s own human rights.

A question emerging from the case study work is the long-term viability of civil servants as multipliers within their own professional environments. Some of the REAP sections were able to make remarkable gains in terms of establishing formal partnerships with government agencies other than the Ministry of Education. However, maintaining ongoing access to these agencies and their own internal ability to carry out HRE activities seems to be highly influenced by changes in political leadership, re-structuring and the political and bureaucratic environments in which they work. Therefore, AI investments in government partnership might be justified on goals other than “multiplication” per se.

These other goals would include the establishment of constructive relationships with the potential to bring about other potential outcomes, such as those emerging in Morocco in relation to having prisons becoming more open to NGO visits. However, AI leadership would want to bear in mind that AI appears to have less control of these government relationships as other institutional ones established in REAP and the possibility of government agencies making only symbolic gestures in inviting AI to contribute its educational expertise.

3.3. REAP within Amnesty International Sections

There is ample evidence that the capacities of AI sections to carry out HRE activities have been considerably strengthened through REAP. In addition to the organizational and technical

capacities required for organizing trainings, the HRE Coordinators have developed and maintained associated networks.

REAP can successfully serve as a vehicle for enhancing capacities of AI members as well as a vehicle for attracting new individuals to AI circles. REAP may be more successful in attracting new members when it has enabled the creation of new avenues for outreach (such as the establishment of school groups in Poland) rather than focused on the enhancement of capacities of existing members (Morocco). The creation of such avenues may in part be related to the (early) timing of the REAP programme within the development of HRE programming for a section.

The views of HRE as instrumental to AI growth and mobilization versus HRE as instrumental to personal and professional changes in practice appear able to co-exist within REAP. However, certain sections have made a greater effort to link HRE with mobilization and REAP has therefore been a primary contributor to these AI developments.

The positive impacts on Amnesty International as an organization go beyond those objectives identified for the REAP project, and relate to public image, partnerships, the ability to reach vulnerable groups and the expansion of networks. These outcomes are captured in this evaluation and might be retained as indicators within the monitoring and evaluation framework associated with future REAP programming.

3.4. REAP and Broader Societal Impacts

Methodologically it is difficult to isolate the influence of any single factor when considering societal changes, and the term itself is somewhat open to interpretation. Nevertheless there is evidence that REAP has contributed both directly and indirectly to impacts at the community, regional and national levels.

One area of societal impacts related to Amnesty's work with partner organizations, which can be seen as "delivery agents" for human rights within their own spheres of influence and activity.

Several of the REAP countries increased or enhanced CSO capacities related to human rights promotion. Interviews with beneficiaries in Morocco and South Africa confirmed anecdotally that Amnesty's capacity-building activities with such organizations positively influenced both multipliers and beneficiaries at the community level. This influence was primarily felt through HRE education and awareness activities in conjunction with a human rights-based approach to programming. In relation to this, there is evidence of AI having contributed to the greater realization of human rights among vulnerable populations served by these CSOs.

An enabling environment for Amnesty International's overall work in many countries was enhanced through an improved public image associated with positive publicity surrounding REAP. These impacts were especially pronounced for smaller towns and villages. AI sections may also claim to have promoted an enabling environment for human rights education in a number of countries through their lobbying effort with national and sub-national educational institutions. Such lobbying has contributed to the development of educational policies and practices more amenable to human rights education in schools. However, it is unclear to what degree teachers have taken advantage of increased latitude to take up human rights themes in classrooms.

The scope of any societal impacts brought about by these enabling environments could not be determined through this study. Yet the confirmation of these potential impacts, particularly at the local level, are reminders that REAP programming is intended to influence the realization of human rights at multiple levels and that such impacts will come about through the efforts of individual agency.

End.