

Post – Conflict Peace- Building Through Dialogue on Education

An Evaluative Study

By
Prof. Bidya Nath Koirala, Ph. D.
Neera Shakya
Nandalal Tiwari
Rajkumar Dulal
2013 June

Citation/Copyright

Koirala, B., Dulal, R., Shakya, N., & Tiwari, N. (2013). *Post-Conflict Peace Building through Dialogue on Education*. Kathmandu: REED Nepal.

Executive Summary

Human being possesses both animalistic and divine qualities. As an animal, s/he fights with each other. As a divine creature, s/he exchanges love, compassion, and respect. Peace education is a way to harness the godly characteristics and reduce the devilish ones. The process to cultivate divine quality in human being has been advocated through different religious texts. People have practised these texts as a part of cultural activities to maintain peace and harmony in the society. On the other side of the coin, human beings have fought for their ideas and ideals. The decade-long armed conflict between the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) and the State (1996-2006) is an example which showed animal quality of the Nepali people. Because of this armed struggle, more than 15,000 Nepali were killed, many more displaced and disabled. Schools were closed and teachers as well as students were terrified by both the CPN (Maoist) and the State.

In order to restore peace, Save the Children intensified its peace education program which was started in 2002. During the armed struggle, Save the Children with its partner agencies empowered students to raise their voices for peaceful living; involved parents, teachers, and political leaders for social dialogue on peace; and made efforts to improve quality of education. This process has been continuing. The project *Post-Conflict Peace Building through Dialogue on Education* is a part of such ongoing efforts of Save the Children. This US Institute of Peace (USIP) funded project started in July 2011 for two years. The intent of this project was to ensure implementation of school as zone of peace (SZOP).

Save the Children made Education Journalists' Group (EJG) a partner for this project. As a partner EJG reviewed the earlier studies, organized workshop, dialogue and interaction sessions, trained journalists, sought written commitments of the political leaders for SZOP, reviewed the ongoing program, organized public hearings through TV talk shows, published edited book on SZOP, prepared SZOP materials for display. In partnership with Antenna Foundation, Save the Children also produced jingles and PSAs on SZOP in different languages and got them broadcast in partnership with Media Hub through different radios and TV channels.

In order to evaluate the effect of these activities of the SZOP project, this study was conducted in Bara, Dhanusha, Siraha, and Udayapur districts of Nepal. A team of four persons visited the field, consulted different stakeholders of education, and also observed schools. This weeklong study found that this project was able to make the public aware of SZOP initiatives, ensure written commitments of the political parties on SZOP, bring stakeholders of education together for a uniform voice against school band/strike, boosted journalists' understanding on SZOP, encouraged and informed all to work for SZOP through jingles and PSAs, and published a book on SZOP. The team also found that SZOP was effective in those places where stakeholders were aware, head teachers were dynamic, teachers were friendly, students were aware of their rights, and politicians were rationale. SZOP implementation had lagged behind where District Education Office was lethargic, teachers were indifferent, and stakeholders were unorganized. It

was also found that PSAs as well as jingles were useful for reinforcing people's awareness on SZOP.

The study team identified the overlaps of the SZOP promoting structures and the activities. It figured out the problems associated with them, and then identified the gaps at different levels. Finally, the team came with the learning that reorientation of the SZOP stakeholders is essential to blend local wisdom with the modern wisdom; integrate SZOP with other programs; readjust structural differences; develop partnership with media; ensure multilayer intervention for SZOP with its expansion and encapsulate SZOP in all types of teachers' training.

List of Acronyms

CIF: Creative International Forum
CPA: Comprehensive Peace Accord
CPN: Communist Party of Nepal
CWIN: Child Workers in Nepal
CZOP: Coalition for Children as a Zone of Peace
DCPC: District Child Protection Committee
DCWB: District Child Welfare Board
DEO: District Education Office
DOE: Department of Education
EJG: Educational Journalist Group
FNJ: Federation of Nepalese Journalists
I/NGO: International/Non Governmental Organization
IHRICON: Institute of Human Rights Communication, Nepal
KTV: Kantipur Television
MOE: Ministry of Education
N/PABSON: National/Private and Boarding School's Organisation
NGO: Non Governmental Organization
NTV: Nepal Television
PCF: Per Child Fund
PNGO: Partner National Governmental Organization
PSA: Public Service Announcement
PTA: Parent Teacher Association
RC: Resource Center
SC: Save the Children
SMC: School Management Committee
SZOP: School as Zone of Peace
TU: Tribhuvan University
UNICEF: United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
USIP: US Institute of Peace
VCPC: Village Child Protection Committee
VDC: Village Development Committee

Table of Contents

1.	Background	1
1.1	Objective of the study	2
2.	Methodology	4
2.1	<i>Process</i>	4
2.2	<i>Study groups</i>	4
2.3	<i>Study tools</i>	4
2.4	<i>Data validation technique</i>	4
2.5	<i>Data analysis and interpretation</i>	4
3.	Findings and discussion	5
3.1	<i>Organic approach to peace building</i>	5
3.2	<i>Input of SZOP project</i>	5
3.3	<i>Achievement obtained through SC inputs</i>	6
3.4	<i>Visible changes on the ground</i>	9
3.5	<i>Cases on the ground</i>	10
3.6	<i>Effect of SZOP advocacy</i>	12
3.7	<i>Issues on the ground</i>	13
3.8	<i>Problems occurred</i>	15
	<i>The gaps</i>	16
4.	Learning and way forward	16
	<i>Reorientation for SZOP</i>	16
	<i>Integration of SZOP</i>	17
	<i>Structural readjustment</i>	17
	<i>Partnership with media</i>	17
	<i>Multilayer intervention for SZOP</i>	18
	<i>Expansion of SZOP initiative</i>	18
	<i>Encapsulating training for SZOP</i>	18
5.	Appendices	19
	<i>Cases documented by EJG</i>	22
6.	Study tools	26

List of Tables

Table 1: Lock up/strike and its organizers	1
Table 2: Implementation of SZOP	3
Table 3: Inputs for SZOP related activities.....	5
Table 4: SZOP on the ground	9
Table 5: Success and failure case on SZOP	10
Table 6: SWOT report on SZOP	13

1. Background

Nepali culture has two great assets for peace: Hindu's ritualized peace process and Buddha's midway for living. Despite these assets Nepal witnessed a decade long (1996-2006) armed conflict between Nepal Communist Party (Maoist) and the State. This armed insurgency took the lives of more than 15,000 people and many more were displaced. Both parties in war in one or the other ways used schools as their shelter and training halls. Teachers and students were threatened to vacate the school and/or participate in the programs of the warring groups. But such terrible days have been over following the Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA) between the Government of Nepal and the then Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) in 2006. And yet the remains of the war are still prevalent in the forms of teachers' and students' insecurity, agitating mindset. Added to this is the situation of internal conflict, conflict between School Management Committee (SMC) and head teachers, head teachers and teachers, which has been affecting smooth operation of schools.

In order to combat with this situation Save the Children introduced different educational projects since 2002 in different names. As a sequel to such projects, a national coalition of I/NGOs working with children was formed as Coalition for Children as a Zone of Peace (CZOP). During insurgency period, this coalition played role to protect children from the impact of war. The coalition was also involved in drafting SZOP National Framework and Implementing Guidelines in association with the Department of Education (DOE). The SZOP Guidelines was issued by the Department of Education, Ministry of Education in June 2011. It has envisaged Child Protection Committee at the school level; District Monitoring Committee at the District level; and National Coordination Committee at the central level as structures to meet the following main objectives:

- Save school from armed conflict and other violence
- Save school from party politics and other types of interventions
- Make school free from discrimination, abuses, misbehavior, negligence, and exploitation

Save the Children continued its journey to SZOP. In this process it contracted Federation of Nepalese Journalists (FNJ) for media analysis of 6 national broadsheets and situation assessment of 68 schools of 9 districts of Far Western Region. In media analysis, FNJ found increased incidents of disturbances in school and violence in the classroom. And in situation assessment, it concluded that only 7.68% schools had received the SZOP Guidelines. FNJ also reported that 96% of the PTA, teachers, political parties, and community people had not received the SZOP Guidelines.

Another partner for SZOP advocacy for SC, the Education Journalists' Group (EJG) analyzed the yearlong lock/strike of 2068 BS and figured out its organizers as well. The table below gives a picture of it.

Table 1: Lock up/strike and its organizers

Lock up and strike	Frequency	Organizers	Frequency
Public school	16	Student Union	46
Community school	39	Political Party	27
University	22	Local Teachers	3
University Grants Commission	2	Underground political party	1
Higher Secondary Education Council	2	Head teachers	2
Department of Education	1	SMC	2

CTEVT	3	Teachers' Association/Organization	15
Campus	5	Total band	96 days
TU Central Office	6		
Total	96		

Source: EJG (2013). *School as Zone of Peace: Concept and Situation* (in Nepali)

The table above shows that factors/actors that impose school closure are changed but the number of school closure days have not decreased compared to the past.

In order to reduce the number of unofficial school closure days due to strikes and to contribute to quality education and save children from different kinds of violence, Save the Children conceptualized the present project, *post conflict peace building through dialogue on education*. This project, which started in July 2011 for two years, was the continuation of SC's earlier initiative for quality education. The US Institute of Peace (USIP) funded project was designed to complement to and enhance the ongoing school as zone of peace (SZOP) program through media advocacy targeting four southern districts of Nepal viz., Bara, Dhanusha, Siraha, and Udayapur. In order to roll out this project in action, SC got the Creative International Forum (CIF) to analyze SZOP situation of the concerned districts.

Following the CIF report, SC took Education Journalist Group (EJG) as its implementing partner to promote SZOP implementation mainly in the aforesaid four districts and generally all over the country through different activities. Its aim was to (a) decrease political violence, strikes, interferences, and indoctrination in schools (b) increase understanding and promotion of SZOP (c) increase capacity of civil society to protect schools from political interference and violence, and (d) analyze current implementation status of school as zone of peace.

EJG organized stakeholders' interaction sessions at the district headquarters and in Kathmandu, the capital city of Nepal. Among the stakeholders were the political leaders, head teachers, schoolteachers, parents, NGOs, N/PABSON students, civil society representatives, students' unions, SMC, PTA, peace committee members, members of SZOP national coordination committee, CZOPP members, MOE, DoE, DEO, leaders of the teachers' Unions, child club members and media persons (appendix, 1). EJG also persuaded the central level leaders of 15 different political parties to show their written commitments to implement SZOP (appendix, 2).

In course of the project implementation EJG in partnership with the SC organized one SZOP public hearings, two national dialogues and eight districts interactions. They also documented and compiled case studies and best practices on SZOP (appendix, 3); and collected news from media and analyzed them for SZOP implication (appendix, 4). This is the evaluative report of the EJG-SC partnership for interventions to ensure SZOP implementation.

1.1 Objective of the study

The objectives of this evaluative study were:

1. To identify the traditional ways to maintain social peace
2. To examine the relationship between the locally practiced approach to social peace and SZOP approaches
3. To assess overall performance of the SZOP project in 4 districts (Dhanusha, Bara, Siraha and Udayapur) and central level in Kathmandu;
4. To document major achievements of the project implemented jointly by Save the Children and media journalist (EJG) in promoting SZOP;

5. To assess the objectives and results of the project, particularly identifying political and all types of violence against students in school, identifying needs, problems, progress, lesson learned, policy gap of School as a Zone of Peace, exploring the capacities and opportunities of School as a Zone of Peace, sensitizing the civil society, collection of cases, success stories relevant to the project, and analyzing the effectiveness of partnership with media;
6. To identify emerging issues and lessons learnt as well as analyse internal strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and the areas for improvement and recommendations for SZOP implementation;
7. To assess the effectiveness of SZOP Public Service Announcement (PSA) and Radio jingles broadcast through different media (NTV, KTV and FMs radio);
8. To assess the effectiveness of SZOP in schools comparing the situation before and after the project ;
9. To document the project outcomes, and impacts and share learnings and challenges among project partners and stakeholders in terms of their relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability in terms of/related to the following table

Table 2: Implementation of SZOP

Relevancy in terms of	Effectiveness in terms of	Efficiency in terms of	The impacts on	Sustainability in terms of	Lessons learned related to
(a) consistency with the needs of target groups (b) involvement of the target groups in the implementation and subsequent ownership of the project (c) addressing the need of children.	(a) addressing the root causes of the problem (b) addressing the children's well being, and their needs.	(a) implementation modalities (b) utilization of the project resources, and contribution and participation of community in the implementation of the project	(a) the lives of children (b) intended and unintended positive as well as negative policy changes related to SZOP	(a) measures to ensure that the project achievements, results and interventions will be sustained after the phase over of the project (b) level of coordination and linkages with government line agencies.	(a) the success/failure cases, innovative approaches, and major challenges that can help to inform the project team in replication of the approaches and designing and developing new similar projects in future (b) quantitative, qualitative achievements of the actions against project goal, objectives, results, outcomes and impacts (c) local approaches to social peace (c) suggestions for community owned SZOP

2. Methodology

2.1 Process

The study team went through the following process to generate data from the centre and the field.

- (a) Desk review: The study team reviewed project documents, situation assessment report, district and national dialogue reports, media analysis, desk study reports, and international workshop reports. It also reviewed government laws, regulations, directives, guidelines, policies and programs, and international documents and guidelines on SZOP. The purpose of this review was to be familiar with SZOP intents, efforts, and directions.
- (b) Consultation with Save the Children staffs: The team developed evaluation scheme and plan and shared with SC Nepal PID Education team, PDQ, MEAL, Media director and SZOP focal person through email. In response the team obtained support to (a) identify sampling strategy and sample size (b) develop study tools (c) prepare field visit plan, and (d) get feedback over the tools, field plan, and draft report.
- (c) Field work: The team took a weeklong field work to gather and/or generate field data. It consulted different stakeholders of education and also visited schools in Bara, Dhanusha, Siraha, and Udayapur to assess EJC inputs to complement and enhance SZOP activities. On the way to Kathmandu from Udayapur the team visited SC eastern regional office in Biratnagar, Morang district, and discussed there on SZOP with the concerned authorities as well.

2.2 Study groups

The study team discussed with a wide range of stakeholders of education in the centre and the field. In the centre it consulted DOE, MOE, EJC, and FNJ. At the district it generated information from children, parents, PNGO members, DEO staffs, DCWB members, DCPC members, VCPC members, political leaders, child clubs members, teachers, SMC, PTA, VCPC, and Peace committee (appendix, 5).

2.3 Study tools

The study team prepared a master table for tool preparation. The table consisted of the study objectives, information to be collected/generated, informants to be consulted, and tools to be used. In line with this master table, sets of study tools were prepared (appendix, 6). These tools were reviewed by the members of the study team and the SC personnel for their content validity. The tools thus validated were administered in the field.

2.4 Data validation technique

The study team used different approaches to validate the field data. They were (a) since the team was comprised of bureaucrat, journalist, student, and educationist, the data were perceptually validated; (b) different sets of tools were used and the findings of each tool was crosschecked automatically; (c) the study team used to reflect the field data in each evening for their authenticity (d) the field findings were shared with the district education officer and hence automatically crosschecked (e) the field findings were reflected against the findings of the earlier studies.

2.5 Data analysis and interpretation

The field data were analyzed in line with the objectives of the study. In other words they were grouped accordingly and interpreted perceptually.

3. Findings and discussion

3.1 Organic approach to peace building

Three systems were in practice to promote peace process in the community i.e. *Panchayati*, *Maijani*, and *Daheli*. The *Panchayati* approach was practiced by all the community members of the study districts. In this practice, local elites gather voluntarily once any event of dispute occurs in the community. Sometimes they gather themselves and on other occasion the warring parties and/or the third group call them for *Panchayati*. The members of the *Panchayati* discuss with the parties in conflict and the neutral people of the community. After hearing them all, one of the *Panchayati* members announces the verdict or conclusion of the meeting over the case in discussion. This verdict is considered as final for the warring parties. If any one of the warring parties is unwilling to accept the verdict, the unsatisfied party is free to approach the other forums such as Village Development Committee, district administration or the Court for justice.

In *Maijani* approach, traditional leaders such as Maijan, Dewan, and Nayak settle the community disputes. These groups of the people once informed of the case assemble together, discuss with the representatives of both warring parties. On the basis of this discussion, Maijan gives his (almost) verdict. Although not much in practice at present, this approach was popular among the Madhesi communities of different caste and ethnicity. In fact each caste/ethnic group has its own *Maijani* system to maintain peace and harmony in the community.

Daheliz/Tablig is the third approach found to be in practice for conflict resolution. It is practiced to maintain peace in Muslim community of the study district. Molvis and other believers of the Koran usually gather every fortnight. They make a group of 5-6 persons and visit people door to door. They pass the message of the Koran and the Hadith for peace and harmony. To teach women of their neighbors, women's group also does the same kind of work.

But interestingly none of these organic approaches to maintain peace in the society was applied by this project. What it did is that it worked with the created groups of people like Child Clubs, Children's network, VCPC, and many others. It was also found that the potentiality of the organic approach to maintain peace was not discussed. In this sense the project's approach to maintain peace or ensure SZOP was not linked with the organic approach to peace building in communities.

3.2 Input of SZOP project

This project gave different inputs on SZOP initiatives through the following activities:

Table 3: Inputs for SZOP related activities

Activities	Date	Intent	Progress
Desk study on SZOP	April 2012	Review the earlier and ongoing activities	Identified SZOP related issues from books, reports, newspapers etc
SZOP workshop in Kathmandu	April 2012	Identify progress, problem and challenge related to SZOP	Shared the progress of the EJG activities and made the public aware of SZOP initiatives
District dialogue in Bara, Dhanusha,	June 2012	Obtain commitment of the district stakeholders for SZOP	Obtained commitment for SZOP and also informed the

Siraha and Udayapur		and let stakeholders know about the SZOP Implementing Guidelines issued by DOE to restore peace in school	stakeholders about the SZOP Guidelines and distributed it to them.
Interaction with SZOP stakeholders	May 2012	Ensure regular class in school without strike	Brought stakeholders together for a uniform voice against school closure in the name of agitation.
Journalist training	July 2012	Build capacity of the journalist for SZOP	Trained journalists on SZOP
SZOP national dialogue	August 2012	SZOP discussion with major political parties and secure their commitment	Discussed with political parties on SZOP, secured commitment of party leaders responsible for education sector
SZOP commitment from the chief of political parties	Oct 2012-March 2013	Obtain political commitment from major political parties	Secured written commitment to implement SZOP by chiefs of fifteen national level political parties
SZOP district review	December 2012	Review the commitment on SZOP and sensitize media	found weak implementation of the stakeholders' commitment on SZOP
Public hearing through TV talk on SZOP at NTV Forum Megha Talk Show	February 2013	Make people aware of SZOP status	Made public awareness on SZOP activities of different stakeholders of at school, district, and national levels
Publication of an edited book on SZOP: Concept and Status (in Nepali)	April 2013	Help academia and practitioners know about peace education and SZOP	Published 2500 copies of the 201 pages book on SZOP in Nepali language
Printing of a flex material for public display displaying leaders SZOP commitment and their say on it (in Nepali)	March 2013	Help general public and concerned stakeholders to know about leaders' commitment to implement SZOP	Printed 140 pieces of big and small size flex material for public display
Advocacy of Antenna Foundation produced jingles and PSAs in different languages and their broadcasting through different radios and TV channels	March 2013	Reinforce SZOP initiative	Made people aware of the importance of SZOP

Source, EJG report, 2013

3.3 Achievement obtained through SC inputs

The study team reviewed the documents, discussed with stakeholders of education in four different districts, reflected with EJG personnel, discussed with SC Regional Office in Biratnagar, Morang,

and analyzed the news clips. Out of these efforts the team found that EJG as an SZOP implementing partner of SC reached 681 stakeholders of education with the above activities (appendix,7). It also popularized the SZOP Guidelines among the stakeholders through discussion sessions, telecast, radio broadcast, and broadsheet publications. The achievements made through the initiatives were as follows:

- DEO formed District Coordination Committee for SZOP in all the working districts
- Some of the schools of the districts formed Child Protection Committee to enable students develop yearly plan, prepare code of conduct, take action against the petition, do advocacy, and conduct activities for the welfare of the children (SZOP Guidelines).
- Some schools organized community level interaction programs on SZOP. Schools of Dhanusha districts are the examples.
- Both national and district level Journalists wrote SZOP related news reports/articles.
- Media coverage on SZOP increased.
- Leaders of the national political parties and their district cadres showed their written commitments to SZOP (appendix, 8)
- SZOP Guidelines reached to the consulted stakeholders of education for its operational discussions
- Academia and practitioners received book on peace education for their increased knowledge
- Political leaders felt moral pressure to implement SZOP because of the public display of their written SZOP commitment.

The study team also made efforts to assess the effect of EJG's activities at the district and the school level. As the DEOs found, SZOP has been a project but not the agenda and/or campaign. They further said that it has been an event but not the movement as it was envisaged in the SZOP Guidelines. However, they said that some head teachers, teachers, members of the students' unions, SMC and PTA members, journalists, and political leaders were made aware of SZOP Guidelines. DEOs also accepted that the SZOP directive is yet to be distributed to every school. Ironically, they were dumped in the DEO office stores. The case was so in Bara, Dhanusha, and Siraha districts. Udayapur was different in this case because it received inadequate SZOP Guidelines to be distributed: the available one was already distributed to the teachers, head teachers, SMC and PTA members during their regular meetings.

DOE and MOE persons were of the opinion that SZOP process has been progressing smoothly. To them, it has become the agenda of the political parties, teachers' unions, and the schools. However, they accepted that DEO level authorities were yet to be made functional though they could make SZOP as priority program and/or integrate it in other activities as well; the DEO and the schools are supposed to be oriented accordingly.

DEOs were also of the opinion that there have been three factors that lead to the school closures: political, technical, and local. Political factors refer to the call of strike by the local and national political parties which results in school closure. Technical factors or cause of school closure mean the closure of school by the teachers' union/organization/forum in protest of recruitment, promotion, and deputation of teachers. Local causes of school shut down mean the schoolteachers and students who resort to educational strike for getting their demands fulfilled, the local/social ceremonies such as marriage that affect smooth operation of school and the internal conflict such as the tussle between the SMC and head teachers/teachers.

The analysis of Aasaman Nepal, one of the partner agencies of Save the Children in Dhanusha, showed that school closure due to national political strike has reduced; school closure due to local political conflict/strike has continued as it was; school closure due to technical cause was on the rise; and school closure due to local reasons has also continued. These closures occur with local events like when there is marriage party students do not come to school; when someone dies in the community teachers do not come to school; when there is *bhoj* (feast) in the community both the students and teachers do not come to school; and when there is disputes between SMC members, head teachers, and teachers themselves both the teachers and students do not come to school.

DEOs also accepted that District Coordination Committee for SZOP has been formed but remained non-functional. They also said that SZOP has not been their priority because it has not been the regular program of the DOE as it is not mentioned in the Red Book, it has no financial package to support, and it has not been the mandatory activity.

DEOs believed that teachers know the SZOP as slogan but don't know its essence, importance for students. They gave the proof that teachers have been forcing/luring their students to political parties' programs; giving schools' furniture and other materials for local festivals and wedding ceremony; and closing schools on any type of protests without taking risk to stop such unwanted closures.

Teachers of the studied districts had another problem. As they argued political leaders and their cadres did not give up their habit to threaten teachers and students; parents and guardians did not take risk to say "no" to the strike of any political parties. And hence teachers always felt insecure. In order to be secured in their profession they were compelled to lean with a political party. Their hope was that political party will protect them even if they are not dutiful for their assigned task. So they expected command from the concerned political party. The same idea was shared by the neutral teachers who argued that for political party affiliated teachers valued their party's command more than professionalism.

At the classroom level, teachers accepted that they have changed the habit of giving corporal punishment. Very few teachers know the techniques to discipline students without corporal punishment. Others were punishing their students by (a) using students of the same grade to punish the wrong doers (b) giving verbal punishment (humiliation) in the presence of the class. These two approaches the teachers applied as alternative means to maintain student discipline in place of corporal punishment negated SZOP intent of child friendly classroom/teaching. This suggests that teachers require alternative approach to discipline their students and this was not taught them during trainings they attended. The study team also found that teachers were holding the ideas that students should be controlled but how to do so without offending them was the unanswered question.

SMC members were arguing that teachers were irregular in school and instead they were paying more attention to the political parties they were affiliated to or taking care of their personal business. They viewed that teachers have become unruly. They were neither controlled by the students nor by the parents. They remarked that the teachers are not regulated by their professional organizations and monitored by the Resource Person and School Supervisors. However, the SMC members did not miss to give some of the names of the best doing teachers and the head teachers.

PTA members of the studied districts had a bit different perspectives. They were saying that teachers were not monitored and supervised by DEO and its officials. In their view, "teachers have been free bird".

VCPC and Child Club members were highlighting their efforts to make SZOP a success. As they remarked students were active to prepare code of conducts, protect children from difficult circumstance, generate fund, mobilize their friends for school cleanliness, organize inter and intra school competition programs such as quiz context. NGO partners of Save the Children like Aasaman Nepal, Red Cross, Indreni, Bhawani, and Child Development Society were also echoed VCPC and Child Club members. Yet, they too mentioned that some schools were implementing SZOP as it was envisioned and others were not doing so. The reason, according to the official of Bhawani, is that "teachers' positive attitude is important for SZOP and it is difficult to find out the teachers with right attitude."

The other stakeholders of education were found critical to the teachers' activities/performance. They were holding the experience that teachers were not paying attention to their profession. In their views, teachers' professional dishonesty remained the major stumbling block for SZOP implementation, that include no strike in school, no punishment to the students, and no irregularity of teachers in school for quality education.

Like the other stakeholders of education, district and local leaders of political parties were of the opinion that SZOP is okay up to school level for quality improvement but they were in need of the students and teachers' help as per the call of their national leaders. But the local level politicians of Nepaltar, Udayapur, were different: they had unanimously tried to make SZOP a success at least in their schools. Their local level commitment to make school peaceful and encourage teachers to be professional was commendable. The head teachers, teachers of these schools and some schools of Dhanusa were of the same category.

3.4 Visible changes on the ground

The analysis of these stakeholders of education and the observation of the study team showed that SZOP has been effective in those schools where head teachers are positive and convinced, teachers and head teachers have been working as family members for quality education, SMC and PTA members are active, local political leaders have been accommodative of different ideas for change and development. On the other hand SZOP was not effective where teachers and head teachers were not working as a team, SMC and head teachers had a clash, parents were mute spectators of any type of happenings and where students were not raising voices for their rights to obtain quality education. The table below shows the changes that SZOP made in selected schools of the studied districts though it was difficult to establish direct effect of the EJG's input on these.

Table 4: SZOP on the ground

SZOP worked because it	SZOP that did not work because the schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disciplined the stakeholders of education through code of conduct for different stakeholders of education • made strike organizers/ agitators aware of SZOP by displaying SZOP related flex board and hoarding board in schools • reduced the practice to take children in rally by making the political party aware of the importance of education for children • reduced the local practice to give schools for accommodating wedding parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not prepare code of conduct to make stakeholders of education aware of their duties • prepared code of conduct for different stakeholders of education but did not apply them in day to day life • hung SZOP related materials like the flex board and hoarding board but did not follow them

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduced strikes of the political parties • banned <i>panchayati</i> (community meetings) and <i>daruwa</i> (alcoholic person) in school • made local school monitoring group comprised of the SMC and PTA members • activated VCPC for child rights to ongoing education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relaxed the code of conduct for public consumption • could not form PTA
---	--

The analysis of the table above shows that (a) community level commitment for SZOP is required (c) regular monitoring of the local people is essential (c) intensive lobbying with the political parties is required (d) greater coordination among stakeholders is vital (e) regularized media mobilization for SZOP is a must and (f) good governance is prerequisite.

3.5. Cases on the ground

EJG documented SZOP related cases in its district interaction reports. Some of the cases highlighted the effective implementation of SZOP in schools. And some others showed the ineffective implementation status of SZOP. EJG also analyzed the media report on SZOP that also gave the similar sort of finding. Below is the list of the cases by the project districts.

Table 5: Success and failure case on SZOP

District	Success cases	Failure cases
Bara	A Police post was removed from a school Shree Nera Primary school, Kishanpur While another school was freed from being used as a cowshed following repeated efforts by the stakeholders who participated in SZOP dialogues.	Teachers' Union continuing with its commitment to SZOP by not resorting to any form of strike although the chair said their issues were not addressed by the concerned authority and they had a compelling situation to opt for agitation leading to school closure.
Dhanusha	Conflict of the Janaki Mandir secondary school has subsided, the classes were running regularly, but the case was yet to be resolved.	SZOP district coordination committee formed, but not functional
Siraha	Janata Primary School of Baluwa Gaun, Krishnapur VDC was closed for a year. This case came to light during the SZOP district dialogue and the DEO was asked in public to play role to reopen the school, resolve the conflict. The locals had divided between pro-head teacher and anti-head teacher who had appointed a PCF teacher and it had resulted in a clash. District Red Cross had played the role of mediator to resume the school which remained closed almost for a year due to the dispute of the local over the head teacher. The locals agreed to reopen the school on condition that the head teacher, Rana Mandal, is transferred. Mandal was replaced by Ashok Kumar Yadav. The PCF teacher abandoned the job owing to conflict.	Widespread practice of using school buildings during marriage ceremony, particularly to make shelter for the people coming with the bridegroom.

Udayapur	Higher Secondary School of Nepaltar started SZOP because SMC and teachers witnessed the conflicts between the State and the then warring party, the Maoists. So they localized 14 point SZOP codes into 5 points and implemented it. Now the school has Child Protection Committee. Teachers have developed their scheme to be self-regulated and controlled for quality education. And all the political parties are working for quality education by promoting SZOP. Head teacher, teachers, SMC, and PTA members of Higher Secondary School Bhalayotar developed and implemented code of conduct for teachers and students. The school has child club for students' regularity. It has it's saving as well. The school updates its teachers professionally and does social auditing to maintain transparency.	SZOP district coordination committee formed, but not working effectively, no district report made on SZOP progress/violation as provisioned in the SZOP national framework and Implementing Guidelines.
Kathmandu/central level	All Nepal teachers organization (a teachers grouping close to CPN-Maoist) withdraws its educational strike called for February 28, 2013. The announcement of withdrawal was made at EJG interaction following moral pressures. CPN-UML affiliated Youth Association slashes transportation strike hours during their strike in September, 2012 in order to enable students reach schools.	Nearly three dozens of political parties including CPN-Maoist called general strike for 10 February, 2013. Despite EJG's reminding of SZOP commitment made by that party, schools were also closed.

The cases above shows that SZOP was found successful where (a) head teachers were working as head of the family and teachers and students were working as family members (b) local political leaders have realized the importance of SZOP and its relation to education (c) PTAs were active to make school as zone of peace (d) parents were more concerned with the education of their children. But the failure cases showed that head teachers and teachers' negligence as well as inability to mobilize the human resources around was the major reason for SZOP failure. Similarly, the negligence on the part of the DEOs was also affecting effective implementation of SZOP. Lobby at the central level has paid off in some cases indicating that more lobbying is needed.

But the current study identified that teachers did their technical strike for job permanency, job security, and other programs; students resorted to school closure for better education; politicians did so for their influence; and political party cadres used strike to pressurize people. The box below gives the fresh reason for the closure of school at the community level.

<p style="text-align: center;">Reasons for school band/closure</p> <p>At the community level, schools were forced to shut down because of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teachers and head teachers' dispute • political parties' strikes • SMC election in case of Terai districts, transparency, and employment of the teachers • teachers' unions program • government policy to give <i>khaja</i> (snacks) to some schools and no <i>khaja</i> to the others
--

- disputes between SMC and head teachers
- teachers' licensing issue in Dhanusha that closed schools for 16 days. Only one school was reported to have remained opened but not because of SZOP

3.6 Effect of SZOP advocacy

The then Save the Children, Norway, introduced the concept of "Children as Zones of Peace (CZOP)" in Nepal. This concept promoted the idea of children's rights to education and the need of keeping school free from violence as well as political interferences. Then it formed the coalition of the social organizations working on child rights naming it CZOP in 2002. In the beginning Save the Children, Norway/Nepal, Child Workers in Nepal (CWIN), Institute of Human Rights Communication, Nepal (IHRICON) and Save the Children US were the member organizations of the CZOP. Now the coalition has 28 member organizations. The coalition organized public meetings and seminars to advocate the importance of SZOP. People now understand SZOP as an initiative to quality education, security of children, reduction of political interference, regularity of teachers and students in school, and reduction of discrimination based on caste, gender, religion, disability, ethnicity and the like.

As a project, EJG started SZOP advocacy a year ago. In course of the project, a couple of months ago, national and district political leaders expressed their written commitments to SZOP. These commitments have not been shared to the public through their political parties. SZOP Guideline is yet to be made available in all schools. SZOP committees of different levels are not functional as they should be. In this context, the study team found that it was too early to show the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of SZOP project and advocacy program. This view was supported by the responsible officials at the DOE and the DEO. On this ground the study team came to the understanding that SZOP initiative is relevant; advocacy strategy is worth continuing; MOE system has not been effective to deliver the SZOP Guidelines to the schools; the schools were not discussing over the SZOP Guidelines; and hence the impact and the sustainability of this initiative was yet to be ascertained.

In all, the study team found that (a) upper crust of the society has been made aware of SZOP but their awareness was yet to be translated into action (b) advocacy materials were prepared and tested but they are yet to be popularized (c) MOE SZOP Guideline has been prepared and limitedly distributed but it was not discussed widely among teachers, parents, community leaders and students of individual school (d) journalist group has been mobilized for advocacy but it has not been institutionalized (e) partner NGOs have been mobilized but they have not owned SZOP as their own program rather they have taken it as a project for them (f) different structures have been constituted to reach at children but they are yet to be encouraged for joint planning, implementation, monitoring, and post planning for further action (g) political parties have shown their written commitments for the successful implementation of SZOP but they have not oriented their cadres and sister organizations from their side.

3.7 SWOT on SZOP initiative

The study team reflected on the field data and tried to figure out the strengths, weakness, opportunity, and threat of SZOP initiative. The table below gives the SWOT report.

Table 6: SWOT report on SZOP

Strength	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the stakeholders of education seek and talk on SZOP • In some schools local political parties, regardless of their differences have been working together to make school a zone of peace • Students and teachers have been mobilized for SZOP • Parents are taking interest to work for SZOP by joining hands with PTA in school and VCPC in the community • Political parties have shown their theoretical commitment to SZOP. Some of the political parties have translated this commitment into action
Weakness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are different forms of structures at the district and the community to make SZOP happen. But they are not institutionally responding to each other • SZOP program has not been backed by money, human resource, and Red Book program for the government functionaries. It has been an event to the journalists rather than a movement to be continued. • Schoolteachers and politicians are yet to internalize the intent of SZOP as their own program for the students
Opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the government and I/NGOs are working together right from center to the grassroots for SZOP • National, districts, and local political leaders have shown their written commitments for the implementation of SZOP • Teachers' Unions have shown their commitment and they have also prepared code of conduct to implement SZOP programs • Peoples have been made aware of SZOP through different types of advocacy programs.
Threat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SZOP-commitment - political parties that have signed SZOP commitment have not oriented their cadres on the issue from their system. So the local and district political leaders and the activists were not necessarily paying attention to the signed SZOP agreement. • Teachers' unions of different forms have been closing schools for their own agendas at the local and the district levels

The SWOT analysis above gave a clue that parents and students were in need of SZOP. But the teachers' unions of different types and the political parties are sincere to put their SZOP commitments into practice. At the same time the DEO system was not functioning as it was envisaged. I/NGOs are also changing their agendas/priorities and the program location.

3.7 Issues on the ground

Different stakeholders of education identified the following issues that came out of SZOP operation in the field. They are:

(a) Structural issue

- Save the Children, UNICEF, and World Education have been working with different partners for SZOP in the study districts. But the study team found that none of these agencies were coordinating with each other for effective operation of SZOP initiative.
- Partner NGOs were also doing the same in the field. For instance, Aasaman Nepal has been working for SZOP with Save the Children in Dhanusha. In its project schools, there were signboards on peace, code of conduct for students, parents, teachers, and SMC members.

Almost the same activities were reported with UNICEF and World Education partners as well. But these PNGOs had no operational coordination for SZOP. This showed that both the development partners and their NGO partners possess the same mindset, the mindset for "free show" activities.

- Different organizations have been working for SZOP on the ground with their own structure. For instance, District Child Welfare Board and Save the Children like development partners formed VCPC for child protection. The SZOP Guidelines provisioned child protection committee at school and district monitoring committee in district level. Some other development partners federated child clubs and developed child network at VDC level. But interestingly all these SZOP related structures in one or in other way were not aligned with definite SZOP implementing/monitoring structures no matter whether it is of the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Local Development, or Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare. This had created role confusion among the SZOP promoters of varied structures.
- There were different structures working for children. To name some, they were District Child Welfare Board, SZOP Monitoring Committee, District Child Network, Paralegal Committee (UNICEF), and VCPC. These structures were not found responding to each other at least on the ground. As the study found INGOs were not working together because of their intentional differences, source differences, and thinking differences.

(b) Operational issue

- DEOs of all the study districts had developed operation calendar on education. But none of these districts were found reviewing their calendars and rescheduling their programs right after the strike and any other types of disturbances in school. These calendars were turned to be decorative materials to be hanging on the walls.

(c) Commitment issue

- National, district, and local political parties and teachers' unions of varied types have shown their written commitments on SZOP. But these commitments were not communicated by their chain of commands. Because of this situation, party cadres at the community level were not getting directions from their national leaders. So was the case with the teachers' unions to their member organizations and the members. This means the SZOP commitments of different political parties and teachers' union were turned out to be "stand alone business" of its activists.
- All the schools had no flex report of the SZOP commitments of the national political leaders, district political leaders, and local political leaders. So was the case with the commitments of teachers' unions. In other words, these commitments were not systematically discussed at the school and the community levels to ensure SZOP.

(d) SZOP Guidelines related issue

- The SZOP Guidelines was not available in all schools: They were dumped in the DEO stores at Bara, Dhanusha, and Siraha districts. In case of Udayapur, they were inadequate to be distributed at the school levels. Even the distributed SZOP Guidelines were not shared with the students, teachers, political leaders, and SMC as well as PTA members.

(e) Accommodation issue

- Community people witnessed different generations of local management to maintain peace. *Maijan* system, *Sarpanch*, VDC, Political mechanism, VCPC, and Child Protection Committee. Almost all of these systems are in operation. But they were not institutionally

responding to each other. Because of this reason community people were confused as to where to go for child protection service. In fact they go everywhere as per their convenience.

(f) Accountability issue

- On the ground DEO officials and the head teachers thought that SZOP is NGOs' job and NGOs thought that it is the job of government's mechanism. The reason is that SZOP INGOs were actively involved in preparing the SZOP document and they were expected to be in the forefront. This is where problem has arisen for implementation. INGOs continued with their old *moha* (brain child) and the government did not care for their structure and funding sources
- I/NGOs usually shift their agendas and hence there is a problem to the government to implement SZOP program as its own agenda though Save the Children has been implementing MEAL as follow up to SZOP

(g) Disciplining issue

- Teachers have been trained in conflict management, child friendly schools, violence free education, and SZOP. Despite these efforts, teachers were mentioning about their problems to discipline the students. Here the issue is not training but to prepare teachers for unobtrusive approach to discipline the children.

3.8 Problems occurred

The study team identified various types of problems related to SZOP implementation. These problems were as follows:

- Almost all schools of Udayapur have SMC and PTA. Some of the schools have Child Protection Committee at school level and VCPC at VDC level. But the situation was different in Bara, Siraha, and Dhanusha: there were no SMCs and PTA in all schools. The reason was that teachers were hesitant to form PTA because they were of the opinion that it will control them. Local politicians, teachers and head teachers' interest to form SMC were not synchronized: they were pulling their hands in different directions. Because of these "pulling games" there were no SMC and PTA in many schools of Bara, Dhanusha, and Siraha districts.
- District Coordination Committee for SZOP was formed in all the studied districts but they were found inactive to perform their prescribed roles. The argument of DEOs of the study district was that there is no focal person to be responsible for it, there is no money to support its activities, and there is no program in the Red Book. These arguments were enough to understand that DEO will not be able to implement SZOP Guidelines as it has been entrusted to them. What they need was money to support, program in the Red Book, and focal person to be contacted. But none of them were available in the districts and then SZOP Guidelines had remained non-implemented. In fact it was implemented only in those areas where NGOs were working with the schools. As NGOs they too have been shifting from one theme to the next theme and one area to the next. In non-NGOs' program area SZOP was the cry in the wilderness: there was no activity as such.
- There was oral and written commitment of different stakeholders of education for SZOP. But these district and school level commitments were inadequately translated into action. The DEO and its school level functionaries were not giving priority to this program. According to one of the DEOs the reason is that SZOP has no money, no mention in ASIP as DOE program, and no compulsion to implement it.

- SZOP covers the wide spectrum of areas i.e. from political consensus to financial transparency, child friendly school, and non-violent environment at home, school, and community. But these programs were not encapsulated into a single activity with its varied components.
- Though SZOP taught teachers to avoid corporal punishment, the teachers continued their approach to tame students through *Murga banaune* (hen-sitting), *plane banaune* (standing on one leg while spreading hands out), putting pencils between fingers and pressing hard to cause ache and peers beating. These teachers were not getting alternatives of corporal punishment to discipline students.
- VCPC worked in different ways. In Udayapur it worked as core agency for child protection; in Siraha it mobilized community; and in other districts it worked as child protection center. But the Child Protection Committee of the individual school envisaged in SZOP Guidelines was yet to be institutionalized because it was quite new for the community.

The gaps

The study team reviewed literatures, reflected the field findings, and then identified the gaps. As the team found, there are gaps in (a) understanding the SZOP intent. The political leaders understood that it is an event to show their commitment. Because none of the SZOP commitment signing political parties was reorienting their district, VDC/municipality level leaders and cadres to abide by the national leaders' commitments through their own structure (b) National Coordination Committee though held meeting for three times for the effective implementation of SZOP in the last two years was not making headway except for distributing the Guidelines to the DEOs. (c) District Monitoring Committee of the study districts was not functional and hence Child Protection Committee were not formed in all the schools though NGOs were working there for child rights (d) there were different forms of children related organizations. The heads and the members of these organizations were working in isolation though they were talking for coordination and collaboration (e) DEOs were looking for additional budget and focal person for SZOP implementation. MOE and DOE officials were of the opinion that SZOP should be mentioned in DEP and SIP with its own budget and human resource arrangement. They were also saying that SZOP should not be a separate program as such but it should be integrated in every program related to quality education: the DEO level functionaries were not in a position to implement these thoughts into action (f) with some exceptions, schools were not taking SZOP as their program: rather it had been the program of DEO/NGOs (g) media advocacy on SZOP had been an event that demands collaborative undertakings with the media right from grassroots to the center. But the current project had no provision as such.

4. Learning and way forward

This study gave different forms of learning. Along with this learning it also indicated the way forward as well. Below is the categorized learning and the way forward for the years to come:

Reorientation for SZOP

At the apex level, there was a belief that preparing Guidelines and suggesting the district and local level functionaries work as it is envisaged. Political leaders were also holding the same belief. But the learning is that Guidelines and political commitment did not work as it should be. Here the way forward is to reorient the district and field level functionaries with the required resources and/or technical knowhow to integrate SZOP with other activities. The next way forward is that the commitment showing political parties and their leaders should be persuaded to reorient their leaders and the cadres working at the district and the local governance level.

Culturally there have been different approaches to maintain peace in the community. *Panchayati*, *Maijani*, and *Daheli* are some of these approaches that were found in the study districts. But these approaches were not linked with SZOP advocacy strategy. This learning requires collaborative undertakings among the peace keeping cultural groups, media personnel, and other SZOP promoters.

Integration of SZOP

SZOP at the district level has been a project work. This has neither been dovetailed with other programs nor has it got its own priority. This learning gives a way forward i.e. DEO and its functionaries including school should be trained for blending SZOP with their regular programs or they should be supported to make SZOP a movement.

Structural readjustment

There are different structures to reach children at different levels. The personnel of these structures are not working together as joint planning, joint programming, joint monitoring, and many more. This learning paves a way to discuss with Ministry of Social Welfare, Women, and Children; Ministry of Education at the central level; and I/NGOs working for child rights. Discussion sessions should be organized at the district level with Child Welfare Board; INGO partners, DEO, and Eco Club organizing agencies. At the VDC and school level, there should be the similar types of discussion sessions. Following these discussions consensual solutions should be obtained to work with the single structure or to work collaboratively.

MOE has its own structure to work; the political parties have their own. So is the case with development partners. But they all are working for the school in one or in other way. This demands a forum at VDC/Municipality to coordinate SZOP activities at the local level. District Monitoring Committee can work as coordinating agency of the SZOP forums.

SZOP has many programs. But these programs are not encapsulated to reach at children's level. This learning requires for school based initiative because EJG's effort to SZOP has been confined to peace for education i.e. peace from outside: internal peace or peace education and/or peace within is yet to be made a part of the program.

Partnership with media

Journalists of different media have been oriented and reoriented for SZOP. But these media personnel were not getting regular support to continue reporting on SZOP. Because of this lacking media advocacy programs were turned into SZOP event. This learning gives the room to design and develop long term partnership with media personnel of different locations. Partnership with the journalists should include local public hearing, investigation, publicity, and reflection sessions at different levels. This can be done in cooperation with working journalists, media house, and media forum as project and/or as their social obligation. It demands that media personnel should work as a bridge to the government functionaries and development partners/INGOs and other SZOP promoting agencies.

EJG worked with the central and the district level stakeholders of education this time. It is yet to reach at school and community level stakeholders. This learning requires long term partnership with media to work with community people to the people at the policy levels. This proposed program will be helpful for EJG to establish operational relation with various structures related to school as zone of peace.

Similarly, production of jingles and PSAs in different languages and their broadcasting through different radios and TV channels should also be continued. Many people with whom the study team talked about SZOP said that the PSAs and jingles could reinforce people's awareness on SZOP.

Multilayer intervention for SZOP

SZOP demanded multilayer interventions to reach at school. It required discussion with school authorities, students, community, structure of political parties, journalists, MOE structures, and children related structures simultaneously. This learning looks for multi-pronged approach to SZOP at one stroke.

Expansion of SZOP initiative

Quality education has been a concern of all stakeholders of education. It has also been established that SZOP and students' learning achievement has positive relation. This learning always looks for effective SZOP implementation in all schools. This means community people, local political leaders, students' unions, schoolteachers, and many other stakeholders of education should be informed of this type of research findings. Local elites should also be encouraged to undertake similar research at RC level.

SZOP demands long term intervention. This realization of different stakeholders of education indicates that I/NGOs and DOE should develop long term partnership to declare SZOP school, SZOP VDC, SZOP RC, and SZOP district. For this to happen they should prepare SZOP volunteers in each community and in school as initiators, mobilizers, facilitators, and monitors.

Encapsulating training for SZOP

Since teachers have received different types of trainings, there is need of focusing on SZOP related issues during such trainings. This learning demands encapsulated teacher trainings that will have alternatives to discipline students and many more.

SZOP has experience that programs like (a) literacy boost (b) reading circle provide alternative route to continue education for the students even in the days of education or general strikes. This experience should be expanded as alternative to provide learning opportunities for the students.

Envisioning SZOP for future

Both experience and research prove that SZOP program has been found as an effective initiative to create learning environment for children. Keeping this finding in mind the study team suggests (a) integrating SZOP contents with different components and their programs of Save the Children's projects (b) packaging child related programs such as child friendly school into SZOP umbrella (c) stopping to implement piecemeal programs like media advocacy, quality education, social dialogue, and many more as separate programs (d) addressing political parties, child right organizations, and human right organization with a single stroke for SZOP (e) encapsulating peace, peace education, and education for peace programs into one to reach at individual child.

5. Appendices

Appendix 1

EJG consulted people through Dialogue on Education School as Zone of Peace
National Workshop, April 20 2012 Kathmandu

s.n	Name	Organization	Email	Contact
1	Jagadish Dahal	CIF	info@cif.org.np	9851108195
2	Roshna Subba	EJG	roshna44@yahoo.com	9841499498
3	Sujeet Kumar Jha		sujitjha100.80@gmail.com	9844101567
4	Lxmi Paudyal	SC	laxmi.paudyal@gmail.com	9841488547
5	Rishi Rai		rai.rishni@gmail.com	9743014337
6	Ananda Paudel	NCED	paudel.ananda@gamil.com	9841358531
7	Laxman Pd. Bashyal	DOE	lbashyal@hotmail.com	9841400221
8	Geeta Rana	National PABSAN	Changugeeta@gmail.com	9851010226
9	Dr. Nakul Baniya	MOE	nbaniya@hotmail.com	9841907690
10	Sunil Hakaju Shrestha	CZOPP	sunilhakaju@yahoo.com	9803772957
11	Suprabhat Bhandari			9851083000
12	Rajan Parajuli	Antenna Foundation	rajan@afn.org.np	9851044446
13	Prakash Silwal	EJG	silwal.prakash@gmail.com	9841216176
14	Padam Prasad Paudel	Teachers Union	padampnd@gmail.com	9751050232
15	Pramod Ayam	EJG		9841284031
16	Bashudev Timashina	EJG/TTV	basukomail@gmail.com	9841351211
17	Ram Chandra Maharjan	Radio Kantipur	ramavash@gmail.com	9841689365
18	ShiShir Sharma	EJG		9841575060
19	Umesh Pokhrel	EJG	pokhrel.umesh@gmail.com	
20	Sudarshan Sigdel	EJG /Ajako Shikshya	sigdel@gmail.com	9841528710
21	Goma Chhetri	Save The Children		
22	Laxmi Paudel	Save The Children		
23	Bidur Raj Giri	MOE	bidurraj@yahoo.com	9841449025
24	Sarswoti Bhusal	EJG	saraswotibhusal@gmail.com	9849781288
25	Ananta Ghimire	AFN	ghimireanant@gamil.com	9851121352
26	Raral Dhital	CZop		9851049887
27	Udaya Manandhar	Save The Children		
28	Suno Pyadurel Silwal	RRN	suno@rrn.org.np	
29	Uttam Karki	EJG	myuttamkarki@gmail.com	9849595889
30	Baikuntha Prd Aryal	District Education Offi.	bparyalog@gmail.com	9851138744
31	Rajendra Baniya	Pabson	rajendrabaniya@yahoo.com	9851091577
32	Madan Dhungana	ABC TV	dna_madan@yahoo.com	9851026283
33	Rudra Pangen	The Himalaya Times	rudra.pangeni@gmail.com	9841491363
34	Hari Naupane	EJG/ Sagarmatha TV	journalist.neupane@gmail.com	9841670878
35	Akkal Dunwar	Sagarmatha TV		9849051104
36	Ram Chitrakar	" "		
37	Sudeep Gyawali	Capital FM	sudeep.gya@gmail.com	9849940333
38	Babu Ram Thapa	NNTA	baburamt81gamil.com	9841297938
39	Rajkumar Tamang	ABC TV	gng.antim86@gmail.com	9813308123
40	Tirtharaj Bhusal	Mero FM	tirthavsl@gmail.com	9851088548
41	Nanda lal Tiwari	EJG	ejgtiwari@gmail.com	9841207245

42	pradip Neupane	Rajdhani	pradipneupane137@gmail.com	9841433875
43	Ratna Upreti	Child Nepal	ratna@cildnepal.org	9841327703
44	Deepak Dahal	EJG	dh.mydip@gmail.com	9851023828
45	Nirjala Kakshypati	EJG		
46	Shova Bhattra	EJG		

Peace-Building Through Dialogue on Education School as Zone of Peace
District Dialogue, June 5, 2012 Dhanusa

s.n	Name	Organization	Email	Contact
1	Meghnath Yadav	Nepal Teacher Union		9854025587
2	Prasannath Chaudhary			9744010010
3	Surat Lal Yadav	Nepal Teacher Union		9744008522
4	Rajaram Yadav	Aashman- Nepal		9844100787
5	Manuja Baral	DEO Dhanusa		9841493924
6	Uday Chandra Shah			9744002040
7	Rajendra Kumar Jha	Leader of Student		9844167800
8	Bijaya Mast	Y-world, Avohintear	bijaya.mast@gmail.com	9844032190
9	Saroj Kumar Misra			9844189273
10	Birendra Chaudhary	Youth HRB Bhumij		9804812343
11	Khusbu Thakur	Youth College		
12	Kanchan Thakur	Youth College	khusbhu16_prences80@yahoo.com	9724144113
13	Santosh Kumar Yadav	Youth College		
14	Sandip Kafle	Youth College	sandipkafle@99yahoo.com	9816940180
15	Bharat Paudel	Youth College		9844110367
16	Shiv Kumar Jha	Shree Janaki School		9804800743
17	Birmadra Pathak	Nepal National Teacher		9844053605
18	Sushil Jha	Shree Janaki School		9804802185
19	Laljisaram Yadav			9844097575
20	Yougeshwor Yadav	Nepal National		9844027478
21	Ranjit Kumar Jha	Free lancer Student	ranjitjha@yahoo.com	9844221346
22	Purushottam Subedi			
23	Digambar Pathak			9844052122
24	Ram Pd. Dahal			9844243196
25	Aditya Rohan Kr.Jha			9816849876
26	Dhiraj Kumar Tiwari			984412800
27	Ram Hirdaya Yadav	Rijinal College		9816837675
28	Hirmathu Chaudhary			
29	aatish Kumar Misra	Himalaya TV	aatish.ahk@gmail.com	9844030212
30	Amar Chandra			9744001975
31	Bijaya Kumar Chaudhary	shree janaki School		9844116919
32	Santosh Kumar Yadav	Nepali Congress		9844020535
33	P. Bijaya Datta	Human Rights		9854022882
34	aashpa Kumar Misra	Nepal National Teacher Union		9814849724
35	Ananta Ghimire	Anntena Foundation	ghimirequand@gmail.com	9851121352

36	Ram aasish Yadav	nepal Journalist Federation	jfrn_ryadav@yahoo.com	9844020059
37	Prakash Silwal	EJG	silwal.prakash@gmail.com	9841216176
38	Sujit Kumar Jha	EJG	sujitjha100.80@gmail.com	9844101567
39	Mohan Paswan	N.T.U.		9844118126
40	Niraj Kumar Chaudhary			
41	Shree Krishna Shrestha	Kanya School		9807820344
42	Nilam Thakur	"		9804841949
43	Yanika Kumari Shah	"		
44	Jebe Prabin	"		
45	Maya Khadka	"		
46	Batuk Nath Jha	Madhesh Post	batukjha91@gmail.com	9844119746
47	Shyam			9854025421
48	Pramod Mahat	Save the Children	pramod.mahat@savethechildren.org	9842487202
49	Suresh Yadav	Nagarik Daily		
50	Amar Kanta Thakur			
51	Brisesh Yadav	Kantipur TV		
52	Dinesh Kumar	Youth Human R.		
53	Laxman Yadav	Janakpur today		9844020051
54	Jagadish Rai			
55	Ram Sundar Shah	Dhanusa		
56	Shambhu Shah	Shree Janaki School		9854024770
57	Rameshwor Mahara			9724148900
58	Shatyanarayan Paswan			9816811606
59	Anil Misra	Kantipur TV	anil.kantipur@gmail.com	9844020679
60	Sanjiv Mandal		sanjivkr44@gmail.com	9849904278
61	Birendra Kumar Yadav			9854026540
62	Mo. Ibrahim Rain	Janaki School		
63	Rajesh Kumar Karna	Janakpur F M		
64	Ram Kumar Shah	Janaki School		9854020470
65	Apeksha Thakur	"		
66	Jyoti Kumari Mandal	"		
67	Nandalal Tiwari	EJG		
68	Amrit Kumar Pathak	PYC		
69	Rakesh Kumar Pathak	Nobel College		
70	Nabin Kumar Mahatto	Janaki School		
71	Gudu Kumar Shah	"		
72	Puran Shah	Himalaya Times		9844126588
73	Ramesh Ghimire			9844100232

Appendix 2



Appendix 3

Cases documented by EJG

1. During district review in Siraha, it was found that a Police post was removed from a school Shree Nera Primary school, Kishanpur While another school was freed from being used as a cowshed following repeated efforts by the stakeholders who participated in SZOP dialogues.
2. In case of Dhanusa district, conflict of the Janaki Mandir secondary school has subsided, the classes were running regularly, but the case was yet to be resolved.
3. Janata Primary School of Baluwa Gaun, Krishnapur VDC of Bara district was closed for a year. This case came to light during the SZOP district dialogue and the DEO was asked in public to play role to reopen the school, resolve the conflict.

The locals had divided between pro-head teacher and anti- head teacher who had appointed a PCF teacher and it had resulted in a clash. District Red Cross had played the role of mediator to resume the school which remained closed almost for a year due to the dispute of the local over the head teacher. The locals agreed to reopen the school on condition that the head teacher, Rana Mandal, is transferred. Mandal was replaced by Ashok Kumar Yadav. The PCF teacher abandoned the job owing to conflict.

Appendix 4 EJG media analysis

Padlocking and closure in school

Based on news reports in 6 Nepali dailies in 2068 BS(15 April 2011-14 April 2012)

- Private/Institutional school: 16 times
- Govt/Community school: 39 times
- University: 22 times
- University Grant Commission: 2 times
- Higher Secondary Education Board: 2 times
- Department of Education: 1 time
- CTEVT: 3 times
- Campus: 5 times
- TU central department: 6 times

96 incidents of padlocking or closures

Appendix 5 Consulted personnel during evaluative study

Day: First

Place: Bara

1. Bhola Aalam, Resource Person, Bara, Kalaiya
2. Hari Raut, Section Officer
3. Subash Shah, Journalist
4. Mahamma Aalam Ansari, N-PABSON President
5. Shiv Shankar Mishra, Journalist, Gorkhapatra
6. Laxmi Shah, FNJ Bara, President, Journalist, Kantipur
7. Gokul Ghorsaili, Journalist, Nepal Samacharpatra
8. Raj Mahambad Raya
9. Arun Koirala, DEO, Bara
10. Rashmi Shrestha, Mahila tatha Balbalika Sewa Kendra

Day: Second

Place: Dhanusa

1. Sujit Kumar Jha, Journalist
2. Surait Thakur, Journalist, President Life Nepal (Involved in Ashman Nepal previously)
3. Ishwor Khatri, Save the Children
4. Ram Ashesh Yadav, FNJ Dhanusha Chairman
5. Rupkumar Yadav, Ashman Nepal
6. Rajaram Yadav, SZOP Focal Person
7. Dilip Kumar Yadav, Ashman Nepal

8. Dineshwar Shah

Day: Third

Place: Dhanusha

Surya Narayan Thakur Shree Rashtriya Pra.Bi., Shantipur -6, Dhanusha

Manisha Mahara, Class 2; Kusum Khatun, Class 2; Lokesh Kumar Sharma, Class 2; Shahdatta Shekh
the students:

Shree Ni.Ma.Bi., Dhalkebar 7, Dhanusha

Dharmadas Singh, Head Teacher

Palat Mahato, Teacher

Surya Narayan Mahato, Teacher

Manoj Kumar Singh, Teacher

Students

Sunil Kumar Thakur, Class 7

Manoj Mahato, Class 7

Mahesh Mahato, Class 8

Siba Dhari Mahato, Class 8

Sulekha Kumari Mahato, Class 8

Babita Mahato, Class 8

Day: Fourth

Place: Siraha

Shree Bal Mandir Madhyamik Bidhyalaya

Shree Narayan Yadav, Head Teacher and President at Madhesi Teachers Union

Rajesh Kumar Karna, SMC Head

Jagadish Dash, Teacher of Shree Pra.Bi. Sikrenti

Mithiles Yadav, Journalist

District Education Office, Siraha

Khadananda Parajuli, DEO

Arjun Thapaliya, Journalist

Sambhu Bhattarai, Under Secretary

Red Cross, Siraha

Kishori Yadav, District President, Madheshi Janadhikar Forum

Rajdevi Yadav, Red Cross President

Dinesh Yadav, Central Committee Member of ANNFSU

Debnarayan Yadav, Journalist, Kantipur

Indreni, Siraha, Golbazar

Tejilal Lama, program officer, education

Sanjib Yonjan, Sr. C.M.

Sanjib Kumar Shah, JSC

Nir Bahadur Ale, Program officer

Dilip Kumar Ishwar

Suman Syangwa

Pan Bahadur Lama, President

Bhawani Integrated Program
Rambabu Shah, Program coordinator
Mahesh Kumar Chaudhari, MEAL assistant
Lalita Daash, School Health and Nutrition
Lalit Narayan Chaudhari
Sujit Kumar Chaudhari
Khila Niraula, Sr. Project Coordinator, Save the Children
Bhima Rai, Save the Children

Day: Fifth
Place: Udayapur
Deerghadhwaj Chapagain, DEO, Udayapur
Shree Secondary School, Nepaltar

Gopal Khatri, SMC President
Khamba Bahadur Thapa Magar, Ex Head Teacher
Devi Bahadur Rai, Resource Person
Dambar Bahadur Karki, Parent
Ghanashyam Katuwal, Parent
Yambar Bahadur Khatri, Parent
Basudev Dhakal, Nepali Congress
Sarad Prasad Bhattarai
Dhan Bahadur Karki, UML
Durga Giri, Parent
Kedar Bahadur Basnet, Teacher
Nabaraj Bhattarai, Parent
Jaganath Kafle, Parent
Mahesh Prasad Dhungana, Parents
Rituraj bhattarai, Parent
Ishwar Prasad Bhattarai, SMC member, Panchawati
Dhanbir Tamang, UNCP-M
Bina Bishwakarma, SMC member
Nirmala Bishwakarma
Mira Karki, parent
Laxmi Karki, Bal Samrakshyan Secretary
Rewati Magar, Field Officer, Bal Bikas Samaj, Nepal
Hari Magar, Bal Bikas Samaj, Udayapur
Madhab Bhattarai, Parent
Suman Biswakarma, Parents
Bhima Rai, Save the Children
Nathuni Ram Mochi, Save the Children

Shree Higher Secondary School, Bhalayadada -1, Udayapur
Dinanath Dahal, Head Teacher
Bhesaraj Thapa Magar, SMC president
Anita Kumari Magar, Teacher
Chitrakala Khapangi Magar, Teacher Baljyoti Primary School, Gohiya
Rajan Raut, Teacher, Shree Higher Secondary School
Narayan Thapa, Ni.Ma.Bi. Naretar

Birendra Prasad Yadav, Teacher, Shree Higher Secondary School
 Kedar Bahadur Basnet, Teacher, Ni.Ma.Bi. Chiyabari
 Bhaktakumar Rai, Shree Panchawati Higher Secondary School, Udayapur Gadhi
 Hira Kumar Karki, Shree Secondary School, Bohoribot Nepaltar
 Syam Khatri, Teacher, Shree Higher Secondary School
 Ambika Magar, Teacher Shree Higher Secondary School

Day: Six
 Place: Biratnagar

Bikram Niraula, FNJ chairman
 Nabaraj Kattel, Focal person
 Khilanath Niraula, Save the children
 Bhima Rai, Save the Children

Place: Kathmandu

Ganesh Poudel, SZOP Focal person at DOE
 Dr. Roj Nath Pandey (in an informal talk)
 Dr. Lawa Dev Awasthi (in an informal talk)
 Mahashram Sharma (in an informal talk)

Place: Pokhara

Participants of Education Program Learning Group of Save the Children in 14-16, June, 2013

6. Study tools

FGD guideline for Parents

Content	Core area	Probing questions
Introduction	Will you please give me your introduction?	(Caste?), Age?, Education? Occupation?
Relevancy of the SZOP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SZOP programs' consistency with its objective • involvement of the target groups in SZOP activities • ownership of SZOP initiative • importance of the project for the children 	<p>Please give your ideas about peace building in community? How is it important for the children?</p> <p>What have been the indigenous peace keeping practices of this school and the community?</p> <p>How is SZOP working in this area?</p> <p>How has SZOP linked with the indigenous approach to peace building process?</p> <p>Will you please tell me how is SZOP affecting people and activities here?</p> <p>Who are involved in such activities?</p>

		Is this program important for the children? How?
Effectiveness of the SZOP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • address to the root cause of the conflict and violence • children's wellbeing of their needs through this project 	<p>What do you think are the main causes of conflict and violence at school and the community?</p> <p>How do you think did the SZOP work on ending those causes?</p> <p>Do you think the SZOP effective to resolve the conflict?</p> <p>How did SZOP work on well being of children?</p>
Efficacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment of project modality • utilization of the available resources • contribution of the partnering groups viz school, parents, community and other agencies for the implementation of this project 	<p>Did you like the modality of this programme? Why did you like/ dislike SZOP?</p> <p>Who were involved in this Programme and how? (school, parents, community and other agencies for the implementation of this project)</p>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intended and unintended changes brought by the project at students, parents, teachers, community people, policy formulation 	<p>What are the intended and unintended changes? Regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armed personal and their activities? • Political activities at school? • Discrimination to the students? • Misconducts at school? • Violence? • Negligence? • on students, parents, teachers, community people, policy formulation?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • phase over plan of the school, community, and the partnering agencies • level of coordination and linkages with GOs and NGOs 	<p>What kind of activities done for the long-term effect of SZOP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With someone's support • With someone's linkage and coordination • Without any others' support
Lesson learnt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning from the successful case and learning from failure case 	<p>What did the concerned people learn from this SZOP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students • parents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • innovation approaches if any • major challenges • possible initiatives for replication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teachers • community people • politicians • any others <p>Did you find any innovative ideas related to this SZOP initiative?</p> <p>What are the major challenges on SZOP?</p> <p>How do you think that can overcome?</p> <p>Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the program?</p>
--	--	---

<p>In the end please mention what did you learn from SZOP; what did you do and what is your plan to materialize the SZOP initiatives?</p>

FGD Guidelines for Children

- What are the activities that you do in school?
- How are they related to SZOP initiatives?
- How did you find these programs?
- (Liked/disliked and Why?) What did you learn from it?
- How did you use the knowledge learnt to maintain peace in your school, home and community?
- What kinds of effect you noticed in them?
- What is your suggestion for long-term peace in school, at home and the community?
- In the end please mention what did you learn from SZOP; what did you do and what is your plan to materialize the SZOP initiatives?

FGD guidelines for Teachers

Content	Core questions	Probe question
Introduction	Will you please give me your introduction?	(Caste?), Age?, Education? Others
Relevancy of the SZOP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SZOP programs' consistency with its objective • involvement of the target groups in SZOP activities • ownership of SZOP initiative • importance of the project for the children 	<p>Please give your ideas about peace building at your school. How is it important for the children?</p> <p>What have been the indigenous practices for conflict resolution?</p> <p>How is SZOP working at this school?</p> <p>How has this SZOP liked with the indigenous practice?</p> <p>Will you please tell me how is it affecting students and activities here?</p> <p>Who are involved in such activities and how?</p> <p>Is this program important for the students how?</p>
Effectiveness of the SZOP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • address to the root cause of the conflict and violence • children's wellbeing of their needs through this project 	<p>What do you think are the main causes of conflict and violence in school area?</p> <p>How do you think did the SZOP work on ending those causes?</p> <p>Do you think the SZOP be effective?</p> <p>How did it work on wellbeing of students?</p>
Efficacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment of project modality • utilization of the available resources • contribution of the partnering groups viz school, parents, community and other agencies for the implementation of this project 	<p>Did you like the modality of this program?</p> <p>Why you liked/didn't like on SZOP modality?</p> <p>Who have been involved in this Programme and how? (school, parents, community and other agencies for the implementation of this project)</p>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intended and unintended changes brought by the project at students, parents, teachers, community people, 	<p>What are the changes? Regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armed personals' and activities?

	policy formulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political activities at school? • Discrimination to the students? • Misconducts at school? • Violence? • Negligence? • On students, parents, teachers, community people, and policy makers?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • phase over plan of the school, community, and the partnering agencies • level of coordination and linkages with GOs and NGOs 	<p>What kind of activities done for the sustenance of SZOP initiatives?</p> <p>(With or without outsiders' support and how?)</p>
Lesson learnt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning from the successful case and learning from failure case • innovation approaches if any • major challenges • possible initiatives for replication 	<p>What did the concerned people learn from this program?: (students, parents, teachers, community people)</p> <p>What are the major challenges on SZOP?</p> <p>How do you think that can be overcome?</p> <p>Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the program?</p>
In the end please mention what did you learn from SZOP; what did you do and what is your plan to materialize the SZOP initiatives?		

Interview guidelines for Community representatives

Introduction: (Caste?), Age?, Education? Others
<p>Please give your ideas about peace building at school. How is it important for the children?</p> <p>What are the indigenous practices to maintain peace in school, at home and the community?</p> <p>How is SZOP working in this community?</p> <p>How did you see the linkages of SZOP with the indigenous approach to peace building?</p> <p>Will you please tell me the effect of SZOP in school, at home, and the community?</p> <p>Who are involved in SZOP activities? And how?</p> <p>Is this program important for the community? If yes why?</p>
<p>What do you think are the main causes of conflict and violence at school area?</p> <p>How do you think did the SZOP work on ending those causes?</p> <p>Do you think the SZOP be effective? How?</p> <p>How did it work on the wellbeing of the community?</p>
<p>Who and what are being involved in this Program? (school, parents, community and other agencies for the implementation of this project)</p>
<p>What are the changes? Regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armed personals' and their activities? • Political activities at school? • Discrimination to the students? • Misconducts at school? • Violence? <p>Negligence on: students, parents, teachers, community people, policy formulation?</p>
<p>What kind of activities has been done for the sustenance of SZOP activities?</p> <p>Do you need additional support for the sustainability of SZOP initiatives? If yes,</p> <p>Who can help? How can they do? Why do you think so? If not why?</p>
<p>What did the concerned people learn from this SZOP initiative? (students, parents, teachers, political leaders and community people)</p> <p>What are the major challenges on SZOP? How do you think that can be overcome?</p> <p>Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the program?</p>
<p>In the end please mention what did you learn from SZOP; what did you do and what is your plan to materialize the SZOP initiatives?</p>

Interview Guideline for Head Teachers

<p>Introduction: (Caste?), Age?, Education? Others</p> <p>Please give your ideas about peace building at school. How is it important for the children and the community?</p> <p>How is SZOP working in this community?</p> <p>Will you please tell me how is it affecting school activities?</p> <p>Who are involved in SZOP activities?</p>
<p>What do you think are the main causes of conflict and violence at school area?</p> <p>How do you think did the SZOP work on resolving the conflicts?</p> <p>Do you think the SZOP be effective? How and why?</p> <p>How did it work on wellbeing of the community?</p>
<p>Who are involved in this Program and how? (school, parents, community and other agencies for the implementation of this project)</p>
<p>What are the changes? Regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armed personals' and their activities? • Political activities at school? • Discrimination to the students? • Misconducts at school? • Violence? • Negligence <p>On students, parents, teachers, community people, policy formulation?</p>
<p>What kind of activities done for the sustenance of SZOP initiative?</p> <p>Do you need additional support for the sustainability of SZOP?</p> <p>(Who can help? How can they do? Why do you think so?). If no why?</p>
<p>What did the concerned people learn from this program? (students, parents, teachers, and community people)</p> <p>What are the major challenges on SZOP? How do you think that can be overcome?</p> <p>Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the program?</p>
<p>In the end please mention what did you learn from SZOP; what did you do and what is your plan to materialize the SZOP initiatives?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Thank you for your precious time.</p>