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What was the purpose of this workshop?

The Effective Inter-Religious Action for Peacebuilding (EIAP) meeting in Vienna brought together Principals of the EIAP program from Alliance for Peacebuilding, Search for Common Ground, and CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, experts from the Global Advisory Council, and partners who had tested a draft version of the Effective Inter-Religious Action in Peacebuilding: Guide for Program Evaluation (EIAP Guide). The workshop provided an opportunity for an action-oriented reflection centered on feedback from the testers of the Guide. Discussion focused on how the Guide could be revised to be a more effective tool for practitioners involved in this work. The workshop provided participants with the opportunity to share their thoughts on how the Guide could be improved, how we could disseminate the Guide and encourage organizations to adopt suggested practices and identify potential actions that might be included in a further phase of the project.

What were the goals of the workshop?

- Review lessons learned from the EIAP Guide
- Review and develop prioritized recommendations for revising the EIAP Guide based on the lessons learned
- Reflect on any follow-up actions taken by Global Advisory Council members since the meeting in Istanbul
- Agree on the content of a strategic communications plan to disseminate and promote the uptake of the guide among policy-makers, practitioners, and donors
- Gather GAC input on potential next phase for EIAP

This publication was created for the participants of the Workshop to serve as a record of what was discussed for future reference and to help inform the revision of the Guide and actions under the remainder of the EIAP project.

Thanks to the KAICIID Centre for their generosity in hosting us at their offices in Vienna. It provided a perfect space for our discussions and reflections. Thanks particularly to Renata Smith for all her assistance with logistics and for Khaled Ehsan for his contributions to our evaluative thinking.
1. FEEDBACK ON GUIDE TESTING

A key part of the workshop was to receive feedback from those organizations that had been testing the draft M&E Guide for EIAP and to identify areas for improvement.

The testers had received training on the Guide in November 2016 in Nepal and had applied the principles to current projects that had inter-religious dimensions.

The testers and principals met on the first day of the workshop to share insights from the testing. The feedback was organized around Relevance, Usefulness, Readability and Gaps. Each tester had been asked to provide a score out of 10 for each dimension and reflections based on their experience of using the guide (1 = Poor, 10 = Excellent).

Several organizations had already designed or begun their evaluations before they received the Guide. These organizations used the Guide as a benchmark to compare what they had done and what the Guide suggested as best practice. In some cases, the Guide was used to change the organization’s methodology.

The Guide helped the testers to identify gaps in their design. Several testers reflected that the Guide helped them to think about levels of change. While they often hoped to affect community-level change, they realized that individual level change was a key building block leading to community-level impact. Faith groups often focused on the individual, so there may be a need for more guidance on how to think

The organizations that were testing the Guide included:

- Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (Uganda)
- Sindh Community Foundation (Pakistan)
- Jerusalem Center for Jewish/Christian Relations (Palestine; now called the Rossing Centre for Education and Dialogue)
- World Vision International (Kenya/Lebanon)
- Mercy Corps (Myanmar)
- Catholic Relief Services (Mindanao, Philippines)
- Search for Common Ground (Kyrgyzstan)
about community level impacts. The testers believed the Guide could be adapted to be more relevant for local, grassroots religious leaders/peacebuilders. This included suggestions for using simpler language, focusing on more practical tools and clear steps and consideration for where there is no project, as such. Need to train religious leaders on inter-faith dialogue. Many testers adopted the collection of most significant change stories to collect evidence of the results of their projects based on suggestions in the Guide.

Table 1 below summarizes the feedback from testers on the Guide under each of the criteria together with a summary of the suggested improvements to the Guide.

Table 1. Summary of Tester Feedback: Relevance, Usefulness, Readability and Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANCE</th>
<th>Score: 6.9/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testers found the following aspects of the Guide relevant to their work:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused attention on aspects of their projects that were unique to inter-religious peacebuilding actions like the use of scripture as a unique tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In Pakistan, the Guide was applied to projects using art to engage youth involved in violence. The testers felt there were few evaluators in Pakistan qualified in the inter-religious action area of work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Guide was highly relevant to Mercy Corps’ inter-communal work at the inception phase of the project in Myanmar. The EIAP Guide helped set more detailed targets and was useful in terms of reviewing the evaluability of the project. The evaluability assessment was crucial in helping the team reflect on whether they could do this monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) work in the current context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Based on the initial quantitative findings from the Mercy Corps project, religious leaders emphasized increased knowledge sharing of faith/core values. This was integrated in to the design of the M&amp;E tools. Also, adopted outcome harvesting &amp; storytelling into M&amp;E work based on the Guide to enrich the findings of their future evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ‘Do No Harm’ principle for faith groups/leaders was helpful in the creation of materials for projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One organization had expected a community level change, but then realized they needed to be more realistic and start with change among faith based leaders first and build from there.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The criteria for conducting M&amp;E were useful in guiding the evaluation work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The sections on conflict sensitivity were also very helpful in thinking about the evaluation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CRS did not use the Guide, because they had already begun implementing their project so they used the Guide to compare the process they had agreed upon with the principles outlined in the Guide. Their M&amp;E approach was initially focused on the effectiveness of trainings and the extent to which the skills learned had been translated into community projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CRS developed the following insights from undertaking this comparison between their initial design and the practices suggested by the Guide:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ToC was incomplete- stories revealed no link between trainings and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o What was religious about the work they were doing? The Guide helped CRS focus on this. Did not pay attention to the inter-religious details at outset but the Guide helped to highlight the inter-religious dimensions and address this question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• How could we use a peace architecture for peacebuilding approach by using religious leaders to connect networks?
• Realized that not all religious leaders were equipped or trained to engage in peace work

- The Jerusalem Center for Jewish/Christian Relations did not use Guide initially as the data collection/evaluation had already begun. But they used the Guide to change the M&E methodology after the first workshop they delivered was not successful. After making some tweaks the second and third were much more effective.
- One organization used WhatsApp to share stories of conflict/personal reflection. This was very effective.
- One organization (SFCG) used an external evaluator and the Guide feedback from this evaluator was less positive than the other tester feedback. Decided to follow up to see why the Guide had not been as relevant to this evaluator.

**USEFULNESS** Score: 7.2/10

The **most useful** sections were:

2. Faith Sensitivity | Choosing an Evaluator
3.3. Evaluability
4. Preparing for an Evaluation
   - 4.2 Applying overarching criteria for evaluation
   - 4.3 Key questions or lines of inquiry
5. Cross-cutting sections, gender sensitivity

Terra Nova Example
Annex A: Program Design
Annex C: Evaluation criteria
Annex E: Sample evaluation questions

**Least useful** sections were:

3. Deciding to undertake an evaluation or not
   - 3.1 Where is the impetus for an evaluation coming form
   - 3.4 Program design considerations
4.5 Deciding on an internal or external evaluation
4.6 Developing ToR and choosing an evaluator
4.7 Establishing and evaluation budget and timeline
5.3 Youth sensitive approach (not practical as written)

**GUIDE READABILITY AND GAPS** Score: 6.9/10

Majors gaps in the Guide include

- List of evaluation approaches
- Special considerations for pilot projects
- List of abbreviations and acronyms
- Better introduction to case study to help situate it

---

1 It is worth mentioning that there was not consensus on what the least useful sections were. It depended on your perspective and some participants did find some of these sections useful.
- Distinguish between conceptual/theoretical and practical applications
- Section 4—provide more of a step by step guide.
- Formatting (text box)
- Evaluation approaches → methodology
- How to capture human stories, lessons for inter-religious action
- Introduction to each section
- Indicators of change/level
- In Section 4.2 underline that the criteria for the evaluation should be driven by the ToC/outcomes expected
- Clarify how the Guide can help projects at different stages of design and implementation.
- More on monitoring?
- More guidance on choosing an internal vs external evaluator.

**SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Relevance:**
- More guidance on how to write in a faith-sensitive way (e.g.,) naming/labeling of group (individuals self-identify differently).
- The definition of inter-religious action—could be clarified or explained more.
- Need to clarify the audience or target group for the Guide:
  - Program staff (M&E leads, program staff, INGOs, Local NGOs)
  - Evaluation staff/external evaluator
- In the formatting/presentation make it accessible to external evaluators, including evaluator tips.
- The Guide should provide further Guidance on the level of impact. Organizations might aim for community level impact, but may have to settle for individual change. CRS indicators provided some useful perspectives on level of change.

**Usefulness:**
- Some areas to reflect on in the revision to the Guide in terms of usefulness included:
- The stage a project is at will largely influence which sections of the Guide you will find useful.
- Something could be said about the relationship between church action and actions undertaken by national governments—complementarity or tensions.
- Need to get a better balance between
  - conceptual vs practical
  - implementers vs external evaluators needs
  - capacity building vs information sharing
- Change the title “Guide for Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of Inter-Religious Action” or “DME Issues in EIAP Programming”
- Unsure what to do with section 3? Does the organization have a policy to undertake an evaluability assessment?
- Add, “Best ToRs” are negotiated
- Request for more information on inter-religious programming & links to CVE
- How can we link faith & conflict sensitivity sections?
- Include a section on what options there are for M/E approaches
  - Intended outcomes
  - Emergent forms
- Add key actors in key terms section
• Add future guides on specific issues: youth, women, etc.

The usefulness of each section will vary depending on the audience. For evaluators, section 3 is irrelevant for external evaluators, but it may be extremely useful for practitioners with little evaluation experience. The group suggested there be a way to identify which sections are intended for which audiences through icons, breakout boxes, etc. Suggestions included linking faith & conflict sensitivity sections, including a section on what options there are for monitoring & evaluation approaches, and adding key actors in the key terms section.

Readability and Gaps:
Recommendations for improving the readability include simplifying the language and prioritizing practicality over theory. Many felt it was too theoretical. The sequence of the sections needs to be reviewed – join 2 and 5. Section 2 was confusing. It does not flow well.

2. THEORIES OF CHANGE AND INDICATIONS OF CHANGE

The testers had requested more time to reflect on theories of change and indicators, so a hands-on session was facilitated where the group identified indicators of change/signs of progress based on the following theory of change example:

If people of different religions engage in practical activities for the common good, then prejudice and mistrust will be reduced and understanding will increase, because relationships can grow when a ‘safe space’ is cultivated.

Indications of change included:
- Feel connected, continuous communication
- Willingness to meet each other
- Shared experiences
- Ready to listen, not judge
- Continue doing things together even after project interventions
- Rates of intermarriage
- Increased communication
- Participation in joint celebration
- Increased level of economic engagement
Joint use of resources
Shared responsibilities, managing projects
Consensus decision-making
Acceptance of customs
Sustained cooperation
Personal relationships
Social media connections
Day 2 - Refining the EIAP Guide, Developments Post-Istanbul and Achieving Impact

On Day 2, the Guide testers and Principals were joined by members of the EIAP Global Advisory Council. The testers presented the results of the discussion from Day 1 and we invited further input from the GAC members on the Guide. We then heard updates of activities relevant to the inter-religious peacebuilding work from the GAC members since the meeting in November 2016.

1. PRIORITIZING GUIDE IMPROVEMENTS: RECOMMENDATIONS (*INDICATE PRIORITY VOTES)

Peter and Nick reviewed the practical suggestions made for improving the Guide and came up with a list of the suggested recommendations. All participants had the opportunity to vote on their top priorities for suggested changes to the Guide. Here are the results, in priority order.

- Executive summary: pull out different sections/uses, who/how/when each section********
- Provide guidance for evaluation of intervention outcomes at different levels: personal, community, regional, national********
- Section revisions*******
  - Merge sections 2 and 5
  - 3→2, 4→3
  - Expand 4.9 to include reference to dissemination strategy, powerful stories
  - Section 5 include reference to special needs groups, LGBT, disabled
  - Add to introduction a clarification on target audience which sects are useful for which users
  - Review content to make it accessible to different users with different options to do this (call out boxes, sidebar icons, etc.)
  - Introduce each section-signposts
  - Acronyms explained in text
- Priority focus on interreligious aspects, link to generic evaluation******
- Include links to existing resources on indicators, including process******
- Include material on data analysis******
- Intra-faith peacebuilding****
  - Evaluation and design
  - Faith sensitivity, key terms, title
- Language-simplify-plain English***
- Move program types into body of text, organize material around these types**
- Levels of change → peace writ large**
  - Influence of evaluation policy
  - Institutions
• Use/refer to CRS document**
  o ToC/case study, importance of storytelling
• RCT?*
• Recommendations for designing*
• Add human stories examples (practical)*
• A case study on how guide is used to measure change*

• Color coding for different audiences
• Expand types of programming now in Annex B, compare to table in lit review
• Address non-project based work of religious leaders
• Retitle document
• Invite comments after use
• Hyperlinks, examples on tools/approaches to m/e & adaptive management
• Reinforce value of doing thorough DME (section 3), value to the organization
• Use guide for capacity building
  o Training curriculum? Phase II?
• Visuals: photos/drawings
• Merge Sections 2/5
• Provide example of Terms of Reference and example of a bad Terms of Reference
• Integrate the testers’ experiences
• Take power dynamics into account
• Give examples of indicators
2. WHAT PRACTICAL EVALUATION TOOLS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE EIAP GUIDE?

This session was designed to respond to feedback from testers that more guidance was needed on the types of evaluation approaches and specific tools that could be considered. A participatory process was used to generate ideas for the kind of information that should be included on approaches, methods and tools. There was a general feeling that using mixed methods approaches was the best way to capture the full richness of inter-religious actions for peacebuilding. Including a list of the pros and cons of different approaches in the Guide would be helpful, together with specific tools within participatory approaches. The list of suggested information to include in the Guide is set out below:

**Approaches, techniques, & tools:**
1. Either take existing tools & tailor for interreligious action or provide guidance on how to adapt tool to EIAP. Provide links to existing resources
2. Add examples of computer software that can help with qualitative data collation and analysis
3. Provide more step-by-step guidance for practitioners
4. Make sure (faith-) sensitivities are included in use of different tools
5. Include Do No Harm
6. Guidance on the language to use in each of the tools is important
7. Include material on how you measure change
8. Provide guidance on designing a questionnaire (e.g., sample questionnaire)
9. Guidance on case studies and storytelling
10. Highlight how to undertake reflection exercises-
11. What tools can be used to analyze relationships?
12. Include reference to RCTs and when they might be useful
13. Include tools on how to assess behavioral change
14. Storytelling= interview + analysis and how to write a powerful story
15. Informal approaches, participant observation
16. Guidance on selecting participants
17. Outcome harvesting
18. Tools on data analysis

3. GAC MEMBER SHARING ON DEVELOPMENTS SINCE ISTANBUL MEETING

GAC members and other participants were invited to share information and reflections on actions they had taken since the Istanbul meeting back in Nov 2016 and how they were engaging on EIAP. Since Istanbul, the process has sparked thinking around how the EIAP project can feed up into the broader system and world of evaluation. Some GAC members expressed concern over a growing sense of fatigue and cynicism in inter-religious dialogue which has not demonstrated its impact. They believe the Guide may help to move past this.

Each GAC member reflected on his/her experience since Istanbul:

Rick:

The process challenged him to think through what Peace Catalyst has done
It reminded him to be faithful to his tradition
The CRS report was especially helpful

Andreas:
- The process helped him to think about how GHR feeds into the broader system and how they may have broader impact
- GHR is working to break through the perception of peacebuilding as a “nice” idea, to make it a widely accepted objective

Susie:
- Susie reflected on her experience working with faith groups in Myanmar, when the interfaith movement had taken off post-transition. However, the movement was hastily put together and lacked a clear strategy. She has observed a degree of fatigue and cynicism around interfaith dialogue. Often, the empowered group finds the experience inspiring while the oppressed learn little. It is therefore important to take power dynamics into account in this work. USIP is looking into creating a meta-evaluation on Myanmar using the Guide. They would consider integrating this work into its online course on religious peacebuilding

Sarah:
- She has found that religious leaders are not necessarily equipped to facilitate inter-faith dialogue. In fact, they can do harm. She feels they should be trained to do this work. She has been trying to keep in mind how to work toward the goal of making her organization “go out of business,” as they achieve their mission

Moo:
- He has been working with an intra-Buddhist organization in Burma. The Guide came at the right time in their project. Donors were interested in the Guide. Has also been working in Sri Lanka, will try to use the Guide to develop an evaluation there

Sumaye:
- Has observed in her work that Christian and Muslim women want peace. Interventions often don’t share results or aren’t evaluated at all. She is talking to her networks about the Guide. She finds the USAID evaluation tool lengthy and difficult to understand. She has observed that local organizations don’t want to go through the process of evaluation or don’t have the skills

Shamsia:
- Has found the use and testing of the Guide significant. Used to think inter-religious peacebuilding was too much talk, is excited about action

Myla:
- Is facilitating a reflective learning process for CRS across countries on inter-religious action for peacebuilding. She observes that inter-religious action practices vary by context. She is working to create sensitivity among development actors on inter-religious issues and approaches. Some CRS programs have run over decades. They now need to assess long term impact
- It’s difficult to manage youth when religious actors are older males
- Is interreligious action a field or an approach?
- It’s difficult to explain what we do

Dilshan:
- World Vision has a new *Do No Harm for Faith Groups* manual published in May 2017
- WV is a development organization with a crosscutting peacebuilding element
- They expected a lot out of a pilot project. The Guide helped focus the team and allowed them to get good stories
- Has been participating in DME for Peace and the Thursday Talks

### 4. INTER-RELIGIOUS ACTION FOR PEACEBUILDING: EVALUATIVE REFLECTIONS FROM GAC MEMBERS

GAC members had been invited prior to the meeting to share their evaluative reflections on their interreligious peacebuilding work. Some members gave brief summaries of their evaluative reflections. The intention was to use these experiences and reflections in the Guide as examples and possibly publish the collective reflections as a separate document as part of the EIAP. Those GAC members who had not been able to write their evaluative reflections were encouraged to do so and send them in to Nick Oatley at AfP.
Day 3 - Achieving Impact – Strategic Communications Plan for EIAP and the next Phase of EIAP

(GAC, Testers & Principals)

1. HOW DO WE BEGIN TO DEVELOP A STRONG EVIDENCE BASE FOR EFFECTIVE INTER-RELIGIOUS PEACEBUILDING PROGRAMS?

This session addressed how we could begin to accumulate an evidence base on effective inter-religious action for peacebuilding. The discussion covered challenges to data collection and collation, how to overcome these challenges, what kinds of data/evidence are we talking about and what mechanisms or platforms might we use to make the evidence available to interested users.

We agreed that we need an evidence base to know if and how the work is being effective and not doing harm. However, there may be cultural differences in the value we place on data. We assume that faith institutions have a certain permanency and can reach deeply into communities. We also assume faith involves deeply held beliefs and is values-based.

The evidence base can be strengthened/deepened by examining the gaps in evidence across the different approaches to inter-religious peacebuilding, and across geographical regions. There can be a greater effort to connect with academics and professional evaluators. The PEC III sub-sector reviews may be useful in contributing to this evidence base. Funders also look to understand collective impact. There are challenges to define what is evidence and what is effective. Participants and organizations may fear disclosure and being self-critical. In some cases, evaluation may put the safety of participants at risk. There is also concern about the ability to be accountable to God.

For the evidence base, we need quantitative and qualitative evidence at different levels, gender and age disaggregation, human stories. The different audiences include policy makers and donors.

Use DME for Peace, Joint Learning Initiatives, communities of practice, the AfP Annual Conference, film, mapping tools like the KAICIID map, etc.

Challenges

- Cultural differences with respect to importance of data
- Evidence? What can be considered evidence?
- Levels of trust between communities and organizations doing work can be an issue.
• Mistrust-can undermine reliable info, for example, if there is mistrust between the evaluator/implementing organizations and the local communities
• Fear of disclosure/individual safety/backlash
• Are we using right model? Should we go to them and ask what success looks like? Use “Everyday peace indicators” approach
• Capacity to do evaluations

Overcoming challenges
• Build trust - develop relationships with community - go back to community and involve community members in stage of the program including sharing the results of evaluative work. An iterative process of reflection, developing understanding and building trust should be adopted
• Provide incentives and rewards for organizations who share evaluations/evidence (prizes, spotlight)
• If a group receiving the evaluation reports are not seen as competitors this can help. Also, undertaking sub-sectoral and meta evaluations can be useful (The Alliance for Peacebuilding’s Peacebuilding Evaluation Consortium is taking this approach)
• Get a sense of big wins- where are these, amplify
• Admit failure, not all programs are 100% successful
• Donors more interested in cases of failure, the lessons that can be learned and how to create conditions for success
• Search for new models of funding
• Leverage organizations working together - funders working together=audience for this in the funding community=focus on learning that is valuable for organizations

What kind of Data?
• Quantitative + Qualitative
• Challenge of anecdotal data
• Data that is useful for practitioners, participants, policymakers, funders
• Focus on quality of data - improving quality of evidence
• Provide information on feedback loops and-adaptive management
  o Use data to reflect on implementation and change course
• Engage academics on methodologies for evaluation, adaptive management
• Achieving balance now in evaluation, right sizing, authentic and real engagement is trend that donors will support

Mechanisms & Platforms
• Morph GAC into encouraging adoption of good DME and identify a research/evaluation agenda
• DME for Peace
• Virtual Communities of Practice
• Joint learning initiative has focus on inter-religious action
• Provide mentorship opportunities
• Mapping actors globally (use KAICIID mapping of key stakeholders)
• USIP INPRL
• Use films as documentary evidence
2. DEVELOPING THE STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS AND POLICY PLAN FOR THE DISSEMINATION AND UPTAKE OF THE EIAP GUIDE

This session was designed to come up with some ideas for conducting strategic communications to disseminate the Guide and the findings of the EIAP.

Dissemination methods
- Mentoring and coaching – peer to peer; EIAP practitioners - peers
- Listservs
- Launch event
- Conferences
- Through partners
- Hard copies
- Social media
- Videos
- Academic coordination

Which audiences should we target?
- Church leaders and networks
- Religious organizations
- Inter-religious platforms
- Local organizations implementing inter-religious actions (NGOs)
- Academic
- Evaluators
- Government actors involved in peacebuilding
- New networks
- PCDN
- AfP members
- Inter-faith networks
- Interfaith Observer Newsletter
- Catholic peacebuilding network

3. WHAT IS THE VISION FOR A FURTHER PHASE OF THE EIAP?

This session was designed to elicit ideas from all participants on the kind of activities that would be appropriate for a further phase of EIAP work. Discussion focused on what additional materials might be created, what needs organizations had for capacity building, what role the GAC members might be able to play going forward, how could we best disseminate the Guide and engage with policy makers to impress on them the importance of funding inter-religious action for peacebuilding. The results of the small group discussions are summarized below.
I. Create additional materials and media
- Gathering/documenting stories and evaluations and identify “best practices”
- Encourage the development of short films on the power of inter-religious action
- Develop ToC
- Create one page summaries of sections of the Guide (including exercises for organizations to engage in)
- Develop a PPT summary of the Guide
- Develop exercises for organizations to use to help Guide them in their work
- Develop indicative indicators and guidelines for use
- Conduct country studies
- Conduct meta-analysis of inter-religious programs
- Collate testimonies
- Develop guidance on inter-religious-action and drivers of radicalization
- Further testing and refinement of Guide

II. Capacity Building
- Provide mentoring/coaching to local NGOs
- Training for religious leaders
- Provide incentives for local groups to do evaluations
- Provide training modules and face to face training for local NGOs
- Develop a national level workshop

III. GAC Network/Communities
- Broaden membership (include more academics; Include more evaluators)
- Cooperate with the academic community to develop research agenda to fill gaps, offer to teach classes on their courses (e.g. Myla is developing a course that she will teach at the Mindanao Peace Institute)
- Involve VOPEs
- Set up platforms for evaluations or use DMEforpeace
- Support the community of practice on DMEforpeace

IV. Dissemination and Policy engagement
- Share information with partners
- Funders/orgs that do capacity building
- Evaluators visit countries
- Conduct policy advocacy
- Engage UN agencies

V. Funding
- Diversify funding source
4. NEXT STEPS

In the final wrap up session, Nick committed to setting up a closed Group on Facebook that all participants and absent GAC members could use to share news, stories, announce publications and events and share photos.

Nick agreed to write out to all participants with our agreed action points and a summary of our discussions. Nick also committed to developing a strategic communications plan working with Jack from SFCG.

LIST OF RESOURCES MENTIONED DURING THE WORKSHOP:

OECD resilience framework
CVE Digest - M&E Section
CRS Inter-Religious Action for Peace document
World Vision Do No Harm for Faith Groups
### Global Advisory Council & EIAP Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myla Leguro</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Love</td>
<td>Peace Catalyst International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsia Ramadhan</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumaye Hamza</td>
<td>Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bernstein</td>
<td>Jerusalem Center for Jewish-Christian Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somboon 'Moo' Chungprampree</td>
<td>International Network of Engaged Buddhist and Spirit in Education Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hayward</td>
<td>US Institute for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Oatley</td>
<td>Alliance for Peacebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Strawmyer</td>
<td>Alliance for Peacebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Farrell</td>
<td>Search for Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Garred</td>
<td>CDA Collaborative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Woodrow</td>
<td>CDA Collaborative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Wilson-Grau</td>
<td>Independent Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Hippolyt Pul</td>
<td>Independent Evaluator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Testers - Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Kitakule</td>
<td>Inter-Religious Council of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javed Hussain</td>
<td>Sindh Community Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal Eblagon</td>
<td>Jerusalem Center for Jewish/Christian Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raed Hanania</td>
<td>Jerusalem Center for Jewish/Christian Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Testers – Non-grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilshan Annaraj</td>
<td>World Vision International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Medam</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GHR Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Hipple</td>
<td>GHR Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dalsin</td>
<td>GHR Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Berg</td>
<td>Alliance for Peacebuilding Chair of the Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# AGENDA
**Monday – May 8th**

**Guide Testers Feedback**
*(Testers & Principals)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:45</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>Nick/Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Introductions from each participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brief morning reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of the Workshop and Intended Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recap on where we are with the development of the EIAP Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td><strong>Guide Relevance:</strong></td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Please share one very important finding of your evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How did the Guide contribute toward this finding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td><strong>Guide Usefulness</strong></td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Which sections of the Guide are most useful? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Which sections of the Guide are least useful? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3:00</td>
<td><strong>Guide Readability and Gaps</strong></td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Observations and recommendations on readability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are there any ‘gaps’ in the Guide, or components lacking?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:30</td>
<td><strong>Summary reflections on Guide tester findings</strong></td>
<td>Michelle/Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-3:45</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-5:00</td>
<td>‘Hands-on’ Guide Annex Development: Theories of Change and Indications of Change</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tuesday – May 9th

**Refining the EIAP Guide, Developments Post-Istanbul and Achieving Impact**  
*(GAC, Testers & Principals)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8:00-9:00</strong></td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **9:00-9:30** | Welcome and Introductions  
• Introduction of GAC members and other participants.  
• Brief morning reflection.  
• Overview of the Workshop and Intended Outcomes.  
• Recap on status of the EIAP Guide.               | Nick                  |
| **9:30-10:00** | Presentation of the tester results to GAC Members and other participants. | Tester Group Reps     |
| **10:00-11:00** | Small groups discussions on tester results:  
What are the implications of the findings for changes to the EIAP Guide and are there other recommendations for changes? | Michelle              |
| **11:00 – 11:15** | **Break**                                                            |                       |
| **11:15-12:00** | Plenary Discussion:  
• What are the implications of the recommended changes for the guide?  
• Prioritize recommended changes: high, medium, or low. | Michelle              |
| **12:00-1:00** | **Lunch**                                                            |                       |
| **1:00-2.45** |  
• What practical evaluation tools should be included in the EIAP guide? | Nick                  |
| **2:45-3:00** | **Break**                                                            |                       |

*Islamic prayer breaks will be incorporated into the agenda as needed.*
### 3:00-3:45
GAC member sharing on developments since Istanbul: Reflection on actions taken since Istanbul and how they are engaging on the EIAP  
**Andreas**

### 3:45-4:45
Inter-religious action for peacebuilding: evaluative reflections from GAC Members  
**Nick**

### 4:45-5:00
Wrap-up/thoughts for the next day  
**Nick**

### 7:00-9:00
*Dinner*

*Islamic prayer breaks will be incorporated into the agenda as needed.*

---

### Wednesday – May 10th

**Achieving Impact – Strategic Communications Plan for the EIAP and the next Phase of EIAP**  
(GAC, Testers & Principals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td><em>Breakfast</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00-9:30 | Brief morning reflection  
Welcome and recap of previous day | **Nick**       |
| 9:30 – 11:00 | Plenary Discussion:  
Developing the strategic communications and policy plan for the dissemination and uptake of the EIAP guide? |                |
| 11:00-11:15 | Principals-led Small Group Discussions:  
- How do we achieve the desired impact?  
- What specific actions do we need to take to disseminate and promote the active uptake of the guide to improve the practice of evaluating inter-religious peacebuilding projects? | **Nick/Jack** |
| 11:15-12:30 | *Break*                                                               | **Susan**      |
How do we begin to develop a strong evidence base for effective inter-religious peacebuilding programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3:30</td>
<td>What is the vision for a further phase of the EIAP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-3:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-4:45</td>
<td>Final thoughts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key takeaways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreed actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45-5:00</td>
<td>Wrap-up and Farewell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Islamic prayer breaks will be incorporated into the agenda as needed.*