



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# RWANDA TRIP REPORT

AUGUST 14-SEPTEMBER 3, 2006

WOMEN'S LEGAL RIGHTS INITIATIVE UNDER THE WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT IQC

CONTRACT NO. GEW-I-00-02-00016-00



## September 2006

This report was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It was prepared by Chemonics International Inc. in partnership with the Centre for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA), MetaMetrics Inc., and Partners of the Americas.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

|             |  |    |
|-------------|--|----|
| SECTION I   | Travel Dates, Destinations, and Purposes                   |    |
|             | A. Travel Dates and Destinations                           | 3  |
|             | B. Purposes of Travel                                      | 3  |
| SECTION II  | Trip Results   |    |
|             | A. Training of Trainers on Participatory Methods           | 4  |
|             | B. Review of FY2006  | 5  |
|             | C. Planning FY2007 Action Plan                             | 5  |
|             | D. Gender Trainings for Journalists                        | 6  |
| SECTION III | Next Steps   | 8  |
| Annex A     | Key Meetings   | 9  |
| Annex B     | Participatory Methods Training Program Outline             | 13 |
| Annex C     | Participatory Methods Training Worksheet                   | 26 |
| Annex D     | Participatory Methods Training Report (by Elizabeth Barad) | 28 |

## **SECTION I**

---

### Travel Dates, Destinations and Purposes

#### **A. Travel Dates and Destination**

Lyn Beth Neylon, Legal and Gender Specialist for the Women's Legal Rights Initiative (WLR), traveled from Washington, DC to visit the WLR Rwanda field office in Kigali, Rwanda in East/Central Africa from August 14-September 3, 2006.

#### **B. Purposes of Travel**

The general purposes of this trip were to: 1) attend the training on Participatory Methods of Training; 2) review WLR Rwanda activities and performance for FY2006, including doing an employee evaluation of the WLR Rwanda Coordinator; 3) brainstorming and planning activities for FY2007, including meeting with relevant partners to gather their input and ideas; 4) assist the field office to prepare for two week-long trainings on gender and how to report gender-based violence (GBV) for journalists; and 5) meet with USAID/Rwanda to update them and solicit their advice on our collaboration in FY2007.

## SECTION II

---

### Trip Results

#### A. Training of Trainers on Participatory Methods

WLR Rwanda recruited a human rights lawyer and trainer, Elizabeth Barad, who is familiar with Rwanda and women's rights issues, to develop a training to teach interactive methodology to the trainers from Haguruka who we anticipated would give trainings using the new WLR-supported human rights manual. The translator and facilitator was Justine Uvuza, a well-respected Rwandan lawyer, who was also one of the consultants chosen to develop the Gender and Domestic Relations course for the Institute of Legal Practice and Development (ILPD).

The goals for the training were to introduce participatory methods into Rwandan trainings and to enable trainers to teach interactive techniques in future workshops. Participatory training techniques are an innovation in Rwanda as Rwandans generally are used to the way they are taught in school, with a teacher lecturing students rather than engaging them. Participatory training exercises such as role plays, hypotheticals, interactive analysis, and debates, where participants act out what they are learning, give feedback and discuss the value and use of an exercise, have been shown to be more effective ways of teaching than more passive methods.

There were twenty-seven NGO trainers who attended the workshop from throughout Rwanda, including several judges, prosecutors, a court clerk, a journalist, a deputy mayor, and employees and members of the Board of Directors of Haguruka. Several sociologists, educators and employees of the Rwandan Social Security, National Human Rights Commission, Conflict Resolution Centre of the National University of Rwanda and the Human Rights League in the Great Lakes Region attended. Most of the participants were lawyers, and all of them were trainers in their fields of expertise such as conflict resolution, education, journalism, sociology, economy, women's and children's rights and the rule of law.

The training-of-trainers was held over two and a half days at the Ninzi Hills Hotel in Kigali, Rwanda. Ms. Barad presented and had the trainees practice a variety of participatory techniques, including role plays, hypotheticals and case studies, the "fish bowl" listening exercises, flip charts, "debates," and others. Ms. Barad also modeled how a trainer should set the stage for a participatory training, such as how to arrange a room, whether and when to provide music and food, and how to "manage the action" of the training and strike a balance between being flexible and allowing the participants to make changes to the itinerary, and keeping to a schedule and covering the substantive material. The participants were quite boisterous.

Participants filled out evaluations and self-assessment forms in French or English. According to the evaluations, the majority of the attendees found the training valuable, six found it very successful, and two thought it was unsuccessful. Of those two, one person thought the participants should have created the training and their local organization, Haguruka, should have prepared the materials; the other person found the timing inconvenient. (Since this trip, WLR

Rwanda has had many requests from other individuals and organizations who want to take the participatory methods training, which is another good indication of the training's success.)

Some of Ms. Barad's materials and her report on the participatory methods training are attached as annexes to this trip report.

## **B. Review of FY2006**

Ms. Neylon's first task was to discuss progress on the FY2006 Action Plan with Ms. Mukantabana – what had been completed and what still needed to be done. We reviewed activities WLR Rwanda carried out in the past 10 months, and input from our partners. Ms. Neylon and Ms. Mukantabana made visits to partner NGOs Haguruka and Profemmes/Twese Hamwe (hereafter Profemmes), and the ILPD to discuss collaborative activities and talk about the future. Our team had several scheduled appointments with the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion to discuss WLR Rwanda's current and planned activities, but the meetings were cancelled.

The WLR Rwanda team briefed the USAID/Rwanda staff at the beginning and end of the visit, to update them on our activities (although the WLR Rwanda Coordinator regularly meets with Francis Musinguzi, our gender contact at the Mission) and solicit feedback and suggestions. Democracy and Governance Team Leader Ben Allen suggested that we meet Paulette Lee, the new development and outreach communications officer, which we did. Ben Allen reiterated his interest in women's legal rights and the importance of gender issues, and that he is pleased that WLR is working in Rwanda.

## **C. Planning FY2007 Action Plan**

The Legal and Gender Specialist, Ms. Neylon, visited WLR Rwanda in part to develop an action plan for FY2007 in collaboration with the coordinator and project partners, which we did. Ms. Mukantabana has been meeting with local partners to solicit their input on what they think the priorities of WLR Rwanda for FY207 should be, and while Ms. Neylon was in Rwanda we also had visits and discussions with NGO partners.

The draft FY2007 Action Plan logically followed from the previous year's start-up activities, building upon the interest of the national conference, for example, and continuing to facilitate different groups of NGOs in planning and implementing capacity-building activities. We also planned to solidify our relationships with institutions, such as the ILPD, and pursue our mutual interests in writing courses for legal professionals that define and incorporate gender analysis. The cross-cutting theme within the topic area of women's legal rights linking all WLR Rwanda's activities continued to be advocacy against gender-based violence (GBV). In the FY2007 Action Plan, we focused on three components: strengthening the capacity of the justice sector, building the capacity of civil society, and increasing public awareness. We did not know at the time that, because of the imminent closeout of WLR Rwanda, we will not be able to implement the new activities, and only a few of the ongoing activities will be funded to their conclusion.

## D. Gender Trainings for Journalists

*Media Strategy Group and planning.* WLR Rwanda identified partners to compose a group to collaboratively design a media strategy for a public awareness campaign on gender-based violence, beginning in January 2006. WLR Rwanda facilitates (but does not lead) this group and encourages the members to develop and implement a media strategy in a coordinated manner, making it more effective than smaller efforts by any single group. The Media Strategy Group is composed of Profemmes/Twese Hamwe; ARFEM; HAGURUKA; SERUKA; AJIPRODHO; KANGURIRWA; LDGL; Rwanda Women Network; Réseau des Femmes; National Women Council; Rwanda Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (RNADSV); Association Nzambazamariya Veneranda; Hope Media Group Irembo; Francis Musinguzi representing USAID/Rwanda, and WLR Rwanda Coordinator Rose Mukantabana.

The first activity the Media Strategy Group agreed to organize was a training for journalists on gender and how to report stories on gender-based violence. The group felt that GBV is one of the most flagrant, yet under-reported, crimes in Rwanda. Although the media is supposed to play an important role by reporting on and exposing the prevalence of gender-based violence, it has often, through its own biases, inappropriate language and images, and lack of understanding, been part of the problem rather than part of the solution to stop GBV.

There were some difficulties organizing the journalists' gender trainings. The Media Strategy Group originally chose the RNADSV to do the planning, logistical work, and some of the substantive preparation for the trainings (through a fixed price subcontract with WLR Rwanda), because they represented themselves as having experience organizing trainings and producing a manual for training journalists. This turned out to be untrue. RNADSV is a two-person office with no secured funding. They did not have a manual or a training prepared, nor did they have the capacity or the experience to do one on their own. Mr. Safari Gaspard is the president of both the RNADSV and the Rwandan Association of Journalists, which made it awkward to correct the roles and responsibilities for the journalists' trainings. The WLR Rwanda Coordinator spent much of her time organizing the trainings (one training given twice, to increase the number of participants), scheduled for September 5-9 and September 11-15 in Ruhengeri, finally assisted by an event planner and Profemmes (RNADSV did some of the preliminary logistical work). However, the week before the gender trainings were to begin, most of the organizing work had been completed.

*Last minute funding problems.* At this point, the Legal and Gender Specialist received a directive from Chemonics to WLR staff, via the WLR Chief of Party, not to sign any services agreements or contracts, or to obligate any money until Chemonics received the WLR USAID/WID obligation. These funds were expected within a week, but could be delayed for much longer. Ms. Neylon concluded that the trainings on gender and reporting on GBV, which were to start in less than a week, must be cancelled or postponed. WLR Rwanda was put in the position of not being able to guarantee payment for participants' per diem, or to pay the hotel deposit where the trainings were to take place, or for other immediate costs. Ms. Neylon and Ms. Mukantabana immediately and regretfully explained the situation to Profemmes, as they had taken the lead and

done a great deal of work, and lent their name and credibility to these trainings to ensure that the journalists would attend. We knew that a cancellation would reflect badly on WLR Rwanda, on Profemmes, and on USAID, and there was a possibility that disappointed invitees would express their displeasure in the press.

Ms. Neylon contacted Ben Allen, the DG Team Leader at USAID/Rwanda, because he was very interested in the gender trainings. Mr. Allen contacted the country director of the Community HIV/AIDS Mobilization Program (CHAMP), a health project with an anti-gender-based violence component at the Mission, and they agreed that the journalists' trainings on GBV were too important and strategic not to happen. Postponement would mean almost certain cancellation, because the participating journalists and their respective agencies had set aside the dates for many weeks, and there were many other people involved who had used their contacts to ensure that the right people would be there.

The country director of CHAMP agreed with Mr. Allen to fund the trainings for journalists on gender and how to report on GBV out of their DG funding from the Mission. Profemmes, as the lead local partner, agreed to assume responsibility for implementing them. WLR Rwanda and our partners had done most of the organizing and logistical work already, so "the handover" went smoothly, the money was transferred, and the trainings took place on schedule.

This was the best possible outcome, given the circumstances. The people working on the trainings (and there were many people working many contacts to make these trainings happen) became even more invested in the success of the gender trainings, because the opportunity had almost been taken away. There was a strong feeling of ownership, and the gender trainings for journalists were truly the most collaborative activity WLR Rwanda has participated in.

## SECTION III

---

### Next Steps

In September 2006, USAID/WID informed WLR it would not receive funding for FY2007. The WLR team and our CTO Ed Lijewski determined that WLR must begin closeout of its six programs, and that the WLR Rwanda program should cease activities no later than the middle of November and close the Kigali office by November 30, 2006. The staff has been notified in person and by letter, and severance packages have been negotiated for the field office staff.

The WLR Rwanda team will finish implementing a few activities already in progress from the FY2006 WLR Rwanda Action Plan. The Washington office will continue to supervise and assist the WLR Rwanda project office team in Kigali through daily email reports and weekly telephone conferences for the next two months. Ms. Rebecca Mischel, a program manager, will be in Rwanda November 8-18 to help the office organize and close all administrative and financial files and ship them to Chemonics in Washington, DC. The Legal and Gender Specialist will work on WLR Rwanda until December 29 to finish all necessary summaries and reports.

**ANNEX A: MEETINGS**

---

**8/16/06 Elizabeth Barad**, at the Intercontinental Hotel, Kigali, Rwanda; Tel: (212) 874-7169; [ebarad@attglobal.net](mailto:ebarad@attglobal.net)

WLR Rwanda Coordinator Rose Mukantabana met with Elizabeth Barad, the human rights attorney giving the participatory methods training for Haguruka trainers, to finalize the trainings and materials and go over logistics and final changes.

**8/17/06 USAID/Rwanda**, at the Mission, 55 Avenue Paul VI, P.O. Box 2848, Kigali; Tel: (250) 57-09-40; [ballen@usaid.gov](mailto:ballen@usaid.gov), cell: 08 30 79 42

The WLR Rwanda team met with DG Team Leader Ben Allen and gender contact Francis Musinguzi to update them on WLR Rwanda activities and solicit input for the FY2007 action plan.

**8/17/06 Maurice Weiner, Chief of Party, ADAR**, at the ADAR office, Kigali; Tel: 250-570-433/34 ; [Maurice@adar.org.rw](mailto:Maurice@adar.org.rw) ; Mobile: 08 30 27 38

Lyn Neylon met with Mr. Weiner about the imminent closure of ADAR, and the responsibilities of the WLR Rwanda office to take care of any “leftover” administrative tasks after ADAR is gone.

**8/18-20/06 Participatory Training Methods** training by Elizabeth Barad, sponsored by WLR Rwanda; held Friday 8:30 a.m.-6:30 p.m., Saturday 2:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m., and Sunday 9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. at Hotel x

**8/22/06 Safari Gaspard, President, Rwanda Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (RNADSV)**, and an associate, at the Intercontinental Hotel, Kigali

The background for this meeting is that the Rwanda Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence was originally supposed to do all the logistical work and do the trainings (through a FPSC) for the journalists’ trainings, scheduled for September 5-9 and September 11-15, 2006. The RNADSV president is also the president of the Rwandan Journalists Association. He told the media strategy group that RNADSV had done such a training in the past, and that they had a manual and a gender training for journalists already prepared, so the media group voted to give the responsibility for the trainings to them. Unfortunately, the RNADSV is basically a two-person office, and they do not have the capacity or the experience to prepare or implement these trainings on their own. WLR Rwanda did not sign a contract with them, but they did some logistical work to prepare the trainings on the assumption that they would be signing a contract. Now the RNADSV claims WLR Rwanda owes them money for 53 days of work and for their phone calls, petrol, etc.

Ms. Neylon met with Mr. Gaspard and his associate to discuss the billing problem. Ms. Neylon acknowledged that RNADSV did some work, but that it was impossible that they worked 424 hours in the time period specified and given the results of their efforts. Ms. Neylon also pointed out that there was no contract, although RNADSV

certainly incurred some costs, and that the WLR Rwanda Coordinator had to do a great deal of additional work to set up the trainings. Mr. Gaspard agreed to accept a lesser amount for the work RNADSV did, and to provide receipts to document his expenditures. Ms. Neylon and Mr. Gaspard discussed future WLR Rwanda activities and the possibility of working together in FY2007.

- 8/24/06** **Minister of Justice Tharcisse Karugarama**, at the Ministry offices, Kigali  
The WLR Rwanda team and Ms. Barad met with the new Minister of Justice, Mr. Tharcisse Karugarama. Ms. Neylon first met Mr. Karugarama in October 2004 when he was President of the High Court. We congratulated him on his appointment, and reminded him about WLR and of WLR Rwanda activities. Of most interest and relevance to the Minister was the development of the “Gender and Domestic Relations” course for the ILPD, which is overseen by the Ministry of Justice. He strongly approved of integrating gender issues into the Institute’s curriculum, and expressed his hope that the longer course on “Gender and Law” that WLR Rwanda is planning to develop for the ILPD will also be part of our FY2007 activities.
- 8/28/06** **Agnès Mujaweyezu, National Executive Secretary; Suzanne Ruboneka, Chargée du Programme Campagne et Action pour la Paix ; Madeleine Byukusenge, Coordinator, for Profemmes/Twese Hamwe**, Avenue de la justice, Nyamirambo, B.P. 2758, Kigali ; tel: (250) 518480 or 08503211, [profemme@rwanda1.com](mailto:profemme@rwanda1.com)  
Lyn Neylon and Rose Mukantabana discussed the upcoming journalists’ gender trainings. The representatives from Profemmes said that unless participants received at least 3,000 RwF/day for communications, and certain other expenses, Profemmes could not continue to participate; reimbursement for phone calls when participants are away from home for more than a day is required in their procedures manual. We agreed that this might be allowed under USAID regulations. Profemmes is otherwise ready to sign the official invitation letters and distribute them, although informally the participants have been saving the date for months. It is very important to have Profemmes send the invitations, as they are the most well-known and the officially sanctioned “umbrella” association for women’s NGOs, and it ensures the trainings will be taken seriously.

WLR and Profemmes also discussed the probable renewal of a fixed price subcontract between us through the end of July or August 2007, with a change to the dates the quarterly reports from the coordinator (Madeleine) will be due.

- 8/29/06** **Vénantie Mukankusi, Executive Secretary and Elie Nizeyimana, Legal Officer, Association for the Defense of Women and Children’s Rights (Haguruka)**, B.P. 3030, Kigali; Tel.: (250) 514669, Cell (250) 08-30-08-34, [Haguruka@rawanda1.com](mailto:Haguruka@rawanda1.com), [gashayija2000@yahoo.fr](mailto:gashayija2000@yahoo.fr)  
Lyn Neylon and Rose Mukantabana met with Haguruka representatives to discuss the continuing partnership between Haguruka and WLR Rwanda. Specifically, we planned future trainings to be implemented by those who received participatory methods training by Elizabeth Barad, using the updated human rights manual. We also hoped to collaborate on advocacy to change the “barrister law” which prevents

lawyers who are not members of the bar from representing poor women who are victims of GBV or other human rights violations in court for free.

**8/29 & 8/30/06** **Agnès Mujawyezu, National Executive Secretary, Profemmes/Twese Hamwe**  
Several meetings were held over these two days to try to figure out how to hold the gender trainings for journalists, given the directive to WLR to not obligate any money for an indeterminate amount of time. Profemmes indicated a willingness to help in any way they could, but did not have other funding sufficient to cover the cost of two 2-week trainings outside of Kigali.

**8/29/06** **Justine Uvuza and Isaac Bizumuremyi, consultants,** at the Intercontinental Hotel; [jordanu04@hotmail.com](mailto:jordanu04@hotmail.com), [find\\_isaac@yahoo.com](mailto:find_isaac@yahoo.com)  
The WLR Rwanda team met with the consultants we engaged to write the Gender and Domestic Relations course materials for the ILPD. We discussed the first draft of the course materials and suggested revisions in approach to make it more interactive and practical to the students, who will be judges and other legal professionals. We also agreed to extend the terms of the consulting agreements to add five days each to do further revisions.

**8/29/06** **Forum des Femmes Rwandaises Parlementaires (FFRP)/Rwandan Women Parliamentarians,** at the Parliament building  
Honorable Judith Kanakuze, President of the Forum, and Honorable Faith Mukakalisa met with Ms. Neylon, Ms. Mukantabana, and Ms. Barad to discuss the draft anti-GBV legislation now before the Parliament. We also described WLR Rwanda activities and approach, and discussed the possibility of our project working with the FFRP to discuss a gender analysis of future legislation.

**8/30/06** **USAID/Rwanda,** at the Mission, 55 Avenue Paul VI, P.O. Box 2848, Kigali; Tel: (250) 57-09-40  
Lyn Neylon and Rose Mukantabana met with DG Team Leader Ben Allen, gender contact Francis Musinguzi, Agnès Mujawyezu from Profemmes, and Jean Karambizi from the CHAMP project, to discuss the handover of the journalists' gender training from WLR Rwanda to Profemmes, with financing from USAID/Rwanda (DG) provided by CHAMP. Rose reported on her meeting with Agnès this morning on the handover of the journalists' trainings from WLR Rwanda to Profemmes; WLR Rwanda had completed organizing everything that needed to be done, and was handing over the trainings in good shape, with the written objectives, invitee list, draft schedule, etc. to Profemmes. WLR pledged to help Profemmes successfully implement the trainings. Everyone reported that they had what they needed to proceed with the trainings, now funded through the CHAMP project with money they received from USAID/Rwanda for similar trainings on GBV and the transmission of HIV/AIDS.

The WLR Rwanda team also met with Paulette Lee, the new Development and Outreach Communications Officer. We briefed her on WLR Rwanda activities,

especially the upcoming trainings for journalists on gender and how to report GBV stories. Ms. Lee indicated that she would try to attend at least one day of the trainings, as she would be in the vicinity of Ruhengeri (Northern Province) where they would be held. Ms. Lee asked what she could do for WLR, and we asked her to work with Ms. Mukantabana on how to write success stories suitable for USAID in the coming fiscal year, as it is our final year and we will be concentrating on communicating WLR's achievements. She agreed, subject to time constraints.

**9/1/06 Marcelline Mukakarangwa, Secretary General of the Ministry of Justice, and Mr. Denis, ILPD consultant, at the Ministry of Justice, Kigali;**

Ms. Neylon and Ms. Mukantabana met with the Secretary General, who oversees the new ILPD, and Mr. Denis, a consultant from Canada who is working with the Ministry to develop the ILPD and its curriculum, to discuss WLR Rwanda support for two ILPD courses. We told them that the short, 4-hour course "Gender and Domestic Relations" is being written by two local consultants and will be ready by the end of October, and Mr. Denis assured us that this course is integrated into the larger ILPD curriculum, which will begin in January 2007. They were very interested in the longer course we planned on developing, "Gender and Law," and asked if we could write a short description and an MOU setting out respective responsibilities for this course. Ms. Neylon explained that she had already started discussions with former Canadian Supreme Court Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé, who is an expert on judicial education, about contributing to this course, particularly on the international obligations section. Ms. Mukakarangwa and Mr. Denis expressed the opinion that this course, and this collaboration, will be a very important asset to the ILPD.

**Meetings scheduled but cancelled:** with the Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, and the Rwanda Women's Network.

## **ANNEX B: PARTICIPATORY TRAINING METHODS PROGRAM OUTLINE**

---

### **PROGRAM OUTLINE FOR THE TRAINING OF TRAINERS Kigali, August 18-20, 2006**

#### **DAY ONE**

##### **8:30-10:00**

- MURAHU--Introduction of the facilitator, identification of participants and choice of a training partner (pick the person sitting on either side of you, and if you don't speak or read English, select someone who does because the manual is in English). If someone does not have a partner, raise your hand. Choose a time keeper.
- The goal of this training is to teach participatory methods of training, enabling participants to learn, practice and discuss these techniques so they can coach other trainers in these skills. The facilitator describes an activity to the participants; they practice it and then discuss it. The activity can incorporate the topic of human rights a group is working on.
- Agreement on guidelines such as prompt attendance, everyone participating, asking questions at the beginning of an activity, but waiting until the end of an exercise to ask questions and confidentiality regarding participants' performances.
- Review the program outline
- Facilitators use presentation skills such as:
  1. body language (e.g. eye contact, body position, facial expression, offering a handshake, etc.);
  2. voice inflection, pitch and volume; and
  3. an authoritative, enthusiastic and dynamic presentation.
- Discuss what a training is and what it is not—  
It is: participatory; it isn't: a forum for all participants' opinions  
It is: sharing knowledge; it isn't: a lecture or a class.
- Explanation and discussion of the following training techniques:
  1. Setting the stage (informal seating arrangement, distribution of name tags and materials, indicate the location of the bathrooms, etc.)
  2. Writing a detailed program outline for each day of the training

3. Setting ground rules for the training:
  - be on time
  - turn off cell phones
  - consider others and no talking over others
  - 
  - do all the homework
  - participate
  - (consider fines for violators)
4. Planning openings and closings--see Tab 5, page 11 of the Training the Trainers Methodology Manual (Manual) and describing forthcoming, participatory activities
5. Creating an informal atmosphere by playing music, telling a story or a joke
6. Involving all participants by providing U-shaped seating, if possible, and asking participants to formulate questions they would ask in their future trainings, and inviting them to act in role plays and contribute comments on role plays and case studies--see Tab 4, page 9 and Tab 5, page 12 of Manual
7. Employing "fish bowls"—see Tab 5, pages 14 and 15 of the Manual (divide participants into two equal groups and arrange them in two concentric circles. The inner circle discusses a question selected by the entire group based on the theme of the training and the outer circle gives opinions on the inner circle's answers)
8. Using a flip chart or blackboard to record training techniques and participants' comments
9. Creating role plays and hypotheticals (case studies)—see Tab 5, pages 12 and 13; the difference between the two is that a role play is acted out in front of all the participants and in a hypothetical a set of facts is studied by small groups
10. Establishing group discussions of the role plays and small group analysis of the hypotheticals
11. Requiring participants to prepare and present examples of each technique or mini-mock trainings, incorporating the new techniques learned, to the entire group for its comments and suggestions
12. Using real-life situations
13. Judging timing
14. Involving participants in games such as "Simon Says" and "Musical Chairs", which allow people to relax and have fun. You can also ask participants to create a game with a human rights theme

15. Assigning the participants homework such as planning future trainings, writing role plays, case studies, radio programs, school plays and church presentations
16. Preparing worksheets for participants to plan future and mock trainings
17. Providing evaluation and self-assessment forms
18. Working with a training partner during and after the workshop
19. Ensuring feedback, discussions and questions and answer periods after each event and debriefing the group by asking what was valuable to them in the activity, what was difficult for them and whether they would use it in a future activity;
20. Asking if the exercise and the explanation is clear for all the participants
21. Discussing the following elements of questioning skills (see Tab 6 of the Manual)
  - a. types of effective questions;
  - b. guidelines for phrasing questions to provoke thought; and
  - c. responding to questions.
22. Learning the following effective listening skills (see Tab 7 of the Manual:
  - a. not interrupting the speaker;
  - b. making eye contact;
  - c. asking clarifying questions instead of jumping to conclusions;
  - d. concentrating on what is being communicated; and
  - e. repeating back to the speaker what he/she has said and asking if this if this is what was meant.
23. Practicing listening skills by dividing participants into two equal groups facing each other, discussing a statement about human rights provided by the facilitator and then each participant repeats what the other one has said and asks if this is correct
24. Creating a debate by dividing the participants into two groups, providing them with a human rights issue such as employment discrimination against someone with HIV/AIDS, having one group for the employer and the other for the employee and then have the groups change places—see Tab 5, pages 15 and 16

25. Using “myths and facts” by having a volunteer state a myth about a facet of human rights, such as women’s rights, using a myth (i.e. “husbands have the right to beat their wives if they don’t obey them”) and then asking another volunteer to state the relevant fact. The group then considers whether the myth or the fact holds true for the communities they work with, and suggests other myths they encounter and methods to eradicate them -- see Tab 5, page 16
  26. Polling participants after an activity by having them raise their hands in answer to questions such as, “Have you experienced this type of problem in your work?” or “Have you been able to assist the victim?”
  27. Preparing closings for each training day, reviewing the day’s actions and describing the next day’s activities and for the last day of the training asking participants to evaluate the training; and
  28. Debriefing every activity by asking a) what was valuable in the exercise, b) what worked well in it c) what was difficult in the exercise? d) how could the participant have made it easier and e) how they could use the exercise in their own training.
- Review and use of the *Train-the-Trainer Methodology Manual*.
  - Distribution, explanation and rationale for the following handouts:
    1. questionnaire for planning future trainings--in binder
    2. mock training worksheet--in binder
    3. evaluation and self-assessment forms--handouts

### **10:00-10:15**

#### COFFEE BREAK

### **10:15-11:30**

#### DO A ROLE PLAY--see Tab 5, pages 12 and 13 of the Manual

- The purpose of doing the following role play is to illustrate the topic of a training by acting it out, showing facts based on the training theme, involving the participants and enjoying the interaction.
- Read through the following group role play (that can be used in a children’s rights and/or criminal law procedure training) and have volunteers actors act it out in front of the group. Have the participants introduce themselves as their character and what their role is, so the audience is not confused as to who’s who. Then consider the value of using the questions below in a training but do not answer them:

Goretti and Assiel live in a two-room house in Rwanda commune in Gitarama province with their four daughters, the oldest of whom is Rose. She is 12 and takes after her mother who is very pretty. Assiel's youngest sister, Claudine, lives nearby with her husband, John. They have four boys who are all under eight. "It's good we live nearby so we can visit together so often," says Claudine, "although our boys now prefer to play football lately instead of coming to see their cousins."

"You're very lucky to have such pretty girls", John says to his brother-in-law. "I've always been especially fond of Rose and I like putting her to bed when Claudine and I visit." One night when the families are together, Rose appears in her mother's best dress and head scarf. "Look at me. I'm all grown up," Rose says proudly. "No. You're not," says Goretti. "You're still a little girl and if you don't act like one and do this again, your father will spank you with his belt." Assiel begins to take off his belt. Rose cries, "No. No. Last time you really hurt me." "You're being too harsh," says John. "I'll put her to bed, calm her down and tell her nicely not to dress up like that again."

Later that night Goretti hears Rose crying and asks her why. "I can't tell you; it's a secret," says Rose. When Rose continues to cry every night, Goretti hugs her and says, "You must tell me the reason for your tears and I will help you." Finally Rose says, "He hurt me when he put his thing in me. He's always touches me but never like that." "Why didn't you tell me before?" asks Goretti. Rose replies amid her sobs, "I was afraid to; he told me not to tell anyone. I thought it was okay because he's my uncle, and I went outside afterwards and showered like he told me to".

Goretti tells Assiel what happened to Rose and says, "I'm going to report it to the police. Now no one will marry Rose and suppose she got some awful disease from John. He hasn't looked well lately." "No," says Assiel. "Then everyone will know that Rose has been violated and she'll have to describe all the details to the policeman."

Assiel goes to John's house, hits him several times and says he's going to the police. "You hurt my baby." John begs Assiel not to tell the police. "If I go to jail, who will take care of your sister and the boys? Isn't there any other way I can make amends to you and Goretti and beg your forgiveness?" Claudine comes in and asks "Why are you hurting my husband, Assiel? You're my brother and you're supposed to be good to me and my family. Surely you can work out whatever the problem is with John." **VOLUNTEERS—GORETTI, ASSIEL, JOHN, CLAUDINE & ROSE**

- Think about the value of using the following questions during the role play- you don't have to answer them:
  1. What advice would you give Assiel and Goretti?
  2. How can Rose be helped emotionally and medically under the present laws?
  3. If Assiel does to the police, how can Rose be protected while telling her story to the police or in court?
  4. How can Joseph be kept away from Rose?

5. What punishment does Joseph face under the Penal Code and how would such an action be brought?
  6. How can Claudine support her boys if Joseph goes to jail?
- Participants' proposals of questions to ask in future trainings.
  - Feedback on what participants learned from the role play, what worked well as a learning tool, what didn't, what was difficult for them, and what could make the exercise easier to complete. Could the participants use this exercise in their own training?
- RAISE HANDS OR VOLUNTEER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS

### 11:30-12:00

- Discussion of the following elements of questioning skills—see Tab 6 of the Manual:
  1. selecting the right type of question that stimulates thinking, creates involvement, and elicits discussion;
  2. asking open-ended questions, not ones that can be answered with a “yes” or no”;
  3. beginning questions with “what”, “how”, “when,” or “why”;
  4. asking clear, concise and challenging questions; and
  5. asking for volunteers so no one feels put on the spot.

### 12:00-12:45

ENJOY WORKING ON A HYPOTHETICAL (CASE STUDY)—see Tab 5, page 13 of the Manual

- The purpose of using a hypothetical or story is to engage small groups in discussing a set of facts that simulate a situation of a topic of the training, analyzing it, answering questions about it, and creating questions they would ask an audience in their own training.
- Small groups of four or six selected by the facilitator read the following case study (that can be used in a training on Laws Relating to Matrimonial Regimes, Liberalities and Successions) and consider the questions listed below, but participants don't have to answer them. The method is to work on using a case study.
- Diagram the following hypothetical, and whenever necessary to clearly present the facts to the participants.

Pierre and Mukaneza were legally married in 1982 and lived together in small house on a five hectare plot with their four children. Later Pierre abandoned Mukaneza and married another woman, Agnes, with whom he produced two children, Gaetan and Elisabeth. Pierre fled to the Congo during the genocide and hasn't been heard of since. Mukaneza wants to sell some land and was asked to show Pierre's death certificate in order to prove her ownership of the land. She said she tried to get a certificate but was told by a civil status officer that she had no proof of his death.

Six years prior to this, Agnes obtained her certificate of marriage with Pierre. When Pierre didn't return from the Congo, she took the certificate to the Social Security Fund and to the manager of the factory where Pierre worked and claimed her right to social allowances. Thereafter Agnes remarried, but died shortly thereafter. Agnes' surviving husband claims if Mukaneza sells the land, she must share the profits of the sale with Gaetan and Elisabeth, Pierre's legitimate children.

- Think about the value of using the following questions in the training:
  1. Does Mukaneza have the right to sell any of the land?
  2. Does she need a death certificate in order to prove her ownership of the land?
  3. Must she share the profits of a sale with Agnes' children, Gaetan and Elisabeth, and if so, does Gaetan have the right to a larger share?
  4. Did Agnes have the right to claim social allowances based on Pierre's social security?
  5. Is Agnes' marriage to Pierre legal?
  6. How can this dispute be resolved?

#### **12:45-14:15**

LUNCH AND INFORMAL DISCUSSION WITH YOUR TRAINING PARTNER AND THE FACILITATOR OF HOW YOU WOULD USE A HYPOTHETICAL IN YOUR OWN TRAINING.

#### **14:15-15:15**

- Showing of a short film emphasizing the potential role women as drivers after they have left an abusive husband.
- Small groups choose a representative to report on each group's conclusions. Then each group considers the value of using the questions presented in a training, proposes questions they would ask in a future training and the use of a hypothetical as a training technique.

#### **15:15-16:15**

- Presentation by each small group representative.
- Group and facilitator's non-judgmental comments on each group's conclusions.

#### **16:15-17:15**

- Discussion of what the participants learned from the hypothetical, what worked well, what didn't and what participant could have done to improve his/her performance.

Feedback on how participants would use role plays and case studies in their trainings on human rights. Ask participants if the exercise and the explanation of it was clear.

- Short restatement --training techniques done —role plays and hypotheticals
- Request for participants to engage in energizing techniques—stretching, etc. Ask participants for their suggestions.
- Listening exercise (not a dialogue) with a participant—The trainer says, “Fifty percent of women are beaten because meals are not on time and I don’t think under the present law there’s any remedy, but it’s covered in the new Gender-based violence bill. The participant repeats the core of what the trainer has said and waits until the trainer agrees with what the participant has said.
- Assignments for the next day:
  1. read the *Train-the-Trainer Methodology Manual* ;
  2. write a role play and a hypothetical based on a real-life situation; and
  3. plan a future training using the worksheet in your booklet and try a listening exercise.

## **DAY TWO**

### **14:00-16:00 P.M.**

- Presentation of each future training plan.
- Group comments on the proposed trainings, suggestions for any changes, assurances that the trainings cover human rights topics listed in the “Training Guide for a Human Rights Trainer” and that they do not duplicate any proposed venue of another training.
- Debriefing the proposed trainings—see Tab 5, page 18 of the Manual:
  1. What was valuable for the participant in planning the training;
  2. What was difficult for the participant in doing this and how they could have made it easier;
  3. How the participants could use such planning in their own trainings; and
  4. How the participants would customize such a planning in their own trainings.
- Discussion regarding the value of holding monthly meetings to follow-up on how many of the proposed trainings have occurred, when others will take place and evaluations on the trainings that have taken place.

### **16:00-16:15**

### **COFFEE BREAK**

### **16:15-16:45**

## A “FISHBOWL” EXERCISE

- The purpose of this exercise is to involve all the participants and to practice their listening skills. Listening skills are important because:
  1. it makes communication interactive;
  2. it helps the listener understand what the speaker is saying; and
  3. it shows the speaker that he/she is being understood.
 (See Tab 7 of the Manual)
- Engage in a fishbowl exercise, using the topic of the family and discussing what marriages are legal and how they can be dissolved. The entire group suggests three questions to ask concerning these topics. Half the participants, selected by the facilitator, sit in an inner circle (“the fishbowl”), surrounded by an outer circle of the remaining participants. Everyone in the inner circle discusses the questions for five minutes. The outer circle listens carefully, making notes on what is being discussed.
- Ask someone in the outer circle to comment on the fishbowl circle’s answers and try to repeat what they have said.
- The groups then change places and roles.
- Debrief this exercise by asking the participants whether it was valuable for them, what was difficult for them, how they could have made it easier and whether they could use a “fishbowl” exercise in their future training.

### 16:45-17:15

#### ENGAGE IN A DEBATE

The purpose of this exercise is to listen to other people’s views, and become aware of people’s assumptions in order to dispel them by logical arguments.

- Dividing the group into two concentric circles, they will debate the following statement: “Men and women are different, have different roles and duties in the family and therefore cannot have equal authority in it or over the children.” The inner circle of volunteers debates the pros of the statement while the outer circle argues against the statement, taking five minutes for their arguments. The people in each group listen to the other group and try to repeat what they have said in their own words. Ask a volunteer in the outer circle to state what the inner group said, and a volunteer in the inner circle to say what the outer group said. The groups then change places and debate for another five minutes, and if there’s time the inner and outer circle representative repeat what the other circle said.

- After each group debates, the entire group discusses what was valuable in this exercise, what did and didn't work and whether they would incorporate it in their own training of trainers.

### **17:00-17:15**

- Review of the activities covered during the day
- Assignments for the last day of the workshop:
  1. list questions to ask participants regarding the role play or hypothetical that you've already written;
  2. prepare a mini-mock training of no more than ten minutes incorporating the role play or hypothetical, using the worksheet in the program outline binder;
  3. review the evaluation form to be completed during lunch tomorrow; and
  4. answer questions on the self-assessment questionnaire.
- Agenda for the last day.

## **THIRD DAY**

### **9:00-10:15**

- Announcement that the completed self-assessment questionnaires and evaluation forms will be collected after lunch. Evaluations are valuable for the following reasons:
  1. they are the basis for deciding whether to hold future trainings;
  2. they help in revising the materials; and
  3. they help revise the training format.

The self-assessment forms help the participant measure his/her performance.

- Review of the following training techniques:
  1. role plays
  2. hypotheticals (case studies/stories)
  3. "fishbowls"
  4. listening exercises
  5. debates
- Discussion of when each technique is best used (in what kind of trainings) and examples of each method.
- Request for participants to give their experiences in using training methods and inquiry as to whether they have used techniques presented in the training.

### **10:15-11:15**

- One-half of the participants present a role play or hypothetical usable in a training while the rest of the group makes notes on it.
- The group and the facilitator give non-judgmental comments on the presentations

### **11:15-11:30**

#### **COFFEE BREAK WITH FURTHER FEEDBACK BY THE GROUP AND THE FACILITATOR ON THE MOCK TRAININGS PRESENTED**

### **11:30-11:45**

- Discussion of the difference between a future training and a mock training and review of the relevant worksheets in the binder.

### **11:45-12:30**

#### **TRY ANOTHER HYPOTHETICAL— (Use a diagram to illustrate the facts)**

- Small group work on the following hypothetical (for use in a training on children's rights); select a representative, list the issues raised in the case study and create questions to ask in future trainings:

Charles lived with his parents, Judithe and Jean, and four older brothers in Kibuye province. They lived next to an older widower, HABIMANA Ansastase who had a three hectare plot and two goats. He often gave some of the goat's milk to Judithe for the children. When the killing began in Kibuye, Judithe and Jean, afraid for their lives asked Habimana to take care of the children if anything happened to them, particularly Charles because he was only two years old and had been born with one leg considerably shorter than the other.

When the genocidaires reached the hill where Judith and Jean lived, they killed them and the four older boys, but Charles was so well hidden they could not find him. They spared Habimana because he was so old. Habimana took Charles to live with him and although he fed and clothed him, when Charles was older, he made him work from sunrise until after sunset taking care of the land and animals, cleaning, going to the market and cooking all the meals. Habimana never sent Charles to the small school a few kilometers away. As the years went by Habimana, now ailing became cruel and callous and often severely beat Charles when Habimana didn't like the meals or the house wasn't spotless. Charles often went to bed crying with welts and sores on his back.

On Charles' fourteenth birthday, he told Habimana that now he was almost an adult he was leaving. "I'm going to try to go to Kigali where I can learn a trade and maybe find someone to teach me to read and write." Habimana severely beat him and said he would not

allow it, not only because he needed Charles, but because Habimana had parental authority over him.

### **12:30-1:00**

- Report by each representative of the group's conclusions on the issues raised (such as Charles' rights, whether Habimana could prevent him from leaving) and their selection of questions to ask in future trainings regarding the hypothetical.
- Feedback from the participants and the facilitator on each group's conclusions.
- Debrief the activity by asking each group member what worked well for them doing this exercise, what was difficult for them, how they could make it easier and when they would use such a hypothetical in a future training.

### **1:00-14:30**

LUNCH AND INFORMAL DISCUSSION WITH YOUR TRAINING PARTNER AND THE FACILITATOR ON WHAT PARTICIPATORY METHODS WERE VALUABLE, WHICH TECHNIQUES WERE DIFFICULT AND WHAT WOULD HAVE HELPED THE PARTICIPANT IN USING THEM.

PLEASE FILL OUT THE EVALUATION AND COMPLETE THE SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM.

### **14:30-15:00**

- Completion and collection of the evaluation and self-assessment forms.
- Participants choose a topic to debate and break up into small groups. They choose a representative who then presents a précis of their work.
- Debrief of debates by asking the group what worked well for them in this exercise, what was difficult for them and how they could use debates in their own trainings.
- Presentation of the following "flip chart" technique for use in short trainings or to quickly get participants involved and contributing:

(The facilitator explains and demonstrates the method by writing a statement on the flip chart underneath which are columns marked "positive" and "negative". The participants contribute comments under their selected column.)

- Completion of any unfinished presentations of hypotheticals or role plays.

### **15:00-15:30**

- Quick review the training exercises:
  1. role plays
  2. hypotheticals (case studies)
  3. fishbowls
  4. listening exercises
  5. debates
  6. “flip chart” or comparative method
  
- Questions and answers from the participants.
  
- Showing of hands to answer whether the training was helpful in preparing future trainings of trainers, whether participants can use the participatory skills learned and whether they would use them in their own trainings.

**MURAKOZE TO ALL THE PARTICIPANTS AND CONGRATULATIONS ON ALL THE WORK DONE.**

**A FILM WILL BE SHOWN TUESDAY EVENING, 29 AUGUST AT 19:00 AT THE NOVOTEL.**

## ANNEX C: PARTICIPATORY METHODS TRAINING WORKSHEET

---

### WORKSHEET FOR PLANNING A FUTURE TRAINING

- Who do you plan to train? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- What will be the human rights theme of the training? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- When will the training be held? \_\_\_\_\_
- How will you arrange and ensure that the training takes place?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- Where will you hold the training? \_\_\_\_\_
- How will you arrange the room and what tools will you use (flip chart, blackboard, circular seating)? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- What methods will you use in the training?  
Role plays? \_\_\_\_\_  
Hypotheticals? \_\_\_\_\_  
Small group work? \_\_\_\_\_  
Use of participants' real-life situations? \_\_\_\_\_  
Question and answer periods? \_\_\_\_\_  
Discussing questioning skills? \_\_\_\_\_  
What homework will you assign? \_\_\_\_\_  
What additional methods will you use? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 
- How will you involve all the participants? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

- What materials and worksheets will you prepare for the training? \_\_\_\_\_

---

- How and when will you follow up on the future trainings? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

- How will you get a report on the trainings that are held?

---

---

## **ANNEX D: PARTICIPATORY TRAINING METHODS REPORT**

---

### **REPORT ON TRAINING OF TRAINERS HELD AUGUST 18-20, 2006 IN KIGALI, RWANDA**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Women's Legal Rights (WLR) Initiative Rwanda's 2006 action plan envisioned at least two pilot training-of-trainers workshops on human and women's rights for Rwandan NGO leaders, a concept initiated by WLR's Legal and Gender Specialist, Lyn Beth Neylon, Esq. The recent training held by WLR Rwanda was done in collaboration with their NGO training partner, Haguruka, a highly-respected association for the defense of the rights of women and children. It followed WLR Rwanda's finalizing and printing Haguruka's training guide for human rights trainers.

The recent training was planned to effectuate two goals:

- To introduce participatory methods into Rwandan trainings, and
- To enable trainers to teach interactive techniques in future workshops to others who can train additional trainers similarly. In that way these methods will be used exponentially and the amount of trainers skilled in these techniques will multiply.

Participatory training techniques are an innovation in Rwanda. Rwandans are used to the way they are taught in school with a teacher lecturing students rather than engaging them, having them interact and contribute to discussions. Participatory training methods use exercises such as role plays, hypotheticals and debates where participants act out what they are learning, give feedback and discuss the value and use of an exercise; they are not similar to teaching a class subject matter. The participatory method is to "tell, show and do". It is effective because participants are involved verbally, physically and mentally instead of passively listening to a "talking head".

#### **II. THE TRAINING**

##### **A. The Participants**

There were 27 NGO trainers who attended the workshop, an overly-large number of participants to do a training. Many of the women trainees were members of Haguruka, including Rose Mukantabana, the Coordinator of WLR Rwanda. The President and the Executive Secretary of Haguruka attended the first day of the training, and a member of the Haguruka Board of Directors, the Chief of its Legal Affairs Unit and the heads of the offices throughout Rwanda (i.e. the Southern, Northern, Eastern and Western provinces) were present throughout the training.

Among others were several judges, prosecutors, a court clerk, a journalist and a deputy mayor. Several sociologists, educators and employees of the Rwandan Social Security, National Human Rights Commission, Conflict Resolution Centre of the National University of Rwanda and the Human Rights League in the Great Lakes Region attended. Most of the participants were lawyers and all of them were trainers in their fields of expertise such as conflict resolution, education, journalism, sociology, economy, women's and children's rights and the rule of law.

## **B. The Trainer**

Elizabeth Barad, Esq., an international human rights lawyer and former Chair of the Rwanda Legal Task Force of the New York City Bar Association, led the training-of-trainers. Ms. Barad previously presented lectures to the Kigali Bar, initiated two ethics seminars for the Rwandan justice system, prepared a training workshop on gender and international law and was a panel member at the Rwandan conference on gender-based violence.

Ms. Barad's experience teaching participatory methods includes her positions as an instructor at the International Law Institute of Uganda, New York University, the New School University, Baruch College and the Lobsang Banden School in Lhasa, Tibet. She has also lectured at the New York City Bar Association's seminar "Doing Business in Africa", was a panel member on global education at International Law Weekend, and participated in the Global Alliance for Justice Education's conference.

Ms. Barad serves as a mediator and arbitrator for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, the New York Supreme Court and the American Arbitration Association. She has also done research and field work for Human Rights First, the Coalition for Haitian rights and monitored the South African elections.

Her publications include articles on international women leaders, Rwandan women and judicial and gender-based violence reforms.

## **C. The Program**

The training-of-trainers was held over two and a half days at the Ninzi Hills Hotel in Kigali, Rwanda. Lunches and coffee-breaks were provided.

### **C.1 Day One**

After introductions the following materials were distributed:

- The Program Outline, attached hereto as Appendix A;
- A form to plan a future training, attached as Appendix B;
- A worksheet to plan a mock training, attached as Appendix C;

- A form to evaluate the training and a sampling of the completed forms in English and French, attached as Appendix D;
- A self-assessment questionnaire for the participant to appraise his/her performance, attached as Appendix E; and
- The Training the Trainers Methodology Manual, attached as Appendix F.

Pamphlets on WLR initiatives and on WLR Benin's work were also available to the participants. The trainer gave books on training trainers to Haguruka that will be available to participants at Haguruka's main office as well as DVD copies of the film, "The Constant Gardener", shot in Kibera, a Nairobi slum.

An informal atmosphere was set by a U-shaped seating arrangement and the playing of a CD in Kinyarwanda. Most of the participants knew each other but name tags were distributed to everyone, identifying those they didn't know. Justine Uvuza, a Rwandan lawyer who teaches gender at the National University of Rwanda, translated the trainer's English into the local Kinyarwanda.

The trainer began with a statement of the goals of the training and an overview of the program outline which was thereafter changed to adapt to the needs of the participants after assessing their concerns. After setting some ground rules, Ms. Barad explained the training techniques that would be used in which the trainees would participate. Significance was given to a trainer's presentation skills, body language and vocal use.

Ms. Barad described the contents of the Methodology Manual and proceeded to engage the trainees in the first training technique, a role play written to raise the issue and the ramifications of a child's rape. The exercise was debriefed with feedback from the volunteer actors and the group. This was followed by a description of effective questioning skills.

The next technique the participants engaged in was a hypothetical (case study or a story). The attendees separated into small groups and worked on a case study relating to the Rwandan law on inheritance which was illustrated on the flip chart. A representative presented each group's lists of the issues raised in the hypothetical. Thereafter there was a discussion of what the participants learned from the exercise, what worked well for them and how they could use such an exercise in their future trainings.

After lunch, a short film was shown depicting a woman's flight from being a battered wife to becoming an independent truck driver. The CD of the film was given to Haguruka for its future use. The facilitator reviewed the training techniques in which the group participated, and, after suggesting the attendees stand up and stretch, requested the group's input on additional energizing exercises. A participant led the attendees in running in place and arm movements.

After the trainer distributed candies to further energize and reward the participants for their work, she explained a listening exercise wherein the listener, after understanding the speaker's

statement, repeats the core of what the speaker has said and waits until the speaker agrees with the listener's reflection. The purpose of the exercise is not only to properly understand a speaker's communication, but to reassure the speaker that he/she is being understood. It is not a dialogue with the speaker. To illustrate the exercise, the trainer practiced it with the translator and later assigned it to small groups to perform.

Homework for the next day was to read the Training the Trainers Methodology Manual, to practice a listening exercise and to plan a future training using the previously-provided worksheet for doing so.

## **C. 2 Day Two**

The second day of the training was shortened to a half-day session due to nationwide elections that were held in the morning. It began with an explanation of a "fish bowl" exercise in which some of the participants sit in an inner circle, i.e. the "fish bowl". Others sit around the inner circle and listen while the "fish bowl" people answer three questions chosen by the rest of the group. The purpose of this exercise is to involve all the participants and to hone their listening skills. Participants debriefed the technique by discussing its value and use in future trainings and whether its practice was clear to them.

Following that, the participants broke up into small groups and practiced a debate, another training method in which part of the group takes one side of an issue (the "pros") and the remaining members argue the other side (the "against"). The pros have to repeat what the "against" say and visa versa. The trainer explained that the purpose of the exercise is to listen to opposing arguments, try to understand them and dispel them with logical arguments. The technique was debriefed by asking the participants what was valuable in it, what worked well for them, what didn't and whether they could incorporate it in their own trainings.

After the day's activities were reviewed the trainer gave the following assignments for the last day of the training:

- To list questions to ask trainees in future workshops regarding the role play or hypothetical the participants have already written;
- Prepare a mini-mock training incorporating the role play or hypothetical using the previously distributed worksheet; and
- Review the evaluation and self-assessment forms to be completed during lunch on the next day of the training.

## **C. 3 Day Three**

The trainer announced that the evaluation and self-assessment forms would be collected after lunch. Lyn Beth Neylon, Esq. explained that the evaluation forms would be the basis for deciding whether to hold future trainings and assist in revising the training format and materials.

The trainer said completion of the self-assessment form would help the participants measure their performance and should be done with someone else for an objective view.

The training techniques were reviewed, and the facilitator indicated when each technique could be used and in what kind of trainings, giving examples of the use of each method. Participants were asked for their experiences using training techniques and whether they employed any of the methods practiced in the training.

Several trainees presented the role play or hypothetical they had prepared and the group and the facilitator gave non-judgmental comments on their contributions. Further feedback was given to them during the coffee break. Thereafter the trainer answered questions regarding the difference between the preparation of a future and a mock training, following which small groups worked on a case study prepared by the facilitator raising issues of children's rights.

Representatives of each small group presented the group's conclusions as to the issues raised in the hypothetical, although some focused on solutions instead of practicing the technique. The trainer highlighted the distinction between addressing the subject matter of a case study and concentrating on the use of the method as a training exercise. Debriefing of the technique included questions of whether the method worked well for the participants and how they could use it in a future training.

The evaluation and self-assessment forms were collected after lunch. Then, at the participants' suggestion, small groups chose a topic to debate and a spokesperson for their group. Subjects included polygamy, inheritance rights and underage marriages. Some representatives related only their group's solutions to the subject matter of the debate, but others used the technique correctly to describe the issues involved and their experience using it.

Participants were concerned that the techniques presented could not be incorporated in a short training of only a few hours. In answer to this, Lyn Beth Neylon, Esq. presented the "flip chart" technique in which a statement was written on the flip chart, eliciting positive and negative comments that were written underneath in two relevant columns. Ms. Neylon explained that this technique could not only be performed quickly but would encourage the audience's participation.

The trainer took a poll by a showing of hands regarding the value of the training, whether the participants learned the techniques presented and whether they could use them in their own trainings. A trainee listed the participatory methods practiced on the flip chart. Haguruka's short film with an upbeat musical accompaniment illustrating women's independence was shown.

In conclusion, the trainer thanked the participants for their contributions after which the gender and legal specialist for WLR Rwanda, Lyn Beth Neylon, Esq. and Esperance Nyirasafari of Haguruka spoke.

## **D. PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES**

### **D.1 Reactions to the Training Techniques**

The participants were enthusiastic about doing and debriefing the first training technique presented--a role play. The volunteer actors gave an excellent performance of the facts of a child's rape. They were eager to tell of their use of this technique in their trainings and their experience with the issues involved in the communities in which they worked. Acting out situations is part of the Rwandan culture, but participants had more difficulty using case studies properly because they usually taught subject matter with them rather than practicing them as a training exercise. Therefore, although small groups enjoyed working on hypotheticals, some participants focused more on resolutions to the problems presented rather than on using the case study to select issues raised and to discuss the value and purpose of the exercise.

Planning future trainings was easy for the participants, although several of them were dependent on the schedules of their organizations. They trained in a wide area of subject matters—education, rule of law, children's and women's rights, marital mediations, etc. The suggestion of follow-up discussions on their trainings was not enthusiastically received, because these hard working trainers were already committed to many planning and review meetings.

Many participants said they understood the listening exercise because, as lawyers, they were used to paying attention to what their clients said. However, they were less skilled at repeating what a speaker had said and making the communication interactive. Because the "fishbowl" exercise included listening skills, although all the trainees contributed comments, the participants had difficulty understanding its use. They all enjoyed the small group debating exercise, particularly where they created their own topics. Arguing for an unlikable point of view was understandably difficult for the participants. The "flipchart" technique was easier for them because it used a written statement to which they could react, and their comments were recorded on the flip chart.

Some of the participants didn't understand the difference between preparing future trainings and mock trainings and also between the use of the "fishbowl" technique and debates. All were eager to learn how and when each method could be used. Some attendees focused on solutions to problems raised in exercises rather than concentrating on their use as training techniques; a few said they would prefer working on positive rather than negative examples in the training methods.

## **D.2 Participants' Evaluations**

A criterion for a successful training is "the degree of participation...taken by the learners".<sup>1</sup> All of the twenty-three completed evaluations indicated the trainees had an opportunity to contribute to the discussions and that the facilitator encouraged them to do so. (A sampling of the evaluations, in English and French, are attached with Appendix D, the evaluation form.) According to the evaluations, the majority of the attendees found the training valuable, six found it very successful and two thought it was unsuccessful. Of those two, one person thought the participants should have created the training and their local organization, Haguruka, should have prepared the materials; the other person found the timing inconvenient.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hart, *Training Methods that Work* (Course Technology, a subsidiary of Thomson Learning, 1991), page 4.

Of those who thought the training was very successful, some thought closer monitoring, additional documentation, films, more practice time and “regular self-updating and contact with other trainers”<sup>2</sup> would be helpful. Among other remarks, some of evaluations indicated that more time to practice exercises<sup>3</sup>, increased brainstorming, more explanations, films, PowerPoint presentations and translation of the training manual into French (which is planned) would be valuable. There was also a request for more flip chart use, preparation of a practical primer, biographies for the participants and a training on Rwandan children’s statutes and international laws (although this was not the purpose of training on methodology).

In answer to a request for suggestions to improve the training, some participants recommended prior availability of the training methodology manual, more role playing, additional practice, sufficient time to prepare assignments and increased input of trainer’s experiences. According to the written evaluations the majority of the attendees found the training helpful.

## **E. CONCLUSION**

The training was an important step to introduce participatory methods of training. Such techniques are important because they actively engage trainees to learn, analyze and use training exercises. This encourages more effective learning rather than the traditional Rwandan way of a teacher lecturing an audience which accepts what is being told to them without thinking about it or discussing it. The innovative participatory approach can not only make trainings more effective but break the Rwandan mold of accepting an authority’s instructions.

Most of the participants indicated that they learned the new techniques and could teach them to other trainers, thus building a pool of trainers skilled in participatory techniques who could then pass it on to other trainers. Some of the trainees said that they already used these methods although several did not perform the techniques properly. This was particularly evident in the listening exercise where they could not succinctly repeat what a speaker said to reassure him/her that he/she was being understood. They also found difficulty participating in a debate where they had to argue a view unacceptable to them and did not understand this was a way of comprehending another point of view and building arguments against it.

Although the majority of the trainees thought the training was successful, it was still difficult for them to wean themselves away from their usual method of providing solutions rather than focusing on the use of participatory techniques to engage other trainees. Nevertheless, and despite the fact that change comes slowly, the trainees began learning the new methods by participating in them. Many found the techniques interesting although some attendees diverted their attention by talking to their neighbors while the trainer and others were commenting on the exercises.

---

<sup>2</sup> Evaluation signed by RUHUMULIZA Ellis, an educator and employee of the Rwandan Social Security, who specializes in conflict resolution.

<sup>3</sup> Evaluation signed by INGABIRE M. Immaculee, a journalist, an independent consultant, an activist in gender-based violence and a member of Haguruka.

The training, however, provided an important platform for introducing innovative and effective participatory training methods which, through practice and use, can be incorporated into trainings of additional trainers.

## **F. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Although the training was generally successful, it was evident that the participatory training techniques that were introduced could be further ingrained by the following:

- Additional practice in a follow-up training for the present participants;
- More trainings for others to learn and practice participatory training techniques in order to teach them to additional trainers;
- Closer monitoring of small group work using more trainers and assistants to observe and supervise each group;
- Translation of the Training the Trainers Methodology Manual into French;
- Requiring a review of the Manual prior to further trainings; and
- Follow up on future trainings to be that by meetings or by an administrator's contact with the attendees by mobile phone or e-mails. (Either the WLR Rwanda's Coordinator or an officer of Haguruka could choose such a person.) This would eliminate any duplication, assess the success of the trainings and help to properly plan more.

With these additional steps, not only will future trainings use more effective learning methods, but new teaching techniques will be incorporated into Rwanda's educational milieu.