War-to-Peace Transitions: Systemic Peacebuilding

PAX 617

Fall 2016

Thursdays 1:45-4:45 p.m.
except the following (please note, these dates are provisional & may change with advance notice & discussion):
All day Sept 1, Oct 13, Dec 8 (8:45-11:45 & 1:45-4:45)
No class on Sept 29, Oct 20, Nov 24 (Thanksgiving), Dec 15

Martin House, Upstairs Classroom

INSTRUCTOR’S INFORMATION:
Catherine Barnes, Ph.D.
catherine.barnes@emu.edu
Office Hours: Thursdays, by appointment
Weaver House, Room 202

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course will address many of the dilemmas in developing and sustaining processes to end armed conflict and make the transition to durable peace and more inclusive states and societies. We will deepen our understanding of key challenges and opportunities, risks and resources typically operating in these conflict systems, exploring leverage points for justice and peacebuilding interventions.

We will explore some of the characteristics of war and protracted organized violence in the 21st century, seeking to identify the strategic implications. We will learn about how people have worked to increase civilian protection, engage with armed groups, promote confidence building, identify comprehensive agendas for transforming conflict. We will study the ‘design’ of processes aimed at ending fighting and creating the frameworks for peaceful settlement, with special attention to processes that enable public participation in political negotiations. We will explore dilemmas, principles and comparative experiences in fostering transitional justice – including retributive, redistributive and restorative models – and promoting reconciliation. We will use case studies, group exercises, simulations and discussion of specific dilemmas participants have encountered in their own work / context. Each participant will choose a specific context and, through a range of class assignments, will develop elements of a strategic framework for supporting transitional processes in that context.

COURSE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:
1. Increased understanding of the key characteristics of war, state fragility and protracted violence in today’s globalized world and the challenges these pose for justice and peacebuilding.
2. Develop a broad understanding some of the key challenges in fostering war-to-peace transitions and in supporting a trajectory for more inclusive and democratic societies.
3. Familiarity with a variety of ways peacebuilders have addressed those challenges in a diverse range of societies, drawing out key learning points and considering their implications for other conflict contexts.
4. Greater capacity to move from analysis of conflict issues – and the positions, interests and needs of parties – to formulating overarching strategies capable of addressing them.
5. Demonstrate capacity to apply systems thinking approaches to map the interaction of factors underpinning systemic conflict and to identify factors and leverage points for supporting transition.
6. Increased skill in using systems thinking to analyze complex societal conflicts, identifying ‘leverage’ points and developing strategies for systemic peacebuilding.
7. Producing written materials that communicate complex ideas effectively to a professional audience on options to address a complex peacemaking challenge.

**REQUIRED TEXTS AND OTHER RESOURCES:**
The required book for the course is:


There is an extensive reading list drawn from the vast amount of high-quality ‘grey literature’ produced by policy institutes, INGOs government agencies and inter-governmental bodies available freely as .pdfs and selected journal articles. These will be uploaded onto the class Moodle site or can be accessed online. Please see the weekly outline, below, for details.

**REQUIRED ASSIGNMENTS:**

1) **Participation (250 points):** Active participation in class discussions and exercises will be an important part of this course. Specifically.
   - Completing the readings will be crucial to effective participation in the class and for achieving the learning objectives. All participants will need to demonstrate they have engaged with the questions and issues set for each seminar-style class. They will be regularly asked to share with the class some of their key ‘take home points’ and critical questions that emerged for them from the readings.

2) **Systemic case study analysis and presentation: (300 points)** Participants will chose a case of interest to them relevant to the focus of this class, in consultation with the instructor. Using the systemic analysis methods explored in class and in CJP’s Foundations courses, as well as several other analytical models (lenses), each participant will analyze the dynamics of the case and the plausible motivations of key parties and will identify potential leverage points for transforming the conflict system.
   - One paragraph case description – due by 10a.m. on Monday 12 Sept
   - Presentation of preliminary systems mapping and analytical lenses at analysis workshop in class on 13 October
   - Case study analysis paper, 3,000-3,500 words max + graphics – due close of day Friday 21 October

3) **Peacebuilding strategies for your case study, using ‘Briefing Report’ format (450 points total)** – due on noon on Thursday 15 December.
   - Briefing Report – Using the structure and lay-out of a USIP Special Report, you will draw on the authors and the thematic challenges explored in class to suggest elements of a strategy to support the prospects of a transformative war-to-peace transition in your case: 2,500-3,000 words maximum + graphics.
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These are brief descriptions of required graded assignments for the course. More details for each assignment can be found on the "Guidance Notes" that will be provided in class.
## Class Schedule and Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept 1</th>
<th>ALL DAY CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:45-11:45; 1:45-4:45 | **Systemic approach to conflict transformation and peacebuilding processes:** Understanding armed political conflict and war-to-peace transition processes writ large  
+ Review overall class trajectory and expectations for this seminar class. |

### On Moodle
-- **READ:** Executive Summary and Introduction chapters
- Review / re-read from Foundations II Reading (re-posted on our class Moodle site):
  - Kaldor, Mary and Robin Luckham. “Global Transformations and New Conflicts”
  - Lewis Kriesberg, Interlocking Conflicts
- **Watch / Listen 2 Case Studies** – for use in class discussions and system mapping exercises
  - **Case study: The wars in the former Yugoslavia (5 hour documentary, available online)**
    Watch the award winning documentary *The Death of Yugoslavia*, BBC documentary series first broadcast in 1995. It covers the collapse of the former Yugoslavia. It is notable in its combination of never-before-seen archive footage interspersed with interviews of most of the main players in the conflict. You can also refer to the companion book by Laura Silber and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Resource/Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 8</td>
<td>Peace processes within war-to-peace transitions: an overview of challenges</td>
<td>ON MOODLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK Department for International Development. 2010. Building Peaceful States and Societies: A DFID Practice Paper. <a href="http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON75.pdf">http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON75.pdf</a> (It is okay to skim this one...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>Preventing violence and building the ‘architecture’ for peace through societal engagement in transforming conflict dynamics Preventing the descent into war / protracted violence and creating</td>
<td>People Building Peace II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Catherine Barnes. Weaving the Web: Civil Society Roles in Working With Conflict and Building Peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Takwa Zebulon Suifon. “Early Warning, Early Response: Preventing Violent Conflict.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Max van der Stoel “Early Involvement”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sept 24  | Engaging armed groups and addressing the challenges of asymmetry + re-conceptualizing the frame of ‘spoilers’ | ALL READINGS ON MOODLE  
http://www.c-r.org/our-work/accord/engaging-groups/contents.php  
READ:  
• Sue Williams and Rob Ricigliano. Understanding armed groups.  
• Clem McCartney. From armed struggle to political negotiations: Why? When? How?  
• Liz Philipson. Engaging armed groups: the challenge of asymmetries  
• Joaquín Villalobos. The Salvadorean insurgency: why choose peace?  
• Alastair Crooke. In search of respect at the table: Hamas ceasefires 2001-03  
Ben Shepard. 2010. The ‘Spoiler’ Concept, Conflict and Politics: who ‘spoils’ what, for whom?  
Seminar Report Paper. |
| Sept 29  | NO Class (please note, this date might need to change..)                |                                                                          |
| Oct 6 | Changing the strategic calculus  
- Policy tools: sanctions, incentives and conditionality  
- Social movements  
- Targeted campaigns | People Building Peace II  
- Milja Jovanovic. Rage Against the Regime: The Otpor Movement in Serbia.  
- Thelma Ekiyor and Leymah Gbowee. Women’s Peace Activism in West Africa: The WIPNET Experience  
ON MOODLE  
- Aaron Griffiths and Catherine Barnes. Incentives and sanctions in peace processes  
- Catherine Barnes and Aaron Griffiths. Influencing resolution: external roles in changing the strategic calculus of conflict  
- El Salvador: war-time negotiations and the coordination of external influence  
- Catherine Barnes. International isolation and pressure for change in South Africa  
- Rex Brynen. Aid as carrot, aid as stick: the politics of aid conditionality in the Palestinian Territories. |
| Oct 13 | ALL DAY CLASS Seminar Workshop: Presentations of draft Systemic Analysis of your case study | In this seminar session, each person will prepare a presentation of their draft case study analysis. (Please refer to the Guidance Note.) Participants in the class will provide feedback and suggestions, which can be incorporated into the final paper, due at close of day on Friday 21 October |
| October 21 | No Class – work on your case study analysis | |
| Oct 27 | Building relationships for peace  
Opening communication channels, Fostering relationships & promoting dialogue + Dealing with destructive fissure: Building intra-group coherence and reconciliation | People Building Peace II  
- Edward (Edy) Kaufman: Dialogue Based Processes (19)  
- Diana Lampen and John Lampen: Facilitating a Mutual De-escalation Process: Quakers and the Peace and Reconciliation Group in Northern Ireland. (21.2)  
- A Nonthreatening Approach to Peace: The Community Sant’Egidio in Mozambique (21.1)  
| Nov 3 | Addressing the military issues & new security arrangements  
|       | • The international normative evolution (and collapse?) of the responsibility to protect (and to prevent).  
|       | • Dealing with military issues during peace negotiations (negotiating ceasefires);  
|       | • Providing human security during times of armed conflict (peacekeeping);  
|       | • Addressing the military build-up to wage wars (disarmament, demobilization and reintegation or 'DDR'); and  
|       | I have grouped the readings under each of these headings. In addition to the required ICISS reading, please choose three additional readings – each from a different category, so as to get a mix of themes and vocabulary for talking about these themes on topics most relevant for your case study. As such, you will do a total of 4 readings in preparation for this class.  

**Everyone reads:**  

**Peacekeeping (skimming is okay)**  

**Negotiating Ceasefires – choose one**  
• Diamedes Eviota, Jr. Grassroots and South-South Cooperation: Bantay Ceasefire in the Philippines. (15.4) People Building Peace  

ON MOODLE  


Optional Extra  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov 10</th>
<th>Constructing the negotiation process: Sudan Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuum from elite pact making and power brokering to structured mediated talks to transformative mediation and public participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON MOODLE

Alex de Waal's article 'Dilemmas of multiple priorities and multiple instruments: the Darfur Crisis'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov 17</th>
<th>Inclusion and public participation in negotiation processes and in renegotiating the political settlement / constitutional reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ON MOODLE

Optional reading:


**Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration – choose one**
- Sami Faltas and Wolf-Christain Paes. "Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration: Not Only a Job for Soldiers" *People Building Peace II* (22)

**Security Sector Reform – choose one (skimming is okay)**
### Nov 24
No Class – Thanksgiving Break

### Dec 1
**Transitional justice**: Dealing with the past; moving together into the future  
- International, national, local considerations  
- Framework agreements: legal, political and societal considerations  
- Comparative experiences and process elements

**People Building Peace II**
- Hizkias Assefa. Reconciliation: Challenges, Responses and the Role of Civil Society. (23)  
- Restoring the Power of Speech: The REHMI Initiative in Guatemala (10.4)  
- John Bond. From Saying ‘Sorry’ to a Journey of Healing: National Sorry Day in Australia. (23.1)  
- Corinne Bloch. Listen to Understand: The Listening Project in Croatia. (23.2)  
- Michael Henderson. The Spirit of Caux: Moral Re-Armament / Initiatives of Change in Switzerland. (23.3)  
- Dialogue Spices Peace: Baku Bae in Indonesia (23.4)  
- Allbino Forquilha. Transforming Arms into Ploughshares: The Christian Council of Mozambique

ON MOODLE  

Optional Extra:  

### Dec 8  
ALL DAY  
**Seminar Workshop: Presenting draft peacebuilding strategies**

In this seminar session, each person will prepare a presentation of their draft peacebuilding strategies for their case study. Participants in the class will provide feedback and suggestions, for incorporation into the finished paper, which will be due at noon on Thursday 15 December. *(no class on 15 December)*

### Dec 15
No Class – Final Peacebuilding Strategies paper due by Noon
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR CJP GRADUATE COURSE SYLLABI:

Writing Guidelines:
Writing will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of writing guidelines for graduate programs that include six sets of criteria: content, structure, rhetoric & style, information literacy, source integrity, and conventions (see page 3). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a "good" level with 60% writing at an "excellent" level. For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP’s GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS (see CJP Student Resources moodle page or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator), unless directed otherwise by the instructor.

Academic Integrity Policy (AIP):
EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy and doing justice. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one’s own someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). This course will apply EMU’s AIP to any events of academic dishonesty. For more information see http://emu.edu/writing-program/faculty-services/student-academic-integrity-policy2015.pdf. If you have doubts about what is appropriate, one useful website is http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/.

Turnitin:
Students are accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Thus, you should be familiar with EMU’s Academic Integrity Policy (see above) in order to meet the academic expectations concerning appropriate documentation of sources. In addition, EMU is using Turnitin, a learning tool and plagiarism prevention system. For CJP classes, you may be asked to submit your papers to Turnitin from Moodle. For more information about Turnitin, with instructions for using it see: https://guides.turnitin.com/01_Manuals_and_Guides/Student/Student_QuickStart_Guide.

Moodle:
Moodle (https://moodle.emu.edu/) is the online learning platform that EMU has chosen to provide to faculty, administrators and students. Students will have access to course information within Moodle for any class they are registered for in a given term. The amount of time a student has access to information before and after the class is somewhat dependent on the access given to students by the individual faculty member. However, please note that courses are not in Moodle permanently - after two years the class will no longer be accessible. Please be sure to download resources from Moodle that you wish to have ongoing access to.

Grading Scale & Feedback:
In most courses grades will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course (several CJP courses are graded pass/fail). Assignments will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g. 18/20). The following is the basic scale used for evaluation. Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.

Grading Scale:

95-100 = A outstanding
90-94 = A- excellent
85-89 = B+ very good
80-84 = B good
76-79 = B- satisfactory
73-75 = C+ passing
70-72 = C unsatisfactory
Below 70 = F failing

Graduate students are expected to earn A’s & B’s. A GPA of 3.0 for MA students and 2.75 for GC students is the minimum requirement for graduation.
Regarding feedback on papers/projects: Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

Institutional Review Board:
All research conducted by or on EMU faculty, staff or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to assure participant safety: http://www.emu.edu/irb/.

Graduate & Professional Studies Writing Center:
Please utilize the writing center! They offer free individual tutoring from graduate student tutors. Please see http://www.emu.edu/writing-program/ for more information, including how to schedule appointments.

Office of Academic Access:
If you have a physical, psychological, medical or learning disability that may impact your work in this course, it is your responsibility to contact the Office of Academic Access in the Academic Success Center on the third floor of the Hartzler Library. They will work with you to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. All information and documentation is treated confidentially. See http://www.emu.edu/academics/access/ for more information.

Class Attendance:
Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed (from EMU Graduate Catalog). Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in the case of CJP classes that only meet once a week or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.

Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:
For fall and spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months), by emailing the instructor, academic advisor and the Academic Program Coordinator. If the request is granted the student will receive an "I" (incomplete) for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under unusual circumstances and with permission of the Program Director). Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work.

PLEASE NOTE: If the outstanding course work is received within the first 6 weeks of the extension, no grade reduction will be imposed; after 6 weeks any outstanding coursework will be reduced by ½ letter grade. If the extension deadline is not met, the student will receive a final grade based on the work completed.
Title IX:
The following policy applies to any incidents that occur (on or off campus) while you are a student registered at EMU. It does not apply if you are talking about incidents that happened prior to your enrollment at EMU. It is important for you to know that all faculty and staff members are required to report known or alleged incidents of sexual violence (including sexual assault, domestic/relationship violence, stalking). That means that faculty and staff members cannot keep information about sexual violence confidential if you share that information with them. For example, if you inform a faculty or staff member of an issue of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination he/she will keep the information as private as he/she can, but is required to bring it to the attention of the institution’s Title IX Coordinator. If you would like to talk to this office directly, Marcy Engle, Title IX Coordinator, can be reached at 540-432-4148 or marcy.engle@emu.edu. Additionally, you can also report incidents or complaints through the online portal at http://emu.edu/safecampus/. You may report, confidentially, incidents of sexual violence if you speak to Counseling Services counselors, Campus Ministries’ pastors, or Health Services personnel providing clinical care. These individuals, as well as the Title IX Coordinator, can provide you with information on both internal and external support resources. Please refer to the Student Handbook which can be found at http://emu.edu/graduate-and-professional-studies/graduate-student-handbook.pdf for additional policies, information, and resources available to you.

Academic Program Policies: For more CJP-specific graduate program policies, please see http://www.emu.edu/cjp/grad/policies/. For EMU graduate program policies see http://www.emu.edu/catalog/graduate/graduate-professional-policies.pdf.
### Writing Standards – Graduate Level (revised Spring 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A excellent</th>
<th>B adequate expectations</th>
<th>C below expectations</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Content** (quality of the information, ideas and supporting details) | • shows clarity of purpose  
• offers depth of content  
• applies insight and represents original thinking  
• follows guidelines for content | • shows some clarity of purpose  
• offers some depth of content  
• applies some insight and some original thinking  
• mostly follows guidelines for content | • shows minimal clarity of purpose  
• offers minimal depth of content or incorrect content  
• applies minimal insight and original thinking  
• does not follow guidelines for content |         |
| **Structure** (logical order or sequence of the writing) | • shows coherence, and logically-developed paragraphs  
• uses very effective transitions between ideas and sections  
• constructs appropriate introduction and conclusion | • shows some coherence and some logically-developed paragraphs  
• uses some effective transitions between ideas & sections  
• shows some construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion | • shows minimal coherence and logically-developed paragraphs  
• uses minimal transitions between ideas and sections  
• shows minimal construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion |         |
| **Rhetoric and Style** (appropriate attention to audience) | • is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective  
• effectively uses correct, varied and concise sentence structure  
• is engaging to read  
• writes appropriately for audience and purpose | • is somewhat concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective  
• generally uses correct, varied, and concise sentence structure  
• is somewhat engaging to read  
• generally writes appropriately for audience and purpose | • shows minimal conciseness, eloquence, and rhetorical effectiveness  
• uses incorrect, monotonous or simplistic sentence structure  
• is not engaging to read  
• lacks appropriate writing for audience and purpose  
• uses inappropriate jargon and clichés |         |
| **Information Literacy** (locating, evaluating, and using effectively the needed information as appropriate to assignment) | • uses academic and reliable sources  
• chooses sources from many types of resources  
• chooses timely resources for the topic  
• integrates references and quotations to support ideas fully | • uses mostly academic and reliable sources  
• chooses sources from a moderate variety of types of resources  
• chooses resources with mostly appropriate dates  
• integrates references and quotations to provide some support for ideas | • lacks academic and reliable sources  
• chooses sources from a few types of resources  
• selects a few resources with inappropriate dates  
• integrates references or quotations that are loosely linked to the ideas of the paper |         |
| **Source Integrity** (appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research) | • correctly cites sources for all quotations  
• cites paraphrases correctly and credibly  
• includes reference page  
• makes virtually no errors in documentation style  
• makes virtually no errors in formatting  
• incorporates feedback given in previous written assignments | • correctly cites sources for most quotations  
• usually cites paraphrases correctly and credibly  
• includes reference page with some errors  
• makes some errors in documentation style  
• makes some errors in formatting  
• incorporates some feedback given in previous written assignments | • provides minimal sources for quotations  
• sometimes cites paraphrases correctly and credibly  
• includes reference page with many errors  
• makes many errors in documentation style  
• makes many errors in formatting  
• lacks incorporation of feedback given in previous written assignments |         |
| **Conventions** (adherence to grammar rules: usage, spelling, & mechanics of Standard Edited English or SEE) | • makes virtually no errors in SEE conventions  
• makes accurate word choices | • makes some errors SEE conventions  
• almost always makes accurate word choices | • makes many errors in SEE conventions  
• makes many inaccurate word choices |         |

The weighting of each of the six areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher's preference. Plagiarism occurs when one presents as one's own "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>A – Excellent</th>
<th>B – Minimal expectations</th>
<th>C – Below expectations</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals &amp; Audience</strong> &lt;br&gt;Are the goals or &lt;br&gt;learning objectives of the project clear? &lt;br&gt;Have they been met? &lt;br&gt;Is the intended audience clearly specified? &lt;br&gt;Is the project appropriate for this audience? &lt;br&gt;Does the project communicate to the intended audience?</td>
<td>- audience &amp; goals/learning objectives clearly identified. &lt;br&gt;- project appropriate for, and likely to meet, its goals &lt;br&gt;- project is appropriate for specified audience &lt;br&gt;- project understandable to &amp; likely to engage and/or communicate to audience</td>
<td>-audience and goals identified though not as clearly as they could be &lt;br&gt;- project may meet its goals but this is not entirely clear &lt;br&gt;- project is at least somewhat appropriate for, and likely to communicate to audience.</td>
<td>-audience and goals inappropriate or inadequately identified &lt;br&gt;- project unlikely to meet its goals and/or communicate to the audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong> &lt;br&gt;Is the overall methodology clear and appropriately used? &lt;br&gt;Has the project incorporated specific methods required by the assignment? &lt;br&gt;If intended as a form of intervention, has thought be given to how it will be implemented?</td>
<td>- project incorporates inquiry methods required by the assignment &lt;br&gt;- all methodologies &amp; technologies have been appropriately used, with attention to ethical and methodological issues &lt;br&gt;- if intended as intervention or advocacy, project has given adequate thought to implementation &lt;br&gt;- sources &amp; methods are adequately identified</td>
<td>- methodology basically appropriate to the project and appropriately used, but could be strengthened &lt;br&gt;- sources and methods identified but not as fully as they could be &lt;br&gt;- more thought should be given to implementation issues</td>
<td>-methodology inadequate and/or inadequately articulated. &lt;br&gt;- sources not appropriately identified &lt;br&gt;- inadequate attention to implementation issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong> &lt;br&gt;Is there evidence of critical thinking and analysis?</td>
<td>- evidence of critical thinking about methods, sources, information and analysis or editing. &lt;br&gt;- uses analysis/editing methods appropriate for the project &lt;br&gt;- method of analysis or editing is adequately articulated</td>
<td>- some evidence of critical thinking but could be stronger &lt;br&gt;- analytical approach and the analysis itself is basically appropriate but could be stronger and/or articulated better.</td>
<td>-inadequate evidence of critical thinking &lt;br&gt;- analysis lacking or inadequate &lt;br&gt;- analytic approach inappropriate or inadequately specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craft &amp; Coherence</strong> &lt;br&gt;Is the level of artistic and/or technical craft adequate for the specified goals and audience?</td>
<td>- level of craft is clearly adequate for the audience &amp; to meet project goals (whether or not it</td>
<td>-level of craft is minimally adequate for the audience and goals &lt;br&gt;- project coherence could be stronger</td>
<td>-level of craft inadequate for purposes and/or audience &lt;br&gt;- project is not coherent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it involve an appropriate amount of work? Does the final product have coherence and &quot;resonance?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-meets &quot;artistic&quot; standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-project is coherent &amp; likely to resonate with the intended audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-product shows an appropriate amount of effort for this assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the content appropriate &amp; adequate, given the goals, audience &amp; assignment? Is there evidence of insight, originality &amp;/or creativity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-information conveyed is clearly adequate for goals, audience &amp; assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shows depth &amp; breadth of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-shows insight, originality &amp;/or creativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | -information conveyed is adequate but could be strengthened |
| | -some evidence of insight, originality, or creativity |

| | -inadequate information |
| | -little or no evidence of insight, originality and/or creativity |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects**

**Background notes:**

- Arts approaches can be used in several different stages of a project:
  1. To gain or create knowledge. (For example, research "subjects" or participants might be engaged in an arts-based project as a way of soliciting information or encouraging insight.)
  2. To add complexity or nuance to created knowledge. (For example, an arts practice may serve as one method in a multi-method research project, creating an integrated, reflective methodology for the project. Alternatively, an arts practice could be used to analyze and/or interpret data collected by conventional methods.)
  3. To test knowledge. (For example, researchers might verify their interpretation of findings from a more traditional research process by creating a play or exhibit and testing it for resonance with their subjects.)
  4. To share findings. (For example, a play or exhibit might be created to (re)-present data collected or analyzed via conventional methods in order to impart the particular kinds of meaning the researcher considers important, and as a way to reach and engage a broader audience.)
  5. As a form of intervention. (For example, a project might be designed to raise awareness of an issue or conflict, to promote dialogue on a contested issue, or to advocate for a cause.)

- Arts-based products often do not specify methodologies used. Thus it may be important for a project to be accompanied by a short paper discussing analysis, theory of change, audience, goals, and methods used.
- Patricia Leavy, in "Method Meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice" (New York: Guilford Press) 2009, argues that "[t]raditional conceptions of validity and reliability, which developed out of positivism, are inappropriate for evaluating artistic inquiry." (p. 15). She suggests that authenticity, trustworthiness, and validity can be assessed through attention to such elements as aesthetics, resonance, and vigor.
- For a discussion of standards, see "Method Meets Art" (Leavy, 2009: 15ff and Chapter 8).