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SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aim of the Evaluation

The aim of this evaluation is to assess the planning, outputs and delivery of the ‘epilogues’ project; the strategic issues facing the project and funding opportunities for future delivery.

1.2 Background

‘epilogues’ is a multimedia workshop education programme exploring the causes of the Northern Ireland conflict. It was developed and is operated by Gaslight Productions, a Derry based media production company responsible for the development and co-production of “Sunday”, an award winning drama documentary for Channel 4 Television.

The concept for ‘epilogues’ was inspired by the experience of making “Sunday” and was developed between April 2003 and December 2005. Following a ten-month gap Gaslight Productions embarked on a phase of funded delivery of the ‘epilogues’ programme that ends in December 2008.

1.3 Terms of Reference

Gaslight Productions commissioned this evaluation in May 2008. It is intended to aid critical reflection on the accomplishments of ‘epilogues’ and on possible future directions and funding opportunities.

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation of ‘epilogues’ call for an assessment of the following five key areas:

1. The Developmental Process and its three outputs:
   a. DVD;
   b. Website;
   c. OCNI Accredited Workshop Education Programme (WEP);
2. The strategic thinking behind the project’s Funded Delivery Phase and the degree to which its strategic objectives have been achieved;
3. The degree to which the WEP’s Learning Objectives have been achieved;
4. An assessment of the strategic issues facing the project in terms of its future delivery;
5. An assessment of present and future funding opportunities for the project’s future delivery.

---

1 Sunday was broadcast in January 2002 and was seen by 2.4 million people in Ireland & Great Britain. It was also broadcast in Australia, Canada and a number of European countries. In 2002 ‘SUNDAY’ won the coveted ‘Prix Italia’ award for ‘Best Television Drama’ in Sicily. It was also one of only four films nominated that same year from around the world for an ‘International Emmy’ in New York. In 2003 it won ‘Best Single Television Drama’ at the Irish Film & Television Academy Awards. It was also screened to critical acclaim at the Human Rights in Film Festival, Warsaw, Poland.
1.4 Methodology

The evaluation was carried out during the period 12th May – 12th September 2008. Arising from the Terms of Reference and discussions with project staff the following methods were used in the completion of the evaluation:

Desk Research:

- ‘epilogues’ materials:
  - Advisory Panel Minutes
  - DVD
  - Website
  - Workshop Education Programme
  - Training of Trainers Programme
  - Baseline Assessment Questionnaires
  - Participant Assessment Forms
  - Open College Network
  - Funding Applications
- University of Ulster Evaluations
- Key Policy documents

Interviews:

- Interviews with 12 ‘epilogues’ participants including 3 Training the Trainer Programme graduates
- Interviews with 2 project staff
- Interviews with 3 members of advisory panel
- Interviews with 9 external stakeholders

1.5 Structure of the report

Section 2 outlines the context in which ‘epilogues’ developed, and then goes on to provide an overview of the two interrelated pieces of work that comprise ‘epilogues’:

1. The development process resulting in:
   a. multimedia interactive learning tools comprised of a DVD and a website;
   b. a supporting Workshop Education Programme (WEP);
2. The delivery of the Workshop Education Programme to organisations, groups and institutions across the project’s seven target groups.

Section 3 presents the key findings of the evaluation in regard to the project elements described above based on the information gathered from interviews and document analysis.

Section 4 presents a series of recommendations of the evaluation arising from the findings.
Executive Summary

‘epilogues’ is a unique and important project which makes an valuable contribution to peace building. It directly promotes engagement with sensitive and contentious issues that lie at the heart of the conflict. The approach is sensitive to the needs and perspectives of participants offering a powerful and compelling challenge to confront ideas, perceptions and emotional reactions to conflict.

‘epilogues’ is seen by participants and stakeholders as a powerful, professional and highly effective project. It is seen as dealing in depth with difficult conflict related issues in a way that few other initiatives have.

Development Process

The development process was thoughtful, rigorous and well planned. It successfully adopted a genuinely inclusive, sensitive and responsive approach that gained the sympathy and respect of many contributors.

DVD

The DVD material often had a powerful emotional impact on participants. It is seen as balanced, but it retains a power to shock and occasionally offend in a way that provides stimulus for discussion of complex and sensitive subjects. The strength of the DVD lies in the breadth and honesty of testimonies offered by ordinary individuals. It provides an excellent channel to introduce the voice of the “other” in a safe and non-judgemental way.

Website

Development of the website was slower that originally anticipated. Over the life of the project, significant additional resources have been made available, making the website a much more valuable resource for ‘epilogues’ participants. Some participants reported difficulty in using it, often because of a lack of ICT skills or technical problems with playing video extracts.
Executive Summary

Strategic Objectives

It is anticipated that by the end of December 2008, the strategic objectives relating to delivery of Workshop Education Programmes (WEPs) by Gaslight productions will be met or almost met. Delivery by Training the Trainer Programme (TTTP) graduates will not be met with only 20% of the target achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEPs</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
<th>Anticipated</th>
<th>% Anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTTP Graduates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEP Participants</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>% Achieved</th>
<th>Anticipated</th>
<th>% Anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTTP Graduates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the target numbers, especially for the TTTP and for programmes delivered by TTTP graduates were probably optimistic, it is possible to identify factors that may have limited, or may have the potential to limit, participant numbers:

- Youth and the Loyalist/Unionist Community were particularly difficult to engage with;
- WEPs require a significant time commitment;
- Potential host organisations are likely to have significant, competing and often funding driven priorities limiting their ability to collaborate;
- Many organisations report difficulty in finding participants to any type of course not directly related to employment.

Workshop Education Programme

The Workshop Education Programmes were very highly regarded by participants. In general, learning objectives were met. The first objective (To develop a sense of active citizenship based on human rights and justice for all) is probably the most ambitious and it is not surprising that it was perceived to be the most difficult to address effectively.

The style of pedagogy was recognised as being challenging for any facilitator but it was recognised as important to the success of the programmes and was well delivered. Some, especially those who had participated in residential programmes, argued for more variety of approach. Facilitation was regarded as excellent, respectful, entertaining and empathetic.
Executive Summary

OCNNI Accreditation was generally seen as a valuable option for participants but added a significant workload for the project team. Feedback on assignments was useful, comprehensive and detailed. Help to find follow on activities from WEP participation was valued and some participants would have liked more help and more ongoing contact with the project.

Training the Trainer Programme

The TTTP was generally regarded as offering very good support to future trainers. It promotes confidence, encourages flexibility of approach and effective deployment of facilitation skills. One trainee would have liked more support with the procedures for OCNNI accreditation.

Target Groups

There was evidence that Target Groups responded to the material in different ways. With some, the emphasis was on personal biography and dealing with personal hurt while with others it was more conceptual. It was generally felt that ‘epilogues’ as it stands is not appropriate for youth but that it could and should be adapted for the needs of youth workers and teachers.

Shared Agenda?

‘epilogues’ is perceived as being consistent with current public policy agendas and that it offers precisely what key policy initiatives are seeking to advance. Many felt that the type of work exemplified by epilogues is still needed but that the window of opportunity to do it is closing as attitudes harden or as people seek to put the memory of the conflict behind them. There is a common perception that it is generally more difficult to engage members of the Loyalist / Unionist community in cross-community work. This was borne out by the experience of ‘epilogues’ for many reasons that had little to do with the ‘epilogues’ project. However, some felt that the use of terminology like “Derry” and “North of Ireland” in ‘epilogues’ literature was unhelpful.

Recommendations

These recommendations are presented as options for consideration rather that an agenda for development.

• The Advisory Panel should be reconstituted. It should be representative of the Target Groups, communities and geographical areas where ‘epilogues’ operates. It should include experienced educators and youth work practitioners and decision makers in relevant policy areas. It should focus on providing advice, building better relationships and creating new opportunities for ‘epilogues’ delivery. The recommendations below should be considered by the project team and by the Advisory Panel.

• Any new Advisory Panel should reflect on the use of language in ‘epilogues’ materials (use of terms like Derry or Londonderry, the North of Ireland or Northern Ireland and so on) and a reasoned, principled and transparent decision taken about the future use of such terms.
Executive Summary

DVD

• Consideration should be given to the development of additional video material relating to the Agreement, post-Agreement period and the future of the Island of Ireland.

Website

• The website should offer an expanded links section, an online library of project documentation, a forum for trainers to share experiences and a marketing orientated news section.

• If it is not already the case, the most widely accessible technologies for online video delivery should be used. Where a plug-in or other software is likely to be required for video playback, instructions for installation should be provided.

• A mechanism should be put in place to monitor website use.

Workshop Education Programme

• With a resource like 'epilogues' it is difficult to maintain a balance between accessibility and quality control. Consideration should be given to whether accessibility could be increased and control responsibly and productively relaxed, at least in certain cases. This will be necessary if 'epilogues' is to be used widely in formal education.

• 'epilogues' should consider how to reposition itself as a core professional development course for practitioners within the Target Groups.

• With the 'epilogues' format, there is a possibility that it can become repetitive, especially in later modules. This presents a creative challenge to the facilitator. It is important to use and promote spontaneity and creativity in the delivery of the programme.

• 'epilogues' should review the arrangements for monitoring the delivery of the WEP. The Baseline questionnaire and the Participant Assessment Form should be revised.

• 'epilogues' should consider adding clergy and or church groups to their Target Groups for the delivery of WEPs.

Training of Trainers Programme

• 'epilogues' should consider whether the needs of target groups are sufficiently distinct as to warrant separate and distinct provision of training for new trainers.

• During the TTTP course more emphasis should be placed on helping trainers become advocates for 'epilogues' within their own organisations.

• Joint facilitation of WEPs should be positively encouraged as an option, at least for new trainers.

• New WEP facilitators should monitor and regularly share experiences of WEP delivery to inform the practice of all.
New Developments

• 'epilogues' should consider collaborating with experienced youth work practitioners to develop a version of the WEP specifically for young people.

• The possibility of using the 'epilogues' concept to develop a version of the resource materials for the Republic of Ireland as well as other conflict-affected societies should be considered.

• The project team should initiate discussions with local academics develop and refine a research agenda related to the work of 'epilogues' and seek funding to support it.

• 'epilogues' should seek to develop relationships with:
  - The new local council clusters which are being developed to facilitate the delivery of Priority 1.1 of the Peace III programme;
  - The Victims Unit of the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister;
  - The Department of Social Development in relation to their Local Community Programmes.
SECTION 2  CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW

2.1  Context

‘epilogues’ is an innovative multimedia workshop education programme developed and delivered by Gaslight Productions. It uses television drama and the personal perspectives of people directly affected by the Northern Ireland conflict to explore the causes of the conflict and the nature of peace building.

Gaslight Productions, established in 1998 by Stephen Gargan and Jim Keys, was seen as a natural development of their involvement in community education initiatives. From the beginning there was a clear commitment to the use of new media for education and to contribute to the process of peace building.

Gaslight’s first project was the research, development and co-production of “Sunday”, a £2.7 million award winning drama documentary for Channel 4 Television. Written by Jimmy McGovern, it tells the story of Bloody Sunday primarily from the perspective of the victims.

The process of research and production was designed to involve and empower the families of those killed and the surviving wounded. So, in addition to a detailed survey of documents, photographs and audio-visual material, Gaslight led an extensive two-year programme of interviews with:

• all the families of those killed;
• all but three of the surviving wounded;
• many eyewitnesses including former IRA members, medical staff and priests
• Paratroopers present in Derry on Bloody Sunday;
• Soldiers from other regiments and senior officers in the British military.

The experience of researching and producing “Sunday” provided the team with a number of insights that inspired and shaped the development of ‘epilogues’. At its inception ‘epilogues’ was envisaged as building on what had been achieved by “Sunday” by creating a workshop education programme to more fully explore significant dimensions of conflict that the film could only touch upon. The events of Bloody Sunday were to be used as a lens to highlight and examine human rights issues. However, in the course of the development phase, the nature of the project changed considerably in response to the outcome of consultation.

The impetus for ‘epilogues’ came not only from their own professional experience and commitments but also from the context of an emerging peace process. The Gaslight team observed that while the majority welcomed the peace process, it was experienced by many, particularly those most affected by violent conflict in polarised communities, as a top down process leaving them,

“Disorientated and to some degree stranded in a mindset formed in the context of violent political conflict.”

Context
In the case of victims of the conflict, the release of prisoners within the framework of the Good Friday/Belfast Agreement,

"Seemed like an insult to the principle of justice and an unwarranted concession to terrorism."

The team argued that these responses were evidence that even ten years after the signing of the Good Friday/Belfast Agreement the very nature of the conflict continues to be contested. In addition to more nuanced perspectives, they identified three perspectives that serve to illustrate diverse understandings of the conflict as being:

1. a terrorist campaign waged by the IRA against the forces of law and order;
2. a conflict between two warring tribes with the forces of law and order caught in the middle;
3. a guerrilla war waged against the presence of Britain as a malign occupying power.

Often, community relations work has depended most heavily on the second of these perspectives. In contrast, ‘epilogues’ rejects the “two tribes” analysis and "recognises the State as one of the key players in the conflict." Consequently the term “community relations” is regarded as problematic and the promotion of contact between the communities is perceived as inadequate.

The approach of ‘epilogues’ is reflected in the selection of Target Groups (see below) of which there are seven, and which do not include reference to the Protestant/Unionist or Catholic/Nationalist communities. The ‘epilogues’ approach is not dependant on the “contact hypothesis” which holds that contact between those belonging to different groups will reduce hostility and tension between the groups.

Rather, an aspect of ‘epilogues’ that makes it distinctive is the attempt to create a context in which individuals grapple with difficult, conflict related issues. These issues have less to do with prejudice and stereotyping and are more concerned with power, justice and dealing with the legacy of violent political conflict. This approach requires courage, entails risk, willingness too discuss sensitive and controversial issues and openness to divergent perspectives.

Even with more traditional approaches based on the “contact hypothesis” it is not unusual to find difficulty in securing participation, especially from the Loyalist/Unionist community. The culture of avoidance remains strong; issues related to the conflict are highly sensitive and painful. Remembrance of the past is often perceived as partisan political point scoring. Yet, at the same time, there is growing tendency to relegate such issues to the past.

The Agreement and the institutions to which it gave rise, have undoubtedly led to greatly reduced levels of violence. Yet, the initial post-Agreement optimism has waned, the institutions remain fragile and significant issues are unresolved. More recently there is evidence of political positions hardening.

The establishment of the Northern Ireland Executive and Assembly brought with it an extensive agenda for change. As a result of the Review of Public Administration, many public bodies are either currently implementing reform, or soon will be. Some public bodies, especially in education, find it difficult, or impossible, to entertain new collaborations or to develop new areas of work.
Funding for community relations type activities is in transition and many community organisations are concerned for their future. Recently, political difficulties within the Northern Ireland Executive have led to uncertainty and delays in decision-making.

In this challenging context Gaslight Productions took on the equally challenging task of developing ‘epilogues’ as a resource for civic society providing a methodology, structure and language to equip ordinary citizens to explore and better understand:

- the underlying causes of the conflict
- the raison d’être of the constitutional changes mandated in the Belfast Agreement;
- the part they need to play in maintaining and building the peace.
2.2 Overview of the Development Process

Gaslight Productions secured funding for two part-time posts and initiated a development process, which lasted almost three years, running from April 2003 to December 2005. Central to the development process was a strong commitment to consult widely with groups, organisations and individuals with expertise or experience in dealing with the legacy of the conflict. This would help to test the initial project idea and shape the development of ‘epilogues’.

In addition, the consultation process was intended to raise awareness of ‘epilogues’, develop relationships and foster a sense of shared ownership with “gateway organisations” identified as possible users and targets of the future embedding / marketing strategy.

Key elements of the development process included:

- Formation of project Advisory Panel;
- Consultation Process;
- Interview and Editing Process;
- Piloting of a Prototype DVD and Workshop Modules of Violence and Loss;
- Production of ‘epilogues’ DVD and Draft Workshop Education Programme;
- Accreditation of the ‘epilogues’ Workshop Education Programme;
- Development and construction of the ‘epilogues’ web site.

2.2.1 Advisory Panel

The Advisory Panel was intended to be a diverse cross sectoral and cross community group. Additionally, it was important for Gaslight Productions that members should be able to grasp the potential of the ‘epilogues’ concept and be willing to work to fulfil that potential.

The Panel was responsible for "broadening, deepening and supporting Gaslight’s consideration of the key aspects of developing and delivering the project." They were kept fully informed of all aspects of the project while the “professional and legal responsibility for ‘epilogues’ rests firmly with Gaslight.” At the first meeting it was agreed that their primary role was to advise on the following three key areas over the course of the project’s development phase:

1. Strategic planning;
2. Monitoring of the progress of the project with the respective target groups;
3. The content of the DVD, website and supporting education programme.

---

2 See Appendix 1 for details of ‘epilogues’ funding.
3 Taken from the Record of Advisory Panel Meeting held on 17th December 03
4 Taken from the Record of Advisory Panel Meeting held on 17th December 03
5 Taken from an e-mail sent to members of Advisory Panel 30th July 03 advising of their role/duties
Overview of the Development Process

The core members of the Advisory Panel members were:

- **Brian Dougherty**: Co-ordinator, Tullyally & District Development Group, Derry;
- **Dave Duggan**: Artistic Director, Sole Purpose Productions, Derry;
- **Diane Greer**: Project Director, Workers Education Association (WEA), Derry;
- **Alan McCully**: Lecturer, UNESCO Centre, School of Education, University of Ulster at Coleraine;
- **Marty Melarkey**: Director of Strategy, Nerve Centre, Derry;

The formal role of the Advisory Panel came to an end towards the end of the Development Phase. This was precipitated by the departure of one member and because funding had come to an end. There was a ten-month gap before new funding became available. The team was under significant pressure to finalise the resources during this period. Several members maintained informal contacts with the project.
2.2.2 Consultation and Development Process

The development of 'epilogues' was driven by a commitment to consult widely with key stakeholders. To facilitate a useful engagement with the 'epilogues' concept, an initial edit of selected extracts from “Sunday” were collated along with two documents offering a project synopsis and describing the project structure.

This material formed the basis of an extensive and wide ranging consultation with forty-nine organisations and individuals referred to by the project as “touchstones”. These “touchstones” worked with one or more of the project’s seven target groups and had expertise and experience in dealing with the legacy of the conflict.

Contact was made with a key individual in each “touchstone” organisation and then two meetings were held, the first to view and explain the material; the second, to generate feedback on the ‘epilogues’ concept and the content of the initial edit.

New funding became available in November 2003 allowing the team to work full time on 'epilogues'. They also received a major contribution in kind from their technical partners at the Nerve Centre. These developments facilitated the development of a second more refined edit of “Sunday” extracts, drawing on the feedback already received.

In the course of the consultation the project team came to the conclusion that it was necessary to broaden the scope of the project by including extracts from sources other than “Sunday” to reflect other experiences and perceptions of the conflict.

The Interview and Editing Process

In collaboration with the Advisory Panel, criteria were drawn up for the selection of individuals to be interviewed for the final 'epilogues' DVD. They are as follows:

- Only individuals who can speak with the authority of direct personal experience;
- Secure a representative sample of voices from all parties to the conflict;
- Secure a representative sample of the victims of violence of the respective parties;
- Ensure that the above sample additionally covers a representative sweep of the incidents that reflect each community’s particular reading of the conflict.

The team worked with the Nationalist / Republican, Unionist / Loyalist communities and the security forces, first in the local area and then beyond to identify and recruit potential interviewees. The process was more difficult and protracted than had been anticipated. The team identified the continuing suspension of the Northern Ireland Assembly and the growing polarisation that was reflected in the Assembly Elections of November 2003.

Difficulty had been anticipated in recruiting members of the loyalist and security force communities, at least in part because 'epilogues' would be perceived to be

---

6 See Appendix 2 for a full list.
emerging from the Nationalist / Republican community. It certainly proved difficult to recruit from these communities initially. However, by the end of August 2004, only the loyalist perspective remained. As the result of continued relationship building with the Loyalist community former UDA and UVF prisoners agreed to take part. While this part of the process took longer than anticipated, it did enable the team to build positive and strategically important relationships for the Delivery Phase.

**Piloting of a prototype DVD and Workshop Module**

Using the new interview material a pilot version of *epilogues* was developed, dealing with two of the six themes: Violence and Loss. The new material was piloted as a three-hour workshop with nineteen organisations drawn from the first pilot group. Feedback was collected on the material, the needs of the target groups and on other potential interviewees. In consultation with the Advisory Panel, feedback was incorporated, including the recording of additional interviews. A final edit of the DVD was produced and a first draft of the Workshop Education Programme completed.

---

7 See Appendix 3 for a full list.
2.2.3 The Target Groups

Seven groups were identified as being Target Groups for ‘epilogues’ delivery:

1. Victims of Political Violence;
2. Ex Prisoners;
3. Former members State Security Forces;
4. Youth;
5. Teachers & Adult Education Providers;
6. Community Activists & Community Relations Workers;
7. Students of Peace & Conflict Studies.

2.2.4 DVD

The DVD is the core ‘epilogues’ resource and includes 248 minutes of material. There are six themes each broken down into subsections that develop the exploration of the theme:

1. Violence
   - Violent Conflict
   - State Violence
   - Republican Violence
   - Loyalist Violence

2. Loss
   - Personal Loss
   - Aspects of Loss
   - Collective Loss

3. Revenge
   - Revenge Is Not Justice
   - Revenge As A Form of Justice
   - Revenge As A Cycle

4. Forgiveness
   - Forgiving
   - Unforgiving
   - Moral Relevance of Forgiveness

5. Justice
   - Ideal of Justice
   - State As Agent Of Justice
   - State As Agent Of Injustice
   - Outside The State In Pursuit Of Justice

6. Human Rights
   - Human Rights As Democratic Ideal
   - Democracy As Majority Rule
   - Democracy As Process
   - Eruption Into Violent Conflict

Each theme is introduced by extracts from television dramas exploring the Northern Ireland conflict. These are intended to be “dramatic illustrations” of each theme “revealing the reality of violent political conflict and the tragic consequences for our society”. Extracts are taken from “Elephant”, “Force of Duty”, “Sunday”, “Omagh” and “Yasmin”. The last of these seeks to build on the learning of the earlier modules to broaden the focus beyond Northern Ireland, and provide a global perspective on human rights issues.
The drama segment is followed by interviews with victims and participants in the conflict. Interviews with twenty-seven people are included in the resource. They represent a wide spectrum of political opinion and personal experience. There are loyalists and republicans who have engaged in violence, there are members of the police and army and there are victims. The aim of the project is to deepen understandings of the conflict between 1968 and 1998 through the perspectives of these twenty-seven individuals. On viewing the DVD participants are confronted with views that may reflect their own perspective but also with views that challenge it.

The ‘epilogues’ DVD is an undeniably powerful resource. The drama segments serve as an important reminder of the horror, pain and violence of the years of conflict. The interviews are an intensely personal testimony of the experience and thinking that characterised the lives of 27 ordinary individuals. They are all the more powerful since they are not major political figures but ordinary people with whom participants may feel more of a sense of connection.

While it is balanced, it does not become bland. Through the views or accounts of actions presented, it retains a power to shock and, at times, to offend. The cumulative effect though, is to create a sense of shared humanity. This is an excellent way to bring the voice of the “other” into a room in which it would not otherwise be heard. We are not asked to agree or to judge, merely to listen to and acknowledge the perspective of other human beings.

There is a clear potential for misuse in the wrong hands and the structure of the Workshop Education Programme, Training of Trainers Programme and the quality assurance process are important and necessary contributions to the value of the project.
2.2.5 Workshop Education Programme

The Workshop Education Programme consists of six hours of personal study and eight modules each of three hours duration:

1. Introduction – outlining the programme and approach
2. Violence
3. Loss
4. Revenge
5. Forgiveness
6. Justice
7. Human Rights
8. Conclusion – consolidating learning

Each thematic module is a facilitated three-hour exploration of the respective theme. Each begins with a viewing of the relevant sections of the DVD resource, including drama and interviews. Participants are invited to reflect on their own experience and the experience of the “other”.

Programme Aims

1. To give participants both an overview, and an insight into, the underlying causes of conflict
2. To help develop a culture of justice and human rights
3. To better equip citizens to play an active role in peace building

Programme Objectives

1. To develop a sense of active citizenship based on human rights and justice for all
2. To underscore the view of democracy as a conflict resolving process
3. To build awareness and understanding of the differences within and between the various perspectives that have been in conflict
4. To underscore the contested nature of History and its role in shaping perception
5. To explore the circumstances that fracture civil society to the point where citizens adopted a ‘war’ as opposed to a ‘peace’ orientation to resolving conflict

---

8 This sense of citizenship is necessarily holistic and such citizens embrace with their rights, a reciprocal responsibility towards the rights of the ‘other’
9 Within this internationally respected view of democracy it is by a state upholding Human Rights & Justice that it reinforces its legitimacy (to manage the conflict resolving process) strengthening public confidence in its rule of law and consequently its right to hold a monopoly (on behalf of the citizenry) on the use of force (Unionist/Loyalist, Nationalist/Republican and British/State Security Forces)
10 and so the potential for forging new alliances in peace building
11 in particular our perception of ‘ourselves’ (our identity) and the ‘other’
12 particularly in addressing the necessary tension between the ideal of democracy and its political reality in a given time and place
Delivery of the WEP was monitored through Baseline Assessment Questionnaires\textsuperscript{14} and Participant Assessment Forms\textsuperscript{15} distributed at the beginning and the end of the programme.

A manual has been developed and piloted over the life of the project and the published version is a welcome addition to the resources of the project. This model of resource development has enabled the project to take cognisance of learning that has taken place during delivery.

The manual contains all the facilitation materials necessary for delivery of the Workshop Education Programme. It contains constructive ground rules that are linked to relevant articles of the Universal declaration of Human Rights. Questions posed are open ended and designed to facilitate dialogue around the 'epilogues' objectives. Explicit references are made to the resources available on the 'epilogues' website.

The manual will make an important contribution to the quality control process and will give additional confidence and support to new trainers.

Participants have the option to be accredited at Level 2 by the Northern Ireland Open College Network.

\textsuperscript{14} See Appendix 4.
\textsuperscript{15} See Appendix 5.
2.2.6 The Website

The 'epilogues' website (www.epilogues.net) is intended to fulfil two functions:

1. It is a marketing tool which promotes 'epilogues', by providing project contact details and information about background, aims and content;

2. It supports the Workshop Education Programme by providing:
   a. factual information about the interviewees and the events about which they speak;
   b. four hours of additional interviewee video material and seventy-five minutes of related news archive footage within a secure area accessible only to participants;
   c. access to articles on dealing with conflict related trauma;
   d. links to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related articles.

The Workshop Education Programme requires participants to access the additional material provided on the website. This is necessary to fulfil the requirements for Northern Ireland Open College Network accreditation.

The development of the website was significantly delayed because of the complexity of selecting and editing extracts and protracted nature of negotiations with copyright holders. The project team felt that it, "Would have been better if the website had all its elements in place at the outset."

Only more recent participants have had access to the full range of online material. The team consider the website to be "a real benefit to the learner."

The website is now a useful addition to the 'epilogues' project. It is visually very appealing and easy to navigate. For the external user, it offers a significant amount of relevant background information about the aims and operation of the project. The Timeline is a helpful guide to some of the key events of the conflict that provides links to the profiles of interviewees where relevant. The introduction to each module offers a good sense of the nature of discussion. Two parts of the public website could usefully be developed: the links section and the news section. Of the many websites that offer excellent human rights resources, the links section only points to two. The undeveloped news section should not be underestimated as a possible marketing tool. This potential could be enhanced by the provision of RSS links.

The secure section provides a real benefit to the 'epilogues' participant. The additional interview clips and news footage are a positive stimulus to remembrance of and reflection upon key events. As with links to human rights resources, only links that are relevant to 'epilogues' exercises are posted but here too the addition of links to websites about the conflict would be welcome. There are many valuable resources freely available on the Internet that would help the exploration of key issues. These will provide background information and need not be tied directly to exercises.
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It is welcome that in any future phase of 'epilogues' it is envisaged that online provision would be extended to include a forum for sharing information and best practice.
2.3 Overview of the Delivery Phase

During the Development Phase, Gaslight Productions developed strategic objectives and a model for the delivery of *epilogues*. This section outlines the strategic objectives, the delivery model and the Training the Trainer Programme (TTTP) also developed at the beginning of this phase.

2.3.1 Strategic Objectives

The strategic objectives for the three-year Funded Delivery Phase established targets for the delivery of WEP and the Training of Trainers Programme. Perhaps more importantly, the strategic objectives contained a plan to embed *epilogues* in other community organisations, thereby leaving a sustainable legacy at the end of the funded delivery phase.

The five stage embedding strategy operated as follows:

1. Meet with relevant organisations and offer presentations and taster sessions;
2. Deliver the WEP in collaboration with organisations;
3. Select and train new trainers from the WEP cohort;
4. Newly trained trainers cascade delivery within their respective communities through host organisations;
5. Host organisations support and fund ongoing delivery of *epilogues*.

To date presentations and taster sessions have been delivered to 41 organisations.

*epilogues* has been successfully embedded in the University of Ulster Peace and Conflict Studies Programme at Magee, Derry and in the strategic programming of the WAVE Trauma Centre. More recently, partnership agreements with have been entered into with both Loyalist and Republican organisations for future delivery.

Specific annual targets were set for the number of:
- WEPs to be delivered by Gaslight Productions;
- individuals to participate in WEPs led by Gaslight Productions and by TTTP Trainers;
- participants to progress to complete the Training of Trainers Programme.
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The targets presented in the Strategic Objectives are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 ‘epilogues’ funded WEPs Facilitated by Gaslight Productions for a total of 100 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘epilogues’ funded TTTP facilitated by Gaslight Productions for 10 WEP graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 ‘epilogues’ funded WEPs facilitated by Gaslight Productions for a total of 100 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘epilogues’ funded TTTP facilitated by Gaslight Productions for 10 WEP graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘epilogues’ funded WEPs facilitated by 5 new TTTP trainers for a total of 50 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 host funded WEPs facilitated by Gaslight Productions for a total of 100 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘epilogues’ funded TTTP facilitated by Gaslight Productions for 20 WEP graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host funded WEPs facilitated by 5 new TTTP trainers for a total of 50 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Funded Delivery Phase

The targets and the actual figures achieved as of 12\textsuperscript{th} September 2008 are presented in the table below:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Achieved %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEPs delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPs delivered by Gaslight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPs delivered by TTTP graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEP Participants Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEP Participants delivered by Gaslight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEP Participants delivered by TTTP graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTTP graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the 287 WEP participants sixty-five have been accredited at OCNNI Level 2.

The IFI Funded delivery Phase will end in December 2008. For the remaining period six more WEPs have been scheduled. It is anticipated that there will be sixty participants and an additional 20 participants will gain OCNNI Level 2 accreditation bringing the total to 85.

One new TTTP course has also been scheduled. It is anticipated that eight new trainers will complete the course.
2.3.2 Training the Trainer Programme

The Training the Trainer Programme is offered to individuals who have participated in the Workshop Education Programme who have thirty hours of relevant facilitation experience. They are, therefore, drawn from the Target Groups. The selection process is influenced by the interests of the participant, the judgement of the ‘epilogues’ team and of fellow WEP participants. On occasion fellow participants have made “almost a group identification” (‘epilogues’ facilitator) of those individuals they consider appropriate for TTTP training. Participants completing the programme after a probationary period will receive Gaslight accreditation. The TTTP offers:

- An introduction to the theory and structure of the WEP, and DVD and associated PowerPoint / Keynote workshop materials;
- Training on essential facilitation skills;
- Guidance on OCNNI Assessment and Moderation Process;
- Time to prepare and facilitate presentations using ‘epilogues’ material;
- An opportunity to explore flexibility and individuality of style in delivery;
- An introduction to the strategic roll out.

To secure accreditation, four Out of Workshop Exercises must be completed. The first of these must be submitted in advance of the training. It asks participants to reflect on their knowledge of the conflict, target groups they anticipate working with, their facilitation experience, and any relevant qualifications. At the end of TTTP the new trainers complete the remaining OWEs.

Once the TTTP is complete, a comprehensive process of support and quality assurance begins (see diagram below). It offers tailored support to each new trainer and includes the possibility of joint facilitation to develop competence and comfort in programme delivery.

One TTTP has been delivered to 6 new trainers and was delivered as:

- a three-day residential workshop held at the Old Library Trust building in Creggan, Derry on Friday 30th November to Sunday 2nd November 2007. The facilitation team included Jim Keys, Diane Greer, Stephen Gargan and Jan Caspers.
- a one day OCNNI Assessment and Gaslight Internal Moderation Training day. The Training day was held in Belfast on 20th February 2008.

The six participants in the first TTTP represented the following target groups:

- Victims of Political Violence;
- Ex Prisoners (2 Republican);
- Former Members of the State Security Forces (1 British Soldier);
- Teachers and Adult Education Providers;
- Community Activists and Community Relations Workers;
- Students of Peace and Conflict Studies.

One new TTTP course has also been scheduled. It is anticipated that eight new trainers will complete the course.
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Simplified Gaslight Quality Assurance and Support Process

**Internal Moderator Induction**
Programme Facilitators meet Internal Moderator to agree Gaslight procedures & share best practice.

**Internal Moderator Support**
Internal Moderator meets with facilitator mid-programme to check standards & provide advice & support.

**Standardisation Meeting**
Programme Facilitators meet Internal Moderator to agree Gaslight procedures & share best practice & dates including date for next Standardisation Meeting.

**Programme Manager**
confirms delivery with host organisation and agrees programme facilitator.

**Programme Manager**
confirms start/end date and Internal Moderation date.

**PROGRAMME BEGINS**

**Delivery Review & Internal Moderation**
After programme delivery & assessment the Facilitator submits feedback on delivery with participant’s folders to the Internal Moderator.

**Internal Moderation Meeting**
Internal Moderator gives feedback on the sample selected and programme delivery reviews. The facilitator records any action points and shares them with the Programme Manager.

**Facilitator**
submits Course and Learner Registration Form to OCNNI & Programme Manager.

**Ongoing Delivery & Assessment by Facilitator**

**Programme Manager**
confirms delivery with host organisation and agrees programme facilitator.

After each TTTP:
1. Update database of Gaslight Registered Tutors
2. Set dates for Standardisation, & Moderation Meetings

**Programme Manager**
confirms start/end date and Internal Moderation date.

**Ongoing Delivery & Assessment by Facilitator**

**Programme Manager**
confirms delivery with host organisation and agrees programme facilitator.

**Programme Manager**
confirms start/end date and Internal Moderation date.

**Programme Manager**
confirms delivery with host organisation and agrees programme facilitator.
Section 3  Key Findings

3.1 Introduction

This section presents the main findings drawn from Participant Baseline Assessment Questionnaires, Participant Assessment forms and from interviews conducted with ‘epilogues’ participants, project staff, members of the Advisory Panel and other key stakeholders.

It is important to preface what follows by explicitly acknowledging that, in general, the views given were very positive. Many of the participants were reluctant to voice criticism. The following comments are representative of those made by contributors:

"The best programme I have been involved in” (participant).

"A unique programme... I haven’t heard of any others like it the material is very relevant and very well done” (participant).

"Very professional... going deeper than anything else I had seen before” (stakeholder).

"A very good example of a very practical project” (stakeholder).

"A polished piece of work delivered well” (stakeholder).

"The project has had a big impact” (stakeholder).
3.2 The Development Process

3.2.1 The Advisory Panel

A number of panel members expressed the view that this was "a well chosen group" bringing a range of relevant expertise in formal and community education, arts and media. The membership reflected a balanced variety of political and community perspectives bringing with it "context and contacts within the Northwest".

Some stakeholders argued that the Panel would have benefited from stronger loyalist representation, particularly from outside the Northwest area. This may have led to a better understanding of the sensitivities and needs of the Loyalist community, especially in the Greater Belfast area. One member of a Belfast based loyalist ex-prisoners group commented that,

"There is really nobody there that would persuade a hard-line loyalist that it’s a good idea for them to become involved... Membership of the board probably would make a difference" to the community’s perception of 'epilogues'.

There was consensus that the Panel worked well together. The membership of the Panel,

"Had a fair amount of sympathy with what was quite a radical project" (Panel Member)

and were willing to commit significant time and energy to project planning. One member commented that they,

"Worked very well and very closely together on a regular basis" another that "it was a great working panel".

All the Panel members interviewed felt that they were meaningfully involved in key decisions about project development:

"Our input was listened to and valued".

They were impressed that the project team were,

"Flexible and responsive", "very thoughtful and reflective... and very open to [our] opinions".

One was impressed by the quality of thinking and discussion:

"I don't think I have ever been involved in something where there was such strong reflection on aims".

The formal role of the Advisory Panel came to an end at towards the end of the Development Phase, although several members maintained informal contacts with the project.

A number of interviewees, including panel members, 'epilogues’ team members and stakeholders, suggested that the panel could have continued to serve a useful purpose after this point.
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3.2.2 Consultation and Development Process

Responses to questions about the consultation process were very positive and highlighted the “sensitivity and genuineness” of the process.

“They really wanted to test things out with people at every stage” (stakeholder).

“I had certain difficulties with it at the start in that I felt it had a Republican / Nationalist bias, but I would have to say that [epilogues] did take on board the concerns that myself and others had about it. I found [them] very responsive” (stakeholder).

“The pilot and the consultation were excellent. It was crucial to do it in protestant areas... one key strategic change was made that proved how genuine the project was. They broadened the context from initially using clips from Sunday to [include] other events like Omagh. [If they had not listened and made the change it] could have been quite easily been construed as pushing Bloody Sunday guilt on to Protestant communities” (stakeholder).

Another stakeholder echoed this sentiment,

"the original intention was to use scenes from “Sunday” they began to look for other scenes beyond the movie, and that was a good move."

"The fact that it was welcomed in the Protestant community [in the Northwest] shows how good and equitable and sensitive the consultation was."
3.2.3 The DVD

In interviews with participants and other stakeholders there was a very strong consensus around the quality and value of the DVD material. A community activist stated, “the DVD sold it for me”. It was often described as being "very powerful" and "a good way of starting off the conversation".

One experienced educator expressed the opinion,

“If you accept the premise… that we have got to deal with the past… then I think this resource is a very, very good one, a very powerful one.”

The project team designed the structure of the DVD to be supportive of the project aims:

“The idea was to have a spectrum of positions juxtaposed with one another and edited together in such a way that they are representative and provocative as triggers for discussion. I think it works very well.”

The drama segment was commonly seen as "a really good draw" (participant) and several interviewees added comments to the effect that the,

"Clips help to make the ['epilogues'] programme” (stakeholder).

There was a general acknowledgement of the powerful emotional impact they made:

"Those opening shots in the different sections are very powerful... provocative, disturbing, but I think, effective” (stakeholder).

Some participants from victims groups found the drama particularly disturbing, especially when there was a close parallel with their own experience. However, no one expressed the opinion that the drama segments should not be shown or that they should be changed.

Participants found the interviews to be helpful in establishing a,

“Feeling [of] personal connection to the conflict”

that made them want to talk about their own experiences. Some saw them as

"An opportunity to see how deeply this all had affected people.”

Many found them to be,

"Excellent because you got other perspectives... of a wide range of people”.

A member of the Advisory Panel offered the opinion,

"What the resource achieves is the power of biography, and the power of story, and it is done... very well it doesn’t label, it lets you get to know the participants as passionate individuals. Their backgrounds and perspectives emerge.”
Many commented that the interviews,

"Opened my eyes to new perspectives... [that were] sometimes difficult to listen to" (participant).

"There were things you were hearing that you didn't necessarily want to hear... from both sides of the community... and that was good” (participant).

A small number of participants, mainly from victims and ex-prisoners groups, described how some of the interviews initially evoking feelings of anger or hatred but then, on reflection, greater empathy enabling them to develop a,

"Better understanding of why people did what they did.”

"There’s a 'them and us’ but towards the end of it, it was like ‘us and us’ because there were so many things that they described, which impacted on them the same as they impacted on me.”

It was suggested that one of the reasons the interviews were able to elicit this type of response was that,

"The voices on it are largely the smaller players rather than the political animals. These are people whose lives have been changed thorough the conflict” (stakeholder).

As for balance, one stakeholder stated that,

"It is balanced but there is sometimes a difficulty for Northern Ireland audiences to see balance because of emotional reactions. If one community finds certain comments provocative and another community finds [certain comments] provocative, that’s probably a good indication that a resource in this part of the world is balanced. If everyone says it is fine, it is probably bland in the extreme.”

All participants agreed that while the contributions could be provocative and difficult to listen to, they were balanced and representative.

Having highly praised the DVD one a participant argued that it "did not tell the whole story” in that it tended to reinforce the erroneous perception that republican violence was strategic whereas loyalist violence was proactive and random.

A small number of interviewees suggested possible supplementary material that might usefully be included in any future revision of the DVD. Those who did commented on the absence of material relating to the post Agreement period and on the future of the island of Ireland.

One participant suggested that it would be interesting to hear statements from leading figures in Sinn Féin and the DUP about the meaning of the years of conflict. A stakeholder suggested a post-Agreement addendum including commentary and critical analysis from representative individuals with "critical weight and authentic experience.”

A member of the ‘epilogues’ team commented that,
"We set the parameters of the project to explore the conflict between 1968-98 through the perspectives and testimonies of these 27 people... A key aspect of the workshop education programme is that it is not only about the individuals on the DVD, it is about the individuals on the DVD and the individuals in the room."

This conception of the relationship between the DVD and the workshops allows conversations to develop in the WEPs that arise out of the DVD material but which are not explicitly dealt with on the DVD.
3.2.4 Website

The ‘epilogues’ website is well designed and is easy to navigate. It provides some valuable additional material including articles, additional video material, notes on contributors and links to human rights materials. As has been noted above, the ‘epilogues’ team acknowledged that all of this material should have been available at the start of the delivery phase but that this had not been possible. They pointed out that more participants are likely to have used the site had more material been available earlier.

Few of the participants interviewed used the website. Some had technical difficulties in playing the video clips. Those accessing the Internet from work or college often found that computers did not have the necessary software to play the video extracts. One participant commented that after trying to access the video clips and then download required software he, “lost patience with it and didn’t bother going in again”. Another suggested that ‘epilogues’ should offer to provide the material on a CD for those who do not have Internet access. However, this option may not resolve the software issue and will raise difficulties with the licensing of copyrighted video material.

Others reported that they did not have computer access or did not have adequate ICT skills.

Those who did access the website found it to be a good reminder of faces and names of speakers on the DVD. Some used it to access the module introductions in advance of workshops.

One participant noted that the course assumed a basic knowledge of computers and that it would be useful to talk about the computer access and technical competence during the first module. This should be followed up by regular checks during the course to identify problems.
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3.3 The Delivery Phase

3.3.1 The Strategic Objectives

As has been described in Section 2 above there was a significant gap between the *epilogues* Strategic Objectives and the actual numbers of:
- WEPs delivered;
- Participants involved;
- TTTP graduates.

These gaps relate not so much to delivery by Gaslight, where it is likely that targets will be achieved or almost achieved by December 2008. Rather, the gap relates to the number of new trainers trained and the projected roll out of delivery by them.

There were significant achievements, both in terms of delivery and in building relationships with the target groups. However, as has been seen, dealing with the past in this context is a sensitive and difficult enterprise:

" *epilogues* deals with very sensitive issues making it harder to recruit. I would be surprised if [a named community organisation] produced a ton of people" (stakeholder).

"Not that easy a project to sell to the protestant community: do they want us to feel guilty?" (stakeholder).

"We had no illusions that this project was going to reach hundreds of thousands of people or that it was going to change the world. It was always going to be a modest contribution" (*epilogues* team member).

Having acknowledged that, it is possible and useful to identify some reasons why targets were missed.

The project team acknowledges that some of the original objectives were too ambitious especially in relation to the training of trainers. They also commented that,

"if you are approaching organisations initially and you are not coming from [for example] the Department of Education or the BBC... people are asking who is this person? Where are they coming from? What is their agenda? You have no credentials or track record. I'm sure that must have worked against us."

They had anticipated this difficulty and had engaged through Advisory Panel membership, consultation, networking and workshop delivery with a wide range of people. However, they were disappointed that individuals rarely emerged as advocates for *epilogues* within their communities and organisations.

It proved particularly difficult to engage with the Loyalist / Unionist community. This will be considered further in Section 3.3.5. There are also other, more practical reasons:

"Twenty-four hours over eight weeks – it is difficult to get people to commit to that.“ (*epilogues* team member).
Key Findings

"It is very long, a major commitment of time, too long for most people" (participant).

One stakeholder indicated that it would be beneficial to develop the taster sessions to give a better sense of the power of the WEP.

In this context it is useful to consider two aspects of the model approach adopted by ‘epilogues’:

1. The model for delivery of the WEP;
2. The strategy for embedding ‘epilogues’.

Model for Delivery of the WEP

With any resource there is a balance to be struck between accessibility and quality control. For ‘epilogues’ there is the additional complication of the sensitive and personal nature of material on the DVD. One stakeholder was particularly impressed by the way in which they entered into a,

"Contract with the interviewees that this was not going to be [given out casually] to anyone."

‘epilogues’ has addressed this balance by asking participants to complete the WEP and the TTTP before being able to tailor it to the needs of their community:

"Having done the programme they will see the logic of delivering the entire programme. Having done it you can choose to break it down" (‘epilogues’ team).

One stakeholder was concerned that the balance tipped too far in the direction of quality control:

"By corralling this resource there is a danger that it will hit too few people... Just by demanding so much they are in danger [of] restricting who actually is prepared to use it."

A community activist warned that there were problems inherent in giving up control:

"[They] can’t hold on to it indefinitely... there is a danger that if you give it to groups they might disrespect it or use it for something different. [There] needs to be a lot of thought paid to that. Teachers and education professionals could do that but I’d have less confidence in some community activists and community relations workers."

Ongoing reflection and sensitive monitoring of these tensions will be an important element of the roll out of ‘epilogues’. The robust quality control and support process employed by ‘epilogues’ will play a significant role in the process of adaptation to the needs of specific target groups.
The strategy for embedding ‘epilogues’

As the ‘epilogues’ project developed the project team were increasingly concerned about the opportunities TTTP graduates would have to deliver ‘epilogues’ WEPs,

“We have 6 people who have done the residential but... two or three of them may never deliver a programme.”

This challenge relates more to host organisations than to the TTTP graduates.

A senior manager of a funding body stated,

“*It is not that people aren’t interested. It is competing work priorities. [It is] difficult to get people to come to anything. Groups are worrying about their own business. [For some] funding is running out.*”

This perception was reinforced by comments from community organisations:

“*It is a question of prioritising [and] when we can fit it in. I don’t think there is a big reluctance. We could probably get a few people who would want to do the programme but maybe it is a priority to get them to do something else at the moment*” (stakeholder).

“*It is just logistical. If I had of been averse to it, I wouldn’t have agreed to participate in it*” (stakeholder).

One community activist when asked if the ‘epilogues’ model could be adapted to be more accessible to his organisation, the answer was,

“*Probably not... it is not a priority of mine at the minute... [this is] more to do with pressures on my own organisation: about not having the resources to do it*” (stakeholder).

“If we went out of our way we probably could access funding to allow them to facilitate workshops. It is not a priority because we have so many other priorities. I don’t diminish the potential it could have if you were able to devote the time to it” (stakeholder).

Another community activist commented that,

“*I have done the training for trainers but I feel guilty. With this position in here, I can’t give it the time I was hoping to. It is my reality and it is so time consuming. We are all pretty pushed for time when you are working in the community*” (participant).

Competition also arises with other similar initiatives. A number of community workers described their involvement with other projects focussed on dealing with the legacy of the past. One interviewee pointed out that each group sees it’s,

“*Project as the transforming one but out there are competing ones for the same organisations*” (stakeholder).

A community activist referred the difficulty they have in recruiting participants in general; people are,
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“Unlikely to take something like this on unless it will directly help them with employment. In many communities there is lots of stuff going on. It is difficult to get people involved in the core issues but [‘epilogues’ would be] very good for activists” (stakeholder).

While it was more difficult than anticipated to recruit for the WEPs, it was even more challenging to recruit for the ‘epilogues’ TTTP. A senior manager of a funding body stated they,

"Were not alone in experiencing difficulty with the training of trainers model. There were often enormous difficulties in getting participants and retaining them whether courses were accredited or not.”

With that in mind he suggested that there is

"A danger that ‘epilogues’ is seen as a bit of a luxury, something to do when they have the time. [But ‘epilogues’ needs to sell itself as] integral to core business.”

He also argued that since many organisations are “more funding driven than needs driven” it is better to work with the host organisation to secure funding for delivery than to expect them to find it on their own (as was the plan for year 3 of the Funded Delivery Phase).

A senior manager of another funding body independently had a suggestion which builds on some of the comments from community activists above and which might help ‘epilogues’ reposition itself as core business for community organisations. This would involve using ‘epilogues’ as contentious issues training as part of a package of training for community activists. Many community activists are confronted with a complex, sensitive and challenging working context, for which there is currently no educational experience to prepare them. He recommended that a package of this kind needed to be designed, delivered and evaluated in close collaboration with community activists.
3.3.2 Workshop Education Programme

As with much of the rest of ‘epilogues’ participants and other stakeholders were very positive about their experience of the Workshop Education Programme. Even where criticism was expressed, it was often prefaced by comments like:

“*This is only a minor criticism*”

“*This is one of the best courses I have ever taken, but*…”

Some of the more general responses to the WEP included the following:

“*Fantastic Course!*” (participant).

“*Opened my heart and mind: an experience I will never forget*” (participant).

“*It was a really good course and I’d recommend it to anyone. I don’t think there is anything I would change*” (participant).

“*One of the best courses I have been involved in even including degrees*” (participant).

“*I’m trained as a counsellor and to me the whole course... was therapeutic*” (participant).

‘epilogues’ “gave me an insight into the things that influenced me and how relevant they were then and today... sitting, taking part in the class opened me up to dealing with [the conflict] a way I hadn’t dealt with it before. I had opened the door and I wasn’t closing it until I got it sorted” (participant).

‘epilogues’ gives you a sense of achievement [in learning a] mechanism for dealing with what went before, where you are now, and your plans for the future” (participant).

“*A fantastic programme, fantastic concept... emotive and moving... interesting and a great way to provoke discussion*” (stakeholder).

It “*went beyond comfort zone [which is] good for cross community work*” (stakeholder).

“I thought I knew what to expect, but as it developed it took on a meaning of itself and [became] a road... where you couldn’t turn back in a positive way... and you actually looked forward to the next session” (participant).

“*Useful for anybody that comes into contact with those affected by the Troubles*” (participant).

“You were here for 3 hours and sometimes it wasn’t long enough” (participant).

“*Not enough time to bring out all the discussion*” (participant).
Objectives

Most participants were in agreement that the WEP Learning Objectives had been addressed effectively. The project team felt that they needed to make a more conscious effort to draw attention to the objectives. This was confirmed by a number of participants some of whom thought that more comprehensive explanations should be offered.

A minority commented that the first objective (To develop a sense of active citizenship based on human rights and justice for all) had been addressed less effectively than the others. The project team described the first objective as a "noble" one,

"Where we have made least headway... [it] is taking the learning out into the world in a very proactive way, if it happens, it will happen in a very limited number of cases."

There was some disagreement in the team as to whether the programme had the "potential to kick-start people into activism" but they felt that the questions asked in the WEP led participants towards active citizenship "in a very important but humble way." They felt that the programme would be successful in this area if it,

"Enables people through discussion and reflection to get a deeper understanding of what the last 30 years was about.... [and] gives them a better understanding of their role in society and how their actions ripple out and influence how it moves forward."

One participant commented,

"It didn't make me come away as an activist but I understood better the role of dialogue as part of active citizenship."

A community activist described how his group

"Had a good run at justice and human rights from our perspective and what needs to be done to bring the situation here into the positive" (participant).

Another community activist described how he recruited participants

"Who were isolated in the community, or were in danger of becoming isolated. Often ['epilogues'] helped to bring them out of themselves [and reengage in the community]" (participant / stakeholder).

A number of participants commented on the role that ‘epilogues’ played in developing their understanding of different perspectives on the history of the conflict and in questioning their own perspective:

"It helped me to learn about some of the history of civil rights and how it all started” (participant).

"Instead of people hearing history from above we need to hear history from below, from the grass roots up, and this is where I would see the main contribution of epilogues” (participant).
"Made me question my own previously held values and judgements" (participant).

One participant who was an experienced facilitator felt that the objectives had been met but that there was an issue with the way in which some of them were phrased, "War and Peace Orientation is difficult to get at: what does it mean?"

A senior manager of a funding body suggested that this would be a good point in the development of ‘epilogues’ to sharpen the definition by defining the skill set needed to live in a sectarian society without being defined by it. He argued that it would be positive to ask participants to make presentations about their own communities and to reflect how we live and act now and how that might change in the light of the experience of ‘epilogues’.

Format

The format of the WEPs makes a significant contribution to the success of the programme. The approach is challenging for any facilitator. The main challenge identified by the ‘epilogues’ facilitator related to the balance between the use of the resources and time for discussion:

"We need a lot more time for discussion in the workshops and the material takes up so much time [but it also] frees people to think [and the participants] are saying things that people might not dare to say in the room otherwise."

A small number of interviewees, especially those who had been involved with WEPs delivered as residential commented on the format. One interviewee remarked that there is,

"An approach to each module that goes through a sequence.... that is much the same for each module [and that participants] as teachers themselves they felt that [some material] could have been used in different ways in different places” (stakeholder).

It was commonly felt that,

"The residential gives you something extra” (‘epilogues’ facilitator).

However, one participant commented that they,

"Would have liked the structure to differ slightly from week to week... [and] different methods to be used rather than following the same format each week."

One participant from a victims group described the delivery of WEPs as being,

"Very static... here we have the video, here we have the other materials lets get a bit of your feed back on it."

He felt that contributions made by participants at each WEP ought to be recorded and fed back into future WEPs.
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The ‘epilogues’ facilitator recognised that this was indeed a risk with later modules,

"I start to feel I’m giving people too much and there is too much going on... [there can be] a bit of burn out on the material... [because of the] repetition of watching the material and discussing it."

A senior manager of a funding body urged the ‘epilogues’ team to break the routine by perhaps meeting with perpetrators and victims or visiting the site of an act of violence relevant to the needs and interests of the group.

Facilitation

All those interviewed were very positive about the quality of facilitation. Various participants described the facilitator as:

"Fantastic!"

"Very enthusiastic good at getting people to talk."

"Very funny... very clever, very good."

Other comments made by participants included:

"The facilitation was well done even though sometimes discussion ran on a bit."

"Showed respect for the participants."

"They run a good session... [the facilitator] speaks from the heart, he gets emotional, that’s why I like him."

"This is an extremely difficult course to facilitate but I felt [it was done] with empathy and humour."

A participant expressed his appreciation of the willingness of the facilitators to express their own views:

"You see that... they are not different from you... they had to struggle too... I got a view of the struggle from their point of view which I didn’t have before."

A small number of contributors to the evaluation suggested that two facilitators might be better than one especially when delivered by newly trained trainers:

"If we were doing it there would be two people“ (participant).

One senior manager in a funding body suggested that they “may need 2 facilitators to deliver it“ and that the option for a joint facilitation or mentoring approach used in the ‘epilogues’ quality control and support process should be encouraged.
OCNNI Accreditation

Most of those interviewed felt that OCNNI accreditation was an important option for participants but stressed that it should be a choice rather than a requirement.

"It is generally important that people can get some sort of accreditation [but] I don’t think it is vitally important [for ‘epilogues’]. Just be careful how accreditation is pitched don’t let it put people off. Choice is important” (participant).

"It is always good to acquire a certificate” (participant).

"The out of class exercises are not critical, some want the qualification others don’t” (participant).

Some participants found the out of class exercises to be challenging in different way:

"I found that I was never doing it I was, too busy” (participant).

"I found them useful to keep you thinking about them in between. At first I did them week by week then I stopped and did them all at the end and that was the case for most people in my group” (participant).

"Not academically challenging but personally challenging: a refreshing change” (participant).

"They were useful but not easy. It was a lot of work and thought” (participant).

"People [were] not sure how to answer the questions just because of the way they were written” (participant).

In one group participants struggled with the exercises because of literacy issues,

"They could talk about it but could not write about it. This could be an obstacle” (participant).

Some participants found the exercises to be a vital part of the ‘epilogues’ experience but were reluctant to submit work for accreditation. The ‘epilogues’ team described the experience of one participant who was quiet in workshops and did not want to submit his work, but when it came to the exercises,

“He couldn’t stop himself thinking... it was like a dam burst.”

“There were a couple of occasions when people had done it but did not want to give it in.”

The team noted that many other participants were in a similar position where they had almost completed all the work but after the course “life takes over” and work remained unfinished.
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The *epilogues* facilitator has found that OCNNI accreditation take a great deal of time and effort. The feedback provided on assignments is comprehensive, substantial and of high quality. The administrative and financial systems that OCNNI use, do not fit well with the way that *epilogues* operates and this generates significant additional work.

Single Identity and Cross-Community Delivery

Some of the WEPs were delivered to cross-community groups but most were not. All of the participants who did not experience a cross-community WEP felt that the inclusion of members of the other community would fundamentally change the nature of the engagement. Some see this as a desirable next step and expressed a "need to tell the other side how they feel" (participant) and to hear the same in return. Others felt that much would be lost in terms of the honesty and openness of exchanges:

"I don’t think people would have opened up as much” (participant)

One participant from a victims group observed that everyone in their group was a victim and that it might have been better to have others present, possibly, though not necessarily from "the other side”.

A participant who had been in a cross-community group emphasised the importance of equal or balanced representation for each group where possible. He also noted the possibility for the facilitator to over compensate for an individual whose community was underrepresented in the group and thereby inadvertently isolate them further.

Sectarianism

Three contributors to the evaluation identified themes that they regarded as absent or neglected in the *epilogues* material.

A community activist argued that like most community relations initiatives *epilogues* has a strong focus on the conflict but that the underlying causes of social and economic injustice were neglected. Without systematically addressing these, he argued, a just settlement encompassing justice and human rights would not be achieved.

One stakeholder felt that sectarianism should be addressed more directly. It was argued that there is too strong a focus on the conflict. Sectarianism set the context and helped to spark the violence. Now that violence has stopped,

"Sectarianism and sectarian division hasn’t gone away... there is still a hard core of sectarianism and there is a real danger that we are just storing this up for the next time."

Others noted that dealing with sectarianism is addressed in *epilogues* specifically in the Axioms document.16 This document offers a more nuanced elaboration of the learning objectives and values that underpin and inform WEP delivery.

---

16 The Axioms document is available on the “epilogues” website: www.epilogues.net
A participant commented that a stronger emphasis on,

"Sectarianism would have taken people down a different route... when you get into sectarianism it doesn’t take you anywhere... it doesn’t mean a lot, it was just an excuse for things that were done for specific political aims" (participant).

Follow up

It must be noted that the 'epilogues' facilitator will go to considerable lengths to help participants find follow on activities suitable to their needs and interests. One participant of a recent WEP was eagerly anticipating a follow-up meeting with the facilitator and several others described feeling a bit at a loss when the WEP ended. Several participants wanted to progress with what they had learned, for one this meant pursuing study at Masters level but others were unsure where to go or what to do,

"It is an introduction but then it just leaves you there. It shouldn’t just end there” (participant).

A representative of a funding organisation noted that,

"Nobody does any work at the point where you re-enter normal life”

He suggested that 'epilogues’ could easily become an action-learning programme. Questions like "what will you do with your learning?” would be implicit throughout the course and people would be encouraged to experiment with, and critically reflect upon, new ways of living and acting. To make this more effective an enhanced structure for follow up would be required and might include periodic meetings after the completion of the WEP.

3.3.3 Training the Trainer Programme

Three participants in the TTTP were interviewed. Two were very positive about the course:

"The layout of how many sessions, what is covered and how long they are and how many people are in the room I think they have nailed it pretty close to what is necessary for good delivery, I don’t think they can improve on that” (participant).

Another said that while they still felt the need to meet with project staff before delivering workshops of their own, the TTTP,

"Gave me confidence ... that I can train deliver in front of a group” (participant).

The project team felt that all the participants had a strong sense of the freedom and flexibility to develop the material and their delivery of it in an organic way depending on,

"Who you are, what you bring and what your perspective is.”
Key Findings

“People brought their own style and experience to it.”

The third participant had found it useful for himself, an experienced facilitator. He expressed a need for more training in the use and marking of materials for OCNNI accreditation. He suggested that for those with less experience, more training was needed in dealing with dominant or difficult participants and in the facilitation of sensitive, controversial and emotive issues.

One Advisory Panel member described the training as “very good, very thorough” and emphasised the value of giving participants experience of delivering elements of ‘epilogues’ during the training.

Another Advisory Panel member argued that recognition ought to be given to those with experience and expertise as educators and an adapted TTTP should be offered when appropriate.

The ‘epilogues’ team intend to target recruitment for the next WEP at individuals who wish to become facilitators and use it in part as a facilitation training course.
3.3.4 Target Groups

The 'epilogues’ Target Groups were generally acknowledged to be appropriate and comprehensive. An Advisory Panel member suggested that to an extent, some of them were self-selecting, in that they were there and were very open. He felt that the list,

"Reflects the advisory group’s awareness of the need to make ['epilogues'] as inclusive as possible”.

Suggestions by interviewees for additional groups included clergy and politicians.

There is evidence from the interviews that different target groups responded to the WEP and the various themes in different ways. Ex-prisoners and members of victims tended to find the first 4 themes (Violence, Loss, Revenge, and Forgiveness) were more likely to bring out pain and anger, to be more valuable, intense and relevant:

"People had personal stories to tell in violence loss revenge forgiveness and they were the more intense sessions” (participant).

"All [the modules were] pretty equal [in quality] but some of them had more of an impact on me... Loss, Revenge and Forgiveness were very difficult for me” (participant).

"Forgiveness is where it got interesting a lot of people hadn’t thought about that” (participant).

The intensity of some of these sessions was such that one victim support worker warned that there is a,

"Need to be careful who you get to participate especially with victims. You do not want to set them back or traumatise them” (participant).

This thought was echoed and developed by the ‘epilogues’ facilitator:

"There are bigger things going on for [some victims], they are locked inside a phase of recovery from trauma and great anger. More individual work needs to be done, maybe they weren’t ready for epilogues.”

Another member of a victims group urged,

"At the beginning of the course, the counsellor should be there and be identified as a face... for me 'epilogues' is just the beginning of anyone’s journey. You can’t work through nearly 40 years of the troubles in 8 weeks.”

One participant who is a member of a victims group suggested that the model could be pushed further by bringing together victims and perpetrators in a restorative justice exercise using the 'epilogues’ materials. Another stated,

"Some people just don’t want to think about these issues and if you asked them would they go through the programme again they would probably say they wouldn’t.”
One participant commented that they found the last two themes (Justice and Human Rights) to have less focus, content and relevance:

"The [modules] started off really well and were more focussed but then some of the subject areas petered out a wee bit“ (participant).

He suggested that in the later modules there was potential either to cut some out or to add material. Another participant working in community education expressed the opinion that

"Human Rights and Justice were heavy and dry should have been shorter and snappier.”

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the responses seem to suggest that for some of the target groups there is a much greater emphasis on dealing with personal hurt and personal biography. In general the last two themes, which might be described as more conceptual, were of greater relevance to student teachers and community activists.

"Human rights and justice sections ask the question of what is democracy and what is appropriate behaviour in a democracy and when is violence justified and what are the consequences of violence they don’t answer those questions but they create the basis of good discussion. The process is a questioning one which allows people to respond in ways that they think are appropriate” (stakeholder).

As members of the ‘epilogues‘ team commented,

"The problem is we are asking people to look at things in a way that is intense and deep [as you must] if you are going to look at thirty years of conflict that resulted in death and destruction.”

That intensity will be different in each group for example WEPs provided for students of Peace and Conflict studies were more intellectual and less emotional.

This suggests that there is a need for careful consideration of whether the single model for delivery adequately caters for the diversity of needs represented by the target groups. It should also be noted that adaptations need not be made for every potential target group and as a member of the ‘epilogues‘ team commented, “this isn’t for everybody.” It is also likely that the flexibility given to TTTP graduates will enable the core resources to be deployed in a way that is more sensitive to the needs of specific groups. As more programmes are delivered by the new trainers these needs may be met more effectively.

Youth

The most difficult group for ‘epilogues‘ to engage with proved to be Youth. During the Funded Delivery Phase it was decided to shift the focus away from directly providing WEPs for young people to working with educators who would have contact with young people. In view of the comments expressed by interviewees, this was a sound judgement.
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A wide spectrum of views was expressed about the relevance of the 'epilogues' concept to young people. Comments included:

“I don’t think the programme as it is works for youth” (participant).

“There is not much need for it” (stakeholder).

“It’s the young people we need to educate on where we went wrong in the past and try to have an influence on them that they don’t go down a similar path in the future” (stakeholder).

Most attributed a perceived lack of relevance to young people to either:
1. the content of 'epilogues';
2. the exclusively discussion based approach of the 'epilogues' WEP.

Those who felt that content was the issue believed that since the conflict was “in the past tense” and young people had little or no direct experience of it, there would be little interest in programmes like 'epilogues':

“We are 10 years since the Good Friday [Agreement], 14 years since the first Cessation. It was our way of life, its not their way of life its just a different way now” (participant).

On the other hand, a number of interviewees felt that 'epilogues' would "lend itself to youth based activity". Some pointed to experience or research showing that young people have do have a genuine interest and,

“Curiosity about the Troubles... that for many, is not satisfied by parents, community or formal education” (stakeholder).

One interviewee suggested that the existing and extensive infrastructure in the youth sector is well placed to deliver an 'epilogues' type programme. However, it should be noted that like the formal education sector, parts of the youth sector are currently constrained by the reform of local administration.

Some interviewees were concerned about the glorification of certain violent events during the conflict. One community activist described how in his experience there is a tendency to “dramatise the troubles” and that “young people almost feel they missed out on something”. He thought that 'epilogues' performed an important function in screening

“Hard hitting clips which show the reality of [the conflict]... It is an opportunity to get a message out to young people that we don’t want to go back to the way things were.”

He went on to warn that,

“Dissidents [are] getting many of their recruits from young vulnerable people [who know little about the conflict].

Many who felt that the content is important and of interest to young people considered the current programme to be inappropriate for a young audience. One participant, the youngest to have taken part in the WEP was confident that,

“You could make it work if you made it more friendly for their age group.”
An experienced educator stated that the,

"Pedagogy around it needs to change intensity. It is asking too much... for someone who didn't live through the period. Those hours of footage are not really going to hold them."

It was commonly suggested that any adoption of 'epilogues' for a younger audience should:

- be shorter;
- be more flexible and less prescriptive;
- be more applied – dealing with how this material affects how we live in communities and interact with each other here and now.
- be more imaginative, interactive and varied. The format of the workshops was considered to be too uniform. The workshops should make more use of exercises and simulations that are common in youth settings;
- involve a trip or residential "as a carrot".

Other suggestions included running an intergenerational workshop with victims and perhaps perpetrators participating and acting as a resource for young people. It is recognised that any of these developments would essentially be a new project.

**Teachers**

'epilogues' has had a positive engagement with student teachers and are committed to work with them in the coming year. One teacher educator described the difficulty of using 'epilogues' with student teachers and in a formal education setting:

"As an educator you have other aims and objectives beyond the ones of 'epilogues'. That creates tensions in terms objectives and in terms of time... Like any resource, I would want to mould it, use it adapt it to our purposes."

He acknowledged the integrity of the 'epilogues' process and recognised the need to control the resource but cautioned that,

"There is a danger of the time demands being unrealistic in [the context] of formal education."

Some PGCE students and others involved in formal education saw potential for "selected aspects" of 'epilogues' to be used as a curriculum resource in history or citizenship. It was suggested that interviews could be treated in a,

"More critical, wider contextual way [asking] what can we learn about life during the Troubles from what we hear?"

It is important to note that at present there are other significant challenges to working with the formal education sector in a strategic way. The Department of Education is undertaking a review of community relations funding. No new funding is likely to be available within the next year. The Education and Library Boards are due to be replaced by the new Education and Skills Authority. New initiatives are unlikely to find a welcome until new arrangements are in place.
Schools are in the process of implementing and bedding down the Revised Northern Ireland Curriculum. In some schools there is a sense of initiative overload. 'epilogues' will need to make a judgement about the priority they give to formal education before committing significant time and energy to new initiatives.
3.3.5 A Shared Agenda?

This section aims to outline participants and stakeholders perceptions of the degree to which the general aims of ‘epilogues’ are part of an agenda shared across different sections of society and how far they are in step with the thinking of particular communities. It is only possible to report views expressed by interviewees, it is not possible to accurately represent community opinion, especially given the small sample.

There was a general consensus that ‘epilogues’ was consistent with thinking at a policy level:

"It fits very well with recent government policy... like the Dealing with the Past agenda, [the Consultative Group on the Past], the Victims Commission, Peace II and especially Peace III” (stakeholder).

"People [like policy makers] are looking for innovative ideas this is as good a way as any of provoking discussion and dealing with issues” (stakeholder).

"The emphasis [of funders] is less on capital infrastructure and more on dealing with the past” (stakeholder).

"Funding climate is more geared towards this type of programme now” (participant).

Some were more cynical about the resonance with the thinking of politicians, particularly members of Sinn Féin and the DUP, and others in government:

"I think it is in the interests of the State to close [the discussion of these issues] down” (participant).

Many of the interviewees from across the communities commented that there is now a window of opportunity for this type of work that may not be open for too long:

"Republicans are regrouping, the loyalists haven’t disarmed and the national question isn’t resolved so now is the time because I think if we don’t it will become harder and harder” (stakeholder).

"It is still needed, at some point it will be confined to history. We need to get in now while there is still an opportunity. Everybody needs it, everybody was at least a bystander. [We need to ask questions about] people making money out of it. Why was there no critical mass to end it sooner? How did we allow it to happen?” (participant).

"There is still a real need for this type of activity. Many feel that it is time to move on but lets see how we can help those who can’t, but it is good for everybody, not just those who are stuck. There are a lot of demons running around” (stakeholder).

"The window of opportunity is closing for this work because I think attitudes are becoming harder. That sense of possibilities for change... is starting to close down” ('epilogues’ team member).
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There is a common perception in the community relations sector that this type of work was less likely to secure the engagement of the Loyalist / Unionist community. Several interviewees echoed this view:

"It is less well supported in loyalist communities" (participant, Republican/Nationalist community).

"On the loyalist side they had to work very hard to gain access" (stakeholder).

"The number of organisations, based within the unionist community, that have engaged with the project is minimal" ('epilogues' team).

Some felt that Unionist organisations were reluctant to be challenged. One stakeholder, a loyalist/unionist community activist from Belfast asserted that dealing with the past is neither easy nor always positive:

"We can all see the pit falls that can arise with dealing with the past... I always look at it as a ‘Catch 22’ situation: if we don’t find some sort of mechanism for dealing with the past it has the potential to destabilise the present and the future. If we do try to deal with the past, that also has the potential to destabilise the present and the future. This is because there are probably a lot of things that went on during the conflict the people are in blissful ignorance of."

He also acknowledged that initiatives that,

"Look at the past present particular difficulties for the unionist community because they see [them] as a Republican Trojan horse: as fighting the war by other means."

It was sometimes perceived as point scoring and an attempt to impose feelings of guilt on his community. Despite these hesitations, he was positive about the potential roles of ‘epilogues’. He continued,

"People from both traditions are reluctant to engage with each other. ['epilogues'] would make a good halfway house, on a single identity basis, as a stepping stone to proper engagement."

He went on to suggest that reluctance or refusal do deal with the past might have more to do with geographical location or social status than with community affiliation:

"There is a nucleus of people in areas most acutely affected by the conflict who would see the relevance of looking at the past, but in areas that were relatively untouched, I don’t hear it talked about a lot. There is a great swathe of people out there who absolve themselves from any responsibility for the conflict and are not particularly interested in talking about the past."

One stakeholder, a community activist from the Northwest stated,

"Protestant communities [in the Northwest] are more open to the thought of having these discussions than they might have been a year or two ago... Protestants suffer from a lack of recognition for
what they have suffered ['epilogues'] allows this [recognition] to happen” (stakeholder).

An ‘epilogues’ presentation to a rural community group comprised mainly of individuals from the loyalist/unionist community, former members of the security forces and victims received a very negative response. The community activist interviewed suggested that the approach taken might be appropriate in Belfast but not in his community. He “understood the need to challenge” but the approach generated, “a lot of anger in the room... one man got up and walked out.” He stated, “there is no appetite” for cross–community work to deal with the legacy of the past:

“Its just too soon... people are meeting each other on the streets... everybody knows who did what.”

In reference to work dealing with the legacy of the past, a participant with a security forces background commented that many serving and former members of the security forces "did not get it” and that some expressed a degree of cynicism or hostility. He felt that this attitude would apply to programmes like ‘epilogues’.

The issue of the language used in the ‘epilogues’ literature and workshops was raised by some participants and stakeholders from Loyalist / Unionist and former security force communities. Language found to be objectionable included the terms “Derry” and the “North of Ireland”. Comments included the following:

“The North of Ireland address is a problem” (participant).

“If you want to draw in Protestants, why make a point of this... language can be a barrier” (participant).

“I used the resource in a... session which included 6-7 police officers and they jumped on [the use of the term Derry] right away” (stakeholder).

“I think I can rise above things like that, if people want to make a political point over the name of a city... that's their problem. It would be a turn off for a lot of people within the Loyalist/Unionist community... [it] is a bit patronising” (stakeholder).

“There was a clear language there. In a sense you could say it was naive... about the impact that would have... at another level they were being up front” (stakeholder).

Those participants from the Nationalist/Republican community generally thought that people in their community understood why they were taking part even if they did not agree. No one from this community expressed any reluctance to talk openly about their involvement in ‘epilogues’. A community activist stated,

“People in my community understand I’m doing it for all the right reasons [even if it is] not popular” (participant).
3.3.6 New Frontiers

Throughout Section 3 various suggestions have been made for amendments to ‘epilogues’ or for possible routes for future development. However there are a number of suggestions that do not easily fit elsewhere, these are included here.

Exporting ‘epilogues’

A number of those interviewed, both participants and stakeholders, expressed the view that the ‘epilogues’ model would be of interest and value in other contexts:

“The concept... can be easily transferable to other situations of conflict internationally” (stakeholder).

One senior manager of a funding body suggested that it would be attractive in any context of conflict where there are limited opportunities for intercultural or inter-group dialogue. An approach that focuses on education, presents history as contested and uses a DVD / Internet resource to transmit from each group to the other would be very attractive in a number of contexts such as Bosnia or the Basque Region. Funding for adaptation and implementation might be available through the European Union or the OECD.

Another senior manager of a funding body pointed to a need for an ‘epilogues’ type resource designed for the Republic of Ireland that would include additional testimony to open up issues specific to that context. It should also counter the perception that the conflict was a purely Northern phenomenon in which the Republic had little involvement or responsibility.

Researching ‘epilogues’

One stakeholder identified a significant and largely untouched research agenda related to ‘epilogues’:

“I think there is a fundamental question of does dealing with the past work? It goes back to the even bigger question: does community-relations [activity] work? I don’t know if we have ever fully answered those. A lot of us work from hunches and assumptions around those big questions. With retrospect to have had a full time researcher would have been very valuable and I think they could still have someone work on the next phase.”

Sharing ‘epilogues’

A number of interviewees had suggestions for possible collaborations that may be beneficial for ‘epilogues’ and would develop new audiences.

One ‘epilogues’ participant suggested that ‘epilogues’ should find place in the educational provision of any museum that emerges from, for example, the “Living Memorial Museum” initiative sponsored by Healing through Remembering.
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One ‘epilogues’ participant suggested using ‘epilogues’ in conjunction with “Facing History and Ourselves” an American organisation that offers "strategies, resources and lessons that inspire young people to take responsibility for their world." This would offer a broad and varied programme that he felt would be attractive to his constituency.


Section 4 Recommendations

This section presents a range of recommendations for future developments in ‘epilogues’. They are intended to present options for consideration rather than being a prescription for development. Other factors will influence the decisions that are made. These will include funding opportunities, the interests and energy of the project team and stakeholders as well as ongoing critical feedback.

4.1 The Advisory Panel

The Advisory Panel performed a number of very important functions and did so with considerable professionalism and commitment. At this point in the life of ‘epilogues’ the Advisory Panel should be re-established.

The membership of the Panel should be reconstituted and broadened to encompass community affiliations and competences that are relevant to the current and future development needs of the project. Rather than have the group become too large, it may be useful to divide functions with one group focusing on strategic issues and another on delivery.

While the membership of the new Panel will depend on a number of factors, including strategic decisions about future directions for ‘epilogues’, it is possible to identify some criteria that may aid in planning.

Membership of the Panel should:

1. Be representative of geographical areas which ‘epilogues’ wishes to target;
2. Be representative of the Target Groups, especially those where recruitment has been difficult;
3. Include strategically selected representation from the former security force, Loyalist / Unionist and Republican / Nationalist communities;
4. Include experienced practitioners in, for example, youth work and formal education;
5. Include decision makers in, for example, formal education, community / good relations and local government.

A reconstituted Advisory Panel comprised of carefully selected individuals and representatives of key stakeholder groups could play a useful role in three respects:

- **Providing advice** - in particular on:
  - pedagogy and content appropriate to a range of participants including young people, those in formal education and so on;
  - marketing ‘epilogues’ to specific groups such as young people and the Loyalist / Unionist community;
  - adapting the ‘epilogues’ model of mainstreaming or embedding to fit more closely with the needs of partner community organisations;

- **Building on existing good relationships to develop trust and credibility with new and existing partners.** Membership drawn from a wider range of political contexts (particularly the Loyalist / Unionist
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Community and geographical contexts (particularly Greater Belfast and rural areas) may help to identify reasons for reluctance to participate;

- **Creating new opportunities for delivery.** Participation in, and ownership of 'epilogues' at the level of decision makers and funders may help to develop sustainable and mutually beneficial engagements in new sectors, for example, formal education, the youth sector and local government.

4.2 The DVD

It may be argued that the conflict cannot be seen in perspective without reference to the Agreement and its consequences. In order to ensure the continued relevance of the DVD, 'epilogues' should consider the possibility of a new phase that would allow the addition of material relating to the Agreement, post Agreement period and the future of the island of Ireland. This issue should be discussed with any reconstituted Advisory Panel before any final decision to proceed is taken. If it is decided to add material, it should be consistent with the content and style of existing contributions.

4.3 Website

Many projects have found it difficult to know whether it is yet worth investing significant time, energy and money in website development. However, bearing in mind that this is a new media based project it is important to develop this area. The more a website offers, the more likely people are to use it. Early plans for the website had included more resources than are currently available. 'epilogues' should revisit these plans and consider how best to expand their online presence by for example:

- Expanding the links section to other relevant websites, or by linking to an existing portal of relevance;
- Offering an online library of project documentation;
- Providing discussion spaces for trainers and perhaps participants;
- Developing a regularly updated news section with RSS feeds.

In the first module of each WEP a printed introduction to the website should be distributed and a little time spent gauging participants’ level of access to the Internet and their technical ability to access all the elements of the 'epilogues' site.

Many participants experienced technical difficulties accessing video clips on the website. It may be useful to explore whether there are more widely accessible technologies for the online delivery of video content.

Where plug-ins or other non-standard software is required for viewing it would be helpful to provide instructions, or links to instructions, for downloading and installation.

It would be useful to put in place a mechanism to monitor website use. Data on usage could help inform future planning for the website.
4.4 The Strategic Objectives

As I have outlined above there were factors influenced progress towards the strategic objectives, many of these were beyond the control of 'epilogues'. However, there are two arising issues that should be considered as significant for future planning:

1. The model of delivery for the WEP;
2. The strategy for embedding 'epilogues'.

4.4.1 The Model of Delivery for the WEP

As detailed above, some stakeholders felt that the delivery of the WEP is controlled to the extent that uptake will be restricted. This model has undoubtedly been important to the successful development of 'epilogues' and it should be recognised that there is significant flexibility in it. However, at this point in project development the team should consider if and how that control might be responsibly and productively relaxed, at least in certain cases. This will be necessary if 'epilogues' is to be used significantly in formal education. It is likely that there will be pressure to relax their requirements in other sectors too. A measured response will be important.

4.4.2 The Strategy for Embedding 'epilogues'

The strategy for embedding 'epilogues' is clearly not as effective as had been anticipated. Contributory factors are outlined above. Recommendations already made in relation to the Advisory Panel and the TTTP are designed, in part, to address this issue.

In addition to serving the type of groups it has been working with, 'epilogues' should also consider how to reposition itself as a core professional development course for practitioners within the Target Groups. Steps to doing this may include:

- The creation and distribution of promotional material that clearly articulates the professional skills developed by participation in the WEP. Materials should be targeted at specific groups such as community activists, victims counsellors, community relations workers;
- Implement a networking strategy designed to develop or enhance relationships with relevant organisations, professional and public bodies;
- Seek inclusion in directories of professional development courses;
- Offer to work with potential host organisations to seek funding to support the WEP;
- Developing contacts with past participants encouraging them to become advocates for 'epilogues' in their own organisations.
4.5 The Workshop Education Programme

There is no doubt that contributors to this evaluation regarded the WEP as a high quality programme that was delivered very effectively. However, there are a number of recommendations that may help to enhance delivery.

With the ‘epilogues’ format, there is a possibility that it can become repetitive, especially in later modules. This presents a creative challenge to the facilitator. It is important to use and promote spontaneity and creativity in the delivery of the programme. While going beyond the ‘epilogues’ model, in certain contexts this could potentially mean a variation in routine for each module or the inclusion of simulations or active learning activities commonly used in youth work, formal and informal education. The degree and nature of variation should be based on the professional judgement of the facilitator and will be dependant on the nature of the particular group.

‘epilogues’ should review the arrangements for monitoring the delivery of the WEP. The Baseline questionnaire and the Participant Assessment Form should be reviewed in light of the experience of programme delivery to date.

Each form should include a question on the level of engagement as an active citizen. Each form, rather than asking who is responsible for “the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’”, it may be more useful to ask the participant to describe their attitude towards the listed groups and towards the use of force.

In the Participant Assessment Form it may be useful to include a question about individuals or organisations known to the participant who may be interested in the course. The final question on the Participant Assessment Form asks for feedback on programme structure, content, methodology and facilitation. Better quality feedback may be obtained by creating more space for answers and asking for positive and negative comments on each category.

Additionally, a procedure should be put in place to ensure that while the forms are completed anonymously, it is possible to identify and compare the forms completed by each participant. This will enable the project team to identify progress towards the WEP objectives.

Structures for follow up with participants should be reviewed with a view to strengthening the network of WEP graduates and maximising their advocacy for ‘epilogues’ within their own communities.

4.6 The Training of Trainers Programme

‘epilogues’ has a wide and diverse range of Target Groups which presents an equally wide range of needs. Student teachers, youth workers, victims groups, community activists and so on, are likely to use distinct approaches to the material. ‘epilogues’ must judge whether any of them are sufficiently distinct to warrant separate and distinct provision of training.

TTTPs tailored to specific professional groups are more likely to be seen as legitimate professional development courses that enhance professional skills. They could also help to create networks of professionals willing to collaborate in the delivery of ‘epilogues’ material.
Recommendations

A number of the trainers who have completed their training are unlikely to deliver training at least in the near future. In light of this, for some participants, it would be worth spending more time exploring how they can become advocates for ‘epilogues’ within their own organisations; to look at the organisational challenges they might face and how they might be overcome.

Joint facilitation of WEPs should be positively encouraged as an option, at least for new trainers.

4.7 Target Groups

‘epilogues’ should consider adding clergy and or church groups to their Target Groups for the delivery of WEPs.

All WEP facilitators should monitor and regularly share experiences of WEP delivery to inform the practice of all and identify differing needs and interest between different Target Groups to enable the adaptation of delivery.

‘epilogues’ should consider collaborating with experienced youth work practitioners to develop a version of the WEP specifically for Youth.

4.8 A Shared Agenda?

The issue of language (the use of terms like Derry or Londonderry, the North of Ireland or Northern Ireland and so on) has already been carefully considered by the ‘epilogues’ team and the usage changed. They should again review current usage, as it does appear to be a barrier to, or cause of suspicion for, some of the Target Groups. Advice should be taken from any reconstituted Advisory Panel and a reasoned, principled and transparent decision taken about the future use of such terms in ‘epilogues’ materials.

4.9 New Frontiers

Through existing contacts and through any reconstituted Advisory Panel, ‘epilogues’ should begin to explore the possibilities for a number of potential routes for longer-term development.

Using the ‘epilogues’ concept to develop a version of the resource materials for other conflict affected societies. This would require the development of international partnerships with practitioners and potential donors. A number of contexts and potential donors have been suggested in Section 3.

One stakeholder indicated a potential research agenda related to the work of ‘epilogues’. The project team should initiate discussions with local academics and researchers to develop and refine a research agenda and seek funding to support it. This has the potential to open up new funding sources, build mutually beneficial partnerships and maximise the learning gained from the project.

‘epilogues’ should seek to develop relationships with:
- the new local council clusters which are being developed to facilitate the delivery of Priority 1.1 of the Peace III programme. Currently, the two clusters that hold the greatest potential for ‘epilogues’ are the Omagh, Strabane and Derry Cluster and the Belfast City Cluster.
Recommendations

• The Victims Unit of the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister.
• The Department of Social Development in relation to their Local Community Programmes.
## Appendix 1 Funding Secured for 'epilogues'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Amount of funding awarded</th>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>LSP Derry City Council Area</td>
<td>£30,828</td>
<td>08289</td>
<td>'epilogues'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(April 03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>LSP Derry City Council Area</td>
<td>£60,654</td>
<td>08289</td>
<td>'epilogues'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Feb 04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>CRC Media Grant (March 04)</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>03/0329</td>
<td>'epilogues'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(DVD Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>CFNI (June 05)</td>
<td>£5000</td>
<td>1003045/C500220</td>
<td>'Training the Trainer'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>CRC (August 05)</td>
<td>£4529</td>
<td>05/0160</td>
<td>'epilogues'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£5000</td>
<td>05/0161</td>
<td>equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'epilogues' Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>International Fund for Ireland</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>GR/JH/GASLIGHTLOO</td>
<td>'epilogues'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Bridges Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslight Productions</td>
<td>PEACE II Ext Measure 2.1</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>05/0580/029775</td>
<td>'epilogues'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(March 06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 Organisations Consulted

Organisations, Educational institutions & Bodies Consulted

1. Department of Peace & Conflict Studies, University of Ulster at Magee
2. Department of Sociology, University of Ulster at Jordanstown
3. School of Education (UNESCO Centre), University of Ulster at Coleraine
4. Institute for Further & Higher Education, Strand Road, Derry
5. Council for Curriculum & Examination Assessment (CCEA), Clarendon Dock, Belfast
6. Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI), Waterside, Derry
7. British Army (Headquarters), Lisburn, Co. Antrim
8. REACT, Bond Street, Waterside, Londonderry (Loyalist Ex Prisoner’s Group-UVF)
9. Community Restorative Justice Project (CRJ), Westend Park, Derry
10. Ulster Prisoners Aid, Bond Street, Waterside, Londonderry (Loyalist Ex Prisoner’s Group-UDA)
11. Prisoners in Partnership, Highfield Drive, Highfield Estate, Belfast (Loyalist Ex Prisoners)
12. Interaction Belfast, Springfield Road, Belfast
13. Dove House Community Resource Centre, Bogside, Derry
14. Peace & Reconciliation Group, Bishop Street, Derry
15. Tullyalley & District Development Group, Waterside, Londonderry
16. Sole Purpose Productions, Playhouse, Derry
17. WAVE, Bishop Street, Derry (victims group)
18. WAVE, Antrim Road, Belfast (victims group)
19. SAVER Markethill, South Armagh (victims group – unionist community)
20. SEFF, South East Fermanagh Foundation, Lisnaskea, (victims group – unionist community)
21. Justice for the Forgotten, Gardiner Street, Dublin (Campaign Group for Dublin/Monaghan Bombings)
22. Disabled Police Officers Association (DPOA), Carrickfergus, Co. Antrim
23. Cunamh, Bishop Street, Derry (victims group – nationalist community)
24. Irish Congress Trade Unions (ICTU), Donegal Street, Belfast
25. Workers Education Association (WEA), Clarendon Street, Derry
26. Bloody Sunday Trust, Shipquay Street, Derry
27. Women's Centre, Guildhall Street, Derry
28. STEP (South Tyrone Empowerment Project), Dungannon
29. Bogside & Brandywell Initiative (BBI), Lecky Road, Derry
30. Creggan Neighborhood Partnership, Central Drive, Creggan, Derry
31. Divert Project, Bogside, Derry (Young People’s Drug Awareness Project)
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32. Tar Abhaile, Westend Park, Derry (Republican Ex Prisoner’s Group)
33. Border Horizons, The Diamond, Derry
34. Pat Finucane Centre, Westend Park, Derry
35. Institute for Conflict Research, North City Business Centre, Belfast
36. Waterside Area Partnership, Ebrington Business Centre, Waterside, Londonderry
37. Relatives For Justice, Falls Road, Belfast
38. The Legacy Project, Warrington, England
40. The Shared City Project, Spencer Road, Waterside, Londonderry
41. Cathedral Club, Fountain Estate, Londonderry
42. Coiste Na - Iarchimi, Beachwood Avenue, Belfast (Republican Ex Prisoners Group)
43. EPIC, Shankill Road, Belfast (Loyalist Ex Prisoners Group-UVF)
44. Youth Service (WELB), Great James Street, Derry
45. Youth Council for Northern Ireland, Purdy’s Lane, Belfast
46. The Community Foundation for Northern Ireland (CFNI), Carlisle Road, Derry
47. EX-PAC, Derry Road, Monaghan Town, Co. Monaghan (Ex Prisoner’s Group)
48. Donegal Community Workers Co-Operative (DCWC), Pearse Road, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal
49. Glencree Peace & Reconciliation Centre, Co. Wicklow
Appendix 3 Pilot Groups

Pilot Phase

Pilot workshops conducted with organisations while using prototype 'epilogues' DVD – Loss & Violence Modules only

1. Disabled Police Officers Association (DPOA), Carrickfergus Co. Antrim
2. International Students Peace & Conflict Studies, Magee College, Derry
3. Intercomm (conflict transformation org.), Antrim Road, Belfast
4. WAVE Trauma Centre (victim support group), Belfast
5. ST. Josephs Secondary School, Creggan, Derry
6. Workers Education Association (WEA), Belfast
7. Reach Across, (cross comm. youth project) Derry
8. Western Education Library Board (WELB) – Youth Workers, Derry
9. Belfast Interaction (republican/loyalist interface group), Springfield Road, Belfast
10. Donegal Community Workers Co Operative, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal
11. EXPAC (republican ex-prisoners org.), Monaghan Town, Co. Monaghan
12. Old Library Trust, Creggan, Derry
13. ST. Mary’s Secondary School, Creggan, Derry
14. Coiste na n-Iarchimi (umbrella org. representing IRA ex-prisoners), Belfast
15. Cunamh (victim support group), Derry
16. Tullyalley & District Development Group, Londonderry
17. School of Education, University of Ulster at Coleraine
18. Tar Abhaile, (republican ex-prisoners ) Derry
19. Northern Ireland British Army Veterans Association
Appendix 4 Baseline Assessment Questionnaire

1. **How do you normally regard yourself?** As:
   - A Unionist _______
   - A Nationalist _______
   - A Loyalist _______
   - A Republican _______
   - Irish _______
   - British _______
   - Northern Irish _______
   - A citizen _______
   - Other _______

   *(Tick one or more answer)*

2. **Do you consider yourself:**
   - Not affected by the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’? _______
   - Somewhat affected by the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’ _______
   - Deeply affected by the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’? _______
   - A victim of the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’? _______
   - A survivor of the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’? _______

   *(Tick one or more answer)*

3. **Who in your view is responsible for the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’?** *(Tick one or more answer)*
   - The British Government _______
   - The Irish Government _______
   - The Unionist Government _______
   - The Unionist Community _______
   - The Nationalist Community _______
   - The British Army _______
   - The UVF _______
   - The IRA _______
   - The UDA _______

4. **How would you describe the conflict in and about ‘Northern Ireland’?**
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
Appendix 5 Participant Assessment Form

1. How do you normally regard yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1a. Who in your view was responsible for the conflict?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Unionist _____</td>
<td>The British Government _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Nationalist _____</td>
<td>The Irish Government _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Loyalist _____</td>
<td>The Unionist Government _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Republican _____</td>
<td>The Unionist Community _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish _____</td>
<td>The Nationalist Community _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British _____</td>
<td>The British Army _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Irish _____</td>
<td>The UVF _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A citizen _____</td>
<td>The IRA _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other _____</td>
<td>The UDA _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tick one or more answer)

2. What was your experience of the epilogues programme?

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

3. What are the key learning points for you?

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

4. Please comment on the programme structure content, methodology and facilitation in terms of what was good what could have been done differently (PTO if you need more space).

Programme Structure ___________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Programme Content ___________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Programme Methodology _______________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Programme Facilitation ________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________