



CENTER FOR URBAN AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

**School of Education
IUPUI**

Peace Learning Center Curriculum Mapping Project: CUME Research Report

Prepared by

The Center for Urban and Multicultural Education

CUME

School of Education

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Troy A. Crayton, M.A.

Robert J. Helfenbein, Ph.D.

Peace Learning Center Curriculum Mapping Project: CUME Research Report

Executive Summary

The Curriculum Mapping Project represents a formalization of the longstanding collaboration between the (PLC) and the Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME) housed in the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis School of Education. As the PLC evaluates and expands its programs, a detailed inquiry into the various components and objectives is an essential first step in supporting this important work. Supported through funding from the PLC, CUME, and the School of Education, this research report includes informal qualitative research methods, literature review, document analysis, and steps toward correlation with Indiana State Curriculum Standards. It is hoped that this work provides valuable contextual information to the PLC as they explore further funding and research and evaluation efforts on their programs.

This research report is an evolving tool designed to build a peace education curriculum and a research evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of peace education programs. The goal of the Curriculum Mapping Project is to outline components of Peace Learning Center (PLC) programs, learning objectives of each component, relevant research that demonstrates each component's relevance and effectiveness, and help develop evaluation tools and systems to gauge the effectiveness of peace education programs, and connections with the State of Indiana's Academic Standards.

An initial finding of this research project holds that the programs of the PLC represent community-based efforts in peace-building, conflict resolution, and peer mediation that follow the existing research base on such interventions. Characteristics of the PLC, such as fluidity of programs, mediation role of program directors, conflict identification, and the impact of self-regulation training, are all supported by the research literature on effectiveness. Furthermore, the PLC is uniquely situated as a site of further and wide-reaching research and evaluation efforts, serving as a national model for similar programs and the replication of local efforts.

As a result of document analysis and qualitative research methods, this research report presents ten (10) objectives for the evaluation of both participant and programmatic effectiveness of PLC programs. The recommendations of the CUME research team are that evaluations be designed that follow these objectives and that a collaborative process be instigated to identify "core" objectives that target essential understandings for program participants.

In exploring the possibilities for future research initiatives with PLC programs, a finding of this project is the need for a shared language across programs in terms of formative evaluation efforts and research projects. A strength of the PLC remains its fluidity and responsiveness to different community partners and contexts; however, this fluidity often creates differing understandings and stages of readiness for programmatic evaluation. This report suggests that moving toward

shared understandings and commitments to research and evaluation efforts would only strengthen PLC programs and potential for continued funding.

Finally, the frequency reporting by program directors on PLC components reveals certain patterns in enacted program across the various initiatives. This finding only suggests to the program directors and PLC administration that consideration be given to program components and the curricular commitments in various contexts.

Table of Contents

	Page Number:
1.0 Introduction	5
2.0 Peace Learning Center Programs	7
2.1 Elementary Education (EE)	7
2.2 Peace Learning Services (LS)	8
2.3 Adult Programs (AP)	8
2.4 Peace and Character Education (PACE)	9
2.5 Supported Programs	9
3.0 Review of Literature	11
4.0 Preliminary Evaluation	17
4.1 Context: Role of Directors	17
4.2 Methods	18
4.3 Findings	19
4.3.1 Perception of Mission	19
4.3.1.1 Elementary Education	19
4.3.1.2 Peace Learning Services	19
4.3.1.3 Adult Programs	19
4.3.1.4 Peace and Character Education	20
4.3.1.5 Supported Programs	20
4.3.2 Research Supported Practice	22
4.3.3 Component Frequency Report	24
4.4 Discussion	27
5.0 Recommendations	28
6.0 References	31
Appendices	

Peace Learning Center Curriculum Mapping: Project: CUME Research Report

1.0 Introduction

This research report, as part of The Curriculum Mapping Project, is designed to begin the process of collaboratively building a research evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of the Peace Learning Center's peace education programs. The goal of the Curriculum Mapping Project is to outline components of Peace Learning Center (PLC) programs, learning objectives of each component, relevant research that demonstrates each component's relevance and effectiveness, and help develop evaluation tools and systems to gauge the effectiveness of peace education programs. Concurrently, connections with the State of Indiana's Academic Standards will be outlined for curriculum alignment.

The Curriculum Mapping Project represents a formalization of the longstanding collaboration between the PLC and the Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME) housed in the Indiana University- Indianapolis School of Education. As the PLC evaluates and expands its programs, a detailed inquiry into the various components and objectives is an essential first step in supporting this important work. Supported through funding from the PLC, CUME, and the School of Education, this working paper includes informal qualitative research methods, literature review, document analysis, and correlation with Indiana State Curriculum Standards. It is hoped that this work provides valuable contextual information to the PLC as they explore further research and evaluation efforts on their programs.

Peace Learning Center (PLC) is an Indianapolis-based community educational institution teaching peace-building and conflict resolution skills to youth and adults. PLC establishes safe and collaborative ways to deal with conflicts and differences. Started in 1997 in Eagle Creek Park, PLC has expanded its programming and reached more than 100,000 youth and adults in a variety of educational contexts including the Indianapolis Public Schools.

The activities of the PLC programs are administered in elementary, middle and secondary schools, and to adults in a variety of corporate environments (adult program) in greater Indianapolis. Greater Indianapolis includes Indianapolis Public Schools, Lawrence Township Schools, and Warren Township Schools. These activities are facilitated by representatives from each PLC program to these schools. The schools in which the PLC programs are administered at the time of this writing are: Warren Central High School; Warren Township middle schools (Raymond Park, Stoneybrook, and Creston); Lawrence Township Charter School (LEC - ninth grade); Lawrence Township Middle School (Fall Creek Valley – sixth grade); Franklin Township Middle School; Franklin Central High School; Irvington Community School (Indianapolis Charter School – sixth grade); Metropolitan High School (Indianapolis Charter School – ninth grade); Indianapolis Public Schools (middle and high school); and the Pendleton Juvenile Correctional Facility for Girls. The student populations in these schools represent the spectrum of socio-economic status.

PLC has been recognized by the Indianapolis Crime Prevention Task Force report as “a local ‘best practice’ that has demonstrated the effectiveness of teaching young adults and at-risk youth creative ways of resolving conflicts, personal responsibility, and character building” as

Crayton & Helfenbein

reflected on the PLC website (www.peacelearningcenter.org). The task force recommends an expansion of PLC middle and high school programs as well as more work in juvenile justice, a recommendation recently taken up by affiliated program facilitators. The following curriculum map begins with a description of each program that make-up the core services of PLC should be presented.

The primary participants in this inquiry consist of the seven directors of programs that is PLC. Each director either facilitates their respective program or trains four to six staff members in facilitating the respective program. Each director brings experience to PLC from the community at-large and in administering peace and conflict resolution programs. The experience between the seven directors ranges from 2 – 19 years which represents varying perspectives to the peace education process.

2.0 Peace Learning Center Programs

There are four programs, each represented by a Director, that make-up the core curriculum of the PLC: Elementary Peace Education (EE), Peace and Character Education Program (PACE), Peace Learning Services (LS), Adult Programs (AP). Additionally, three programs are supported by the PLC and represented collaborative, community-based efforts: International Interfaith Initiative (III), Challenge Education / Peace Learning Program (PLP), and Help Increase the Peace Program International (HIPP Intl.).

2.1 Elementary Peace Education (EE)

The EE Program includes two versions of its program, the Peace Learning Camp (EE1) and an in-school version (EE2). The EE1 is a three-day, two-night program operated at the

Crayton & Helfenbein

Columbus Youth Camp in Columbus, Indiana. The camp most recently consisted of a curriculum “focused on students engaging in small group learning about interpersonal communication, diversity appreciation, and environmental stewardship while improving peacemaking skills” (Peace Learning Center, 2007, p.1). The EE2 “provides an interactive day of learning that includes follow-up lessons and an in-class mediation process. Students learn community leadership, conflict resolution, and non-violent self defense. Focusing on personal responsibility and critical thinking, youth participate in role plays and a nature walk” (Nation, 2007, p.2).

2.2 Peace and Character Education Program (PACE)

PACE, designed for middle school students, consists of a camp (PACE1) and an in-class component (PACE2) with a variety of educational experiences. PACE.

provides over 16 hours of classroom programming for all Indianapolis Public Schools 7th graders as well as a two-day overnight leadership experience at Columbus Youth Camp in Southern, Indiana. Students engage in small group learning about interpersonal communication, diversity appreciation, and environmental stewardship while improving their peace-building skills. (Nation, 2007, p.2)

2.3 Peace Learning Services (LS)

The Peace Learning Services also consists of two main versions. LS1 is a version for elementary and middle-school students, and LS2 is a version for high school students. In either LS program, “participants learn to address the root causes of conflict through dialogue and active learning. Non-violent alternatives, conflict resolution, cooperation, empathy and self-esteem are included in a wide variety of topics offered” (Nation, 2007, p.2). Workshop timeframes range from one-hour to five days of engaging youth in programming.

2.4 Adult Programs (AP)

The Adult Programs (AP) consist of “skill building workshops” ranging from one-hour to three-day overnight retreats engaging teams from schools, businesses, community and faith-based organizations in the application of communication and peace-building skills. In planning these services, Peace Learning Center conducts collaborative assessments on strengths and needs tailoring experiences to meet the individual groups (Nation, 2007). It is hoped by the leadership that these services expand and play an increasing role in the programs of PLC.

2.5 Supported Programs

PLC supports two related programs called Peace Learning Program (PLP) and Help Increase the Peace Indy—a modified version of the copyrighted HIPP originating out of the American Friends Service Committee. As intervention programs, PLP and HIPP consist of “facilitators (that) serve youth involved in the criminal justice system. PLP is a collaborative effort between the Indiana Department of Correction, the Peace Learning Center, and program facilitators in pursuit of implementing curriculum in peace education, conflict resolution, and self-efficacy. With support from the IUPUI Center for Service and Learning, the Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME) has been able to provide a Service Learning Assistant to help facilitate the program and begin contextual work in the hopes of future research projects on the impact and effectiveness of the program. Participants are engaged in conflict resolution, personal responsibility and character building activities using challenge education and

experiential learning (Nation, 2007). The HIPP philosophy extending from the AFSC intends “to train students and teachers in conflict resolution skills and through experience to knit the school into a caring community” (Liss, 2004, p.6).

The International Interfaith Initiative (III) represents a collaborative effort including the IUPUI Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME), the Sagamore Institute and the Peace Learning Center. As the stated goal of the project is “mapping central Indiana’s religious and civic community,” the initial efforts have included hosting a variety of community events that include community partners (i.e. the International Center of Indianapolis, Habitat for Humanity, Max Cade German-American Center, the Dignity Center, and others), and facilitating a youth dialogue program with area middle school students representing Congregation Beth-El Zedeck, St. Thomas Aquinas School, The Oaks Academy, Madrassa Tul-Ilm and Rousseau McClellan IPS #91 (Nation, 2007, p.2).

The not-for-profit organization depends on various forms of funding to operate, and a major source of funding is grants from organizations. These ‘funding’ organizations typically and increasingly require a measured effectiveness of the programs output or services, and depending on the funding organization, adherence to certain standards. This is the case for PLC, as is fairly common in certain service providing not-for-profits such as PLC. Moreover, there are many programs under the PLC umbrella, each of which performs any combination of these said services. In order for PLC to remain attractive to potential funders, therefore, each of the programs have a need for clearly defined objectives without losing the individual integrity of

each program. Additionally, a mechanism for measuring the effectiveness of these objectives needs to be developed while adhering to the standards of effective research.

3.0 Review of Relevant Literature

In the *Harvard Educational Review* article “Social, Emotional, Ethical, and Academic Education: Creating a Climate for Learning, Participation in Democracy, and Well-Being” Cohen (2006) argues that the goals of education need to be reframed to prioritize not only academic learning, but also social, emotional, and ethical competencies. He states, “when evidence-based social, emotional, and ethical education is integrated into traditional teaching and learning, educators can hone the essential academic and social skills, understanding, and dispositions that support effective participation in a democracy” (Cohen, 2006, p.202). As a part of those broader educational goals, conflict resolution, as a tool of peace education curricula, should consist not only of reactive problem-solving strategies but also of preventive measures in complex social situations (see also Crawford, 2005; Francis, 2000).

Evidence for the importance of high-level social experiences and conflict resolution skills is substantiated by multiple scholars (Crawford, 2005; Brantmeier, 2003; Brookfield, 1987). Jones (2004), as part of comprehensive review of peer mediation programs nationwide states that, “peer mediation programs provide significant benefit in developing constructive social and conflict behavior in children at all educational levels” (p.236). It should be noted that so-called peer mediation is a part of the PLC *peace table* component in elementary schools, as will be elaborated upon throughout this report. However, the overwhelming conclusion of a review of the research is the lack of efforts in determining the impact of peace education and conflict

resolution within specific contexts and diverse and non-dominant groups. Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) state that,

measures of success do not include diversity-relevant outcomes (impact on intergroup relations or community harmony is largely ignored), and issues of class or socioeconomic status receive very little attention. However, there is evidence that CRE programs that focus on systemic bias or include “contact theory” can improve intergroup relations. (cited in Jones, 2004, p.240)

This suggests the field is ready for more complex studies on interventions that specifically include attention to diverse populations and what is commonly referred to in the education literature as urban contexts.

The challenges to peace education efforts reflected in the literature are as follows. First a school needs to present the case that there is a high frequency of conflict, and, consequential destructiveness of person or property between students. Brugman and Aleva (2004) show that indeed,

on the basis of empirical findings in secondary school pupils we expect the perception of institutional moral atmosphere to be even more important for predicting behaviour than moral competence... [and that research is needed on] practical reasoning and perception of an institutional moral atmosphere in order to find out whether a delay in moral competence is one of the causes of the offence. (p.323)

In other words, does the frequency of conflict or consequential destructiveness of person or property between students indicate a delay in a student’s ability to gain moral competence?

Deutsch (2003) substantiates this position by illustrating how institutional conditions of conflict and destructiveness contribute to “destructive relations” among students. The implications of

this work point to the possibility that peace education needs approach by schools and institutions holistically—that is, programs for students, employees, educators, and employers.

Inquiry into the evaluation of students' learning of peace education and conflict resolution education (CRE) holds particular value for this project. The need for (and unfortunately lack of) this type of systematic program evaluation is substantiated by Smith, and Daunic, *et. al.* (2002), and K. Bickmore (1997). Smith and Daunic, for example, provide a study in which students were tracked by teacher and disciplinary incident across school years, mediation data was collected, and mediators were compared with a matched sample to determine attitudinal change as a result of peer mediation training and experience. The authors found that schools that develop conflict resolution programs should have a focus on mediation-process evaluation and measures of school-wide outcomes—components often missing in K-12 settings. Additionally, the researchers suggest that the use of peer mediation training as an intervention is important, if not essential.

Another important measure of program effectiveness involves the student's comprehension and knowledge maintenance over time. Benne & Garrard (2003) present no less than thirty conflict management programs in primary and secondary schools that measure knowledge retention (Benne & Garrard, 2003; Bickmore, 1997; Johnson and Johnson, 2001). All but seven programs did not include the essential characteristic of communication, and only one of those programs, according to Benne & Garrard (2003), included,

a measure of communication in the assessment battery. The field of CRE must do a better job of examining the effectiveness of the various curriculum components, including social problem-solving, perspective-taking, and self-regulation of social affect; and of understanding the mechanisms that connect them. (p.83)

Crayton & Helfenbein

Several researchers study the level of use by students of conflict resolution skills in both curricular and extracurricular activities (Bickmore, 1997; Singley & Anderson, 1989). The question that seems to present itself, given the literature thus far, whether curricular or extracurricular, do students achieve at a higher level when learning the conflict procedures in combination with academic learning (Bickmore, 1997; Bjerstedt, 1993)? Jones states the following:

In 2003, Greenberg *et al* reviewed school-based intervention and youth development initiatives concluding that programs in this area are most beneficial when they simultaneously enhance students' personal and social assets as well as improve the quality of the environments in which students are educated. They cite a metaanalysis of 161 positive youth development programs (Catalano, *et al*, 2002) that indicates programs working on social and emotional learning make a difference in improving interpersonal skills, quality of peer and adult relationships, and academic achievement, as well as reductions in problem behaviors such as school misbehavior and truancy, violence, and aggression. Greenberg and colleagues (2003) argue that skills-building components and environmental change initiatives are critical; optimal delivery of programs is through trained teachers who integrate the concepts into their regular teaching and do so over a longer period of time (six to nine months).

Another reoccurring objective in the literature specifically mentioned as a goal of PLC programs was students' ability to identify a problem solving process when placed in situations of conflict (Johnson & Johnson, 2001). Jones (2004) suggests that problem solving processes can
Crayton & Helfenbein

be measured by the enhancement of students' social and emotional development given studies of Kessler (2003), Lantieri (2001), and Lantieri and Patti (1996). Conflict resolution programs—similar to those of the PLC—are effective in achieving student awareness of potential conflicts and multiple strategies in addressing them and,

the benefits include outcomes like these: Increased perspective taking; Improved problem-solving abilities; Improved emotional awareness and emotional management; Reduced aggressive orientations and hostile attributions; and Increased use of constructive conflict behaviors in schools and in home and community contexts. (Jones, 2004, p.235)

Peace education may take multiple forms in differing contexts and program providers have adapted to the needs of particular communities. Bjerstedt (1993) presents a system to identify the various ways in which peace education efforts can be applied to school curricula. The examples provided by this system are:

(1) peace education can be made into a special subject, a mono-curricular approach; (2) peace related issues can be handled by means of special efforts outside of the normal system of classes, an extra-curricular or special event approach; (3) peace education can be seen as a common assignment for several or all school subjects, a cross-curricular approach; or (4) peace education may be viewed as aiming at education for peace values and nonviolent interaction with others, whereby the question of school subject attachment moves into the background, a trans- curricular approach. (Bjerstedt, 1993, p.5)

The ability for peace education to be applicable and adaptable to various contexts provides the potential for increased acceptance by stakeholders of the given school, organization, or community and points to the benefits of the fluidity of PLC programs.

Whether or not age of participant or level of maturity in conflict resolution education effects the effectiveness of programs holds another place in the research literature. Stevahn, Johnson, Johnson, Oberle, & Wahl (2000) completed a study that “found significant differences

Crayton & Helfenbein

in trained and untrained children's knowledge and retention of the conflict resolution procedure, willingness and ability to use it in conflict situations, and conceptual understanding of friendship” in kindergartners at a suburban Midwestern school (p.782).

However, Roger T. Johnson and David W. Johnson represent in their article *Teaching Students to be Peacemakers: A Meta-Analysis* that there is little in the literature on measuring the effectiveness of such programs. Therefore, from 1988 – 2000 Johnson and Johnson did a series of sixteen studies of Peacemaker training “in eight different schools in two different countries” (Johnson & Johnson, 2001) illustrating the diversity of the study finding that the program improved classroom climate and effectively reduced the incidence of negatively handled conflicts. Individual studies by the authors also point to possible connections between peace education efforts and cognitive, psychological, and ethical development in elementary level students. Substantive work has been done by C. G. Benne and W. M. Garrard to support these conclusions (Benne & Garrard, 2003). Johnson and Johnson (2001) suggest eleven areas of inquiry in evaluating for effectiveness which powerfully coincide with the PLC Teach the Facilitator Curriculum (see Ruschman, 2007b).

- 1) Are schools justified in being concerned about the frequency and destructiveness of conflicts among students?
- 2) When given training, do students successfully learn the conflict resolution procedures?
- 3) Do students maintain their knowledge over time?
- 4) Do students apply the conflict resolution procedures to actual conflicts?
- 5) Do students transfer the conflict resolution procedures to non-classroom and nonschool settings?
- 6) Do students use the conflict procedures in the family setting?
- 7) Do students achieve at a higher level when learning the conflict procedures in combination with academic learning?
- 8) Do students use a problem-solving approach to negotiations when placed in a situation where they can use either win-lose or problem solving approach?

Crayton & Helfenbein

- 9) Do faculty, administrators, and parents perceive the conflict resolution in positive ways?
- 10) Will the integration of peacemaker training into academic units enhance or interfere with academic learning or the learning of the negotiation and mediation procedures? And,
- 11) Will the peacemaker training affect the frequency with which students use the integrative negotiation procedure when they are given a choice between seeking distributive or integrative outcomes?

Additionally, Payton *et.al* (2000) describe criteria to identify key social and emotional (SEL) competencies as supported by the Collaborative to Advance Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL). These guides, focusing of social and emotional learning, may serve as valuable supportive mechanisms for developing new program initiatives and guiding the effectiveness of PLC programs.

4.0 Preliminary Evaluation of Peace Learning Center Curriculum

4.1. Context: Role of Program Directors

The Peace Learning Center employs a distributed leadership model with individual program directors leading individual programmatic efforts. Various studies in peace education and conflict resolution call for *mediators*, as well as program facilitators (Johnson and Johnson, 2002; Lincoln, 2001; Fast, J., F. Fanelli, et.al., 2003; Fennimore, 1997; Smith & Daunic, 2002). The mediator, as defined here, conveys the understanding of accomplishing violence prevention, social and emotional learning, and anti-bias education (Jones, 2004). Each program director of PLC functions as mediator of the overarching philosophy of the Center and the curricular components that embody the particular programs. In addition, most program directors serve in a “train the trainer” model their given programs as well as teach within their programs. This

structure allows for a fluid and responsive curriculum and is adaptive to community and contextual needs and clearly represents a strength in PLC's ability to deliver program.

4.2 Method

In terms of future and sustainable research and evaluation efforts, the need for including assessment components in programmatic development is clear (and, indeed, a purpose for engaging in this preliminary report). However, the afore-mentioned fluidity and adaptability of programs provides unique challenges to programmatic assessment. A review of the literature in conjunction with the purpose of PLC in administering conflict resolution skills points to using a grounded theory approach in future evaluation of PLC services. As Creswell (2008) suggests, this approach should be used when a broad explanation of a process or program is required and contextual factors are prominent in program design and implementation. Given the numerous programs that make-up PLC and their commitment to responsiveness to the communities they serve, identifying some commonality—or at least shared commitments—between said programs seems to be called for prior to determining specific research and evaluation processes within which the programs operate. In other words, identifying some common threads within the broadly determined PLC curriculum is required.

Upon meeting initially with Directors, the Executive Director, and a Board Member of the PLC, it is determined that a matrix for representing said common threads or components between the PLC programs will be the basis of establishing a research agenda. To that end, CUME compiled responses from program directors as to their individual programs and existing and/or possible measurable outcomes of effectiveness.

4.3 Findings

4.3.1 Perception of Objectives

As part of the original purpose for this study, program directors of the PLC were asked to describe the specific objectives of their individual programs. Emphasized in the inquiry was the notion that PLC would be attentive to behavioral and instructional objectives that were measurable as part of program effectiveness evaluation efforts.

4.3.1.1 Elementary Education (EE):

The director of this program noted the importance of improving students' ability to understand components of conflict and conflict situations. She suggests that the objectives of measure for this particular program should include:

- reduction in inappropriate behavior;
- body language;
- ability to define conflict and its consequences.

4.3.1.2 Peace Learning Services:

The director of this program suggests evaluation efforts need to produce specific measures related to the discursive interactions between a facilitator and participants or between participants when confronted with conflict situations. Furthermore, the degree to which participants successfully identify and set appropriate boundaries in social interactions could serve as a valid measure of program effectiveness.

4.3.1.3 Adult Programs:

The director of this program was explicit in providing objectives as reflected in the following:

- Tuesday's at PLC Series registrations increases from 6-7 to 20+ participants per session;
Crayton & Helfenbein

- Inquiries about programs increase from 1-2 per month to 3-4 per week;
- Contracted Programs increase from 0 to 4 per month;
- Build awareness to warrant open registration programs;
- Increase open registration programs from 0 to 4 per year;
- Evaluation scores average of 4 or higher;
- Improvement in organizational culture from a broad stance (i.e. improved communication, trust and ability to address conflict in healthier ways, etc...).

4.3.1.4 Peace and Character Education (PACE)

The objectives for measuring effectiveness of the Peace Camp portion of PACE follow the components of the S.T.E.P. curriculum. As “each letter represents a different step in the conflict resolution process, S – “Stay Cool”, T – “Tell Your Point of View”, E – “Explore their Point of View”, and P – “Problem Solve” (Peace Learning Center, 2007), so too could an evaluation of effectiveness measure the extent to which students could identify and provide examples of each component.

4.3.1.5 Supported Programs

International Interfaith Programs (IIP):

The Director of this program suggests that objectives should measure the main components of the H.I.P. program as defined by AFSC. The components are trustworthiness (integrity, honesty, promise-keeping, and loyalty), respect (courtesy, autonomy, diversity, and the golden rule), responsibility (duty, accountability, pursuit of excellence), fairness (openness, consistency, and impartiality), caring (kindness, compassion, empathy), and citizenship

(lawfulness, common good, and environment).¹ The IIP consists of a series of events called the International Interfaith Initiatives (III) as well. One of the initiatives is the Interfaith Youth Dialogues, whose stated goal includes the objective,

that dialogue between students with diverse faith backgrounds becomes self-sustaining, whereby after the 2 year program is ended, those students are continuing to contact each other and continue to participate in other programs together. (Wiles, 2007)

Challenge Education / Peace Learning Program at the Girls School (PLP):

Within this program for incarcerated juvenile girls the following student characteristics and dispositions should be measured:

- respect;
- responsibility;
- empowerment;
- compassion;
- cooperation;
- ethics;
- service;
- self-esteem;
- and, participation.

Help Increase the Peace International (HIPPI Intl.):

The Director of this program suggests that measurable outcomes for Students in Grades 4 and 5 will be based on students' ability to:

- recognize four Jamaican Peacemakers; and,
- identify two non-violent alternatives to resolving a conflict in given situations.

¹ Interestingly, these components correspond to the Six Pillars of Character Education as conveyed by the Character Counts!© program. While attending a CC training, the author (Crayton) witnessed the facilitator state and provide documentation that the "Golden Rule" or version thereof is universal between the religions of the world.

Taken broadly, each of these objectives represents programmatic goals supported by the literature (Lincoln, 2001, pp.31-33; CREnet, 2000). However, a range in specificity and measurability is evident in the responses. A significant first step in formalizing research and evaluation efforts would be to bring each program up to a common point in identifying objectives and measurable outcomes. This shared language among program directors and the administration of the PLC would provide clear ways to communicate across programs, pave the way for cross-program evaluation, and perhaps better facilitate the identification of program needs.

4.3.2 Research Supported Practice

PLC, according to their website, is an organization with the mission to provide programs to teach conflict resolution and peace education to both students and adults. Interestingly, interviews with key members of the PLC staff and Board Members bring to light an important finding resonant with the research literature: differences exist in understandings of the terms *conflict resolution* and *peace education* (Gur-Ze'ev, 2001). When asked the question, “What does conflict resolution mean for you?”, one participant answered that “conflict resolution is a small part of peace education” and goes on to explain that “peace education is the absence of violence or conflict.” Another participant makes a distinction by equating “peace education or social emotional learning with prevention and conflict resolution with intervention.” The second answer follows Payton and Wardlaw, *et.al.*'s (2000) inclusion of social emotional learning with the process of peace education but also points to a shared understanding that

conflict resolution is but one piece—in this case as an intervention component—of the larger project of the PLC.

The theme of prevention as the larger project carries through with other respondents by stating that prevention consists of enabling recipients with techniques or tools to resolve conflict. A participant, for example, states that “Peace education is the act of empowering folks with techniques that could lead to conflict transformation” and another considers conflict resolution as “the mechanics of how you solve a problem.” A participant provides more texture to the existing themes in stating that,

Conflict resolution, I think that is a little more straightforward... conflict is inevitable and it's an idea that you have a sense of power, a sense of authority over resolving an issue.

Several scholars in social and education theory have stressed the importance of highlighting relations of power, knowledge, and education (Lukes, 2005; Harris, 2002; Olssen, 1999; Foucault, 1977; Karabel & Halsey, 1977). In this case, the program directors of the PLC see as part of their role the teaching of skills that seek to remedy a sense of powerlessness in conflict situations.

Through these responses, the participants suggest that conflict is equated to power as a product of the larger social environmental context (Lukes, 2005). It is this environmental product, consisting of the experiences that each of us brings to it, that should be included in a peace education curriculum. Specifically, the various cultures and values that make up our environment and individual experiences should come to be understood by all involved in the efforts at creating cultures of peace (Kumpulainen & Renshaw, 2007).

4.3.3 Curriculum Component Frequency Report

An evaluation of the frequency of the thirty-eight components of PLC programs resulted in ten levels of occurrence representing some programs' multiple initiatives (i.e. Elementary & Secondary distinctions). The curricular components with universal frequency (Freq=10)—meaning they are a part of all curricular efforts of PLC—are: I-message, Rephrasing, Core Values (trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, caring, citizenship & fairness), listening skills, point-of-view questions, and cooperative learning. The next most frequent, ninety percent (90%), of the programs are: peace breath, fouls, explore other point-of-view, peace request, diversity appreciation, and community building. Interestingly 'community service,' as a separate component, has a fifty percent (50%) frequency (see Figure 1).

The next most frequent components, at eighty percent (80%), are: body language, team building, apology, problem solve, tell one point-of-view, stay cool, and foul buster. What seems interesting for this frequency is that three of the components make-up the S.T.E.P. (stay-cool, tell one point-of-view, explore other point-of-view, and problem solve) PLC curriculum. The only other component, explore other point-of-view, is used in ninety percent (90%) of the programs.

The components that are present in seventy percent (70%) of the programs are: team challenge, kanji listening, and cooperation & competition. The components occurring in sixty percent (60%) of the programs are: stereotypes, trust building, and dialogue. The components that are frequent in fifty percent (50%) of the programs are: historical/current peacemakers, community service, fact vs. opinion, and consensus.

There are nine components that are used in less than half the programs. The components that are used forty percent (40%) of the time are: personal renewal and leadership; thirty percent (30%) of the time are: individual challenge education, bully awareness, and interfaith education. Twenty percent (20%) of the time the nature walk is used, and the peace table, peace moves, and the three “R”s (reduce, reuse, and recycle) are used between ten percent (10%) of the programs (see Figure 1).

There is a frequency calculation of the thirty-eight components used in each program. The Elementary Education Program I (EEI) uses, or has a frequency of use of the thirty eight components of sixty-six percent (66%) while EEII has a frequency of use of forty-seven 47%. Peace Learning Services I (LSI) uses sixty-three percent 63% of the components, and LSII forty-two percent (42%). Adult Programs use seventy-one percent (71%) of the components while the International Interfaith Initiative (III) uses sixty-eight percent. The Peace and Character Education I (PACE I) program uses fifty percent (50%) of the components and PACE II uses eighty-two percent (82%) of the components. The Challenge Education / Peace Learning Program (PLP) uses eighty-seven percent of the components, while the Help Increase the Peace Program (HIPP Intl.) uses eighty-four percent (84%) of the thirty-eight components (see Appendix 2).

Figure 1: Frequency Report**Most Consistent Curricular Characteristics****Freq= 10**

- I-message
- Rephrasing
- Core Values (Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Caring, Citizenship, and Fairness)
- Listening Skills
- POV Questions
- Cooperative Learning

Freq= 9

- Peace Breath
- Fouls
- Explore Other POV
- Diversity Appreciation
- Community Building
- Peace Request

Least Consistent Curricular Characteristics**Freq= 3**

- Individual Challenge Education
- Bully Awareness
- Interfaith Education

Freq= 1

- Peace Table
- Peace Moves
- The Three R's (Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle)

4.4 Discussion

The findings—a product of detailed document analysis, observations and interviews with PLC administration and staff—present ten objectives to form a basis for future PLC program research and evaluation. These objectives, supported by the aforementioned literature review, were initially identified as in response to the question “What would you consider a successful peace education session?” and developed further by the holistic analysis of this report. The objectives include six (6) related to participants in PLC programs and four (4) specifically correspond to larger curriculum and program evaluation efforts. Correspondence between objectives, curriculum component, and the relevant research is presented in Appendix D.

Participant Objectives—The learner will:

1. be able to identify differences between themselves and others;
2. understand that his or her individual capacity to teach peace to others;
3. understand and identify structural disadvantages of one over another in their individual contexts;
4. understand and identify the ways in which individual attitudes are related to issues of power;
5. understand and identify the ways in which power operates within specific contexts (i.e. specific policies, programs, communities, and levels of stakeholder engagement);
6. demonstrate how they will constructively address a conflict;

Program Objectives—Evaluation Questions:

1. To what extent do the policies and programs of a given school or corporation reflect attention to issues of cultural integration?
2. To what extent is there evidence of multiple stakeholders coming together to resolve an issue?
3. To what extent is there *mainstream* acceptance in participating communities/contexts for PLC programming?
4. To what extent is there a process for programmatic assessment of meeting objectives?

5.0 Recommendations

- An initial finding of this research project holds that the programs of the PLC represent community-based efforts in peace-building, conflict resolution, and peer mediation that follow the existing research base on such interventions. While this literature review is not exhaustive (and it is suggested that this work be ongoing), the research clearly indicates that multiple aspects of PLC programming are supported by the literature and experts in the field. Importantly, the fluidity of PLC programs provides the opportunity for increased acceptance by multiple stakeholders and applicability to various contexts (see Bjerstedt, 1993).

Furthermore, this initial collaborative effort between CUME and PLC suggests that the Peace Learning Center is uniquely situated as a site of further and wide-reaching research and evaluation efforts. The literature base clearly points to a dearth of research on

program effectiveness the impact of peace education efforts on other markers of school-based success. Also, the position of PLC in an urban context provides the opportunity for research efforts with particular attention to issues of race and class. Taking up that work could position PLC as a national model for similar programs and bolster the project of replicating local efforts.

- In exploring the possibilities for future research initiatives with PLC programs, a finding of this project is the need for a shared language across programs in terms of formative evaluation efforts and research projects. As mentioned, a strength of the PLC remains its fluidity and responsiveness to different community partners and contexts; however, this fluidity often creates differing understandings and stages of readiness for programmatic evaluation. This report suggests that moving toward shared understandings and commitments to research and evaluation efforts would only strengthen PLC programs and potential for continued funding.

This initial inquiry suggests that the integration of research and evaluation into all PLC program development from the onset would increase efforts in establishing both validity and reliability of effectiveness assessments. Program evaluation scholars have long suggested that procedures for assessment and formative planning should be critically embedded from the beginning stages of program development (Bickman, 1994; Chelimsky, 1994; Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999). This approach is embraced by

CUME and leads to and supports “rigorous evaluation designs, stakeholder participation, and ongoing program improvement” (Benne & Garrard, 2003, p.72).

- As a beginning inquiry into the curriculum of the Peace Learning Center, this report points to both the complexity and fluidity of programs offered by the wide-reaching efforts. It is recommended that this work continue in more formalized ways that include: an analysis of the variations of each program; the identification of common instructional objectives for each program; further qualitative work in coming to shared understandings of fundamental philosophical commitments; and the collaborative creation of further research initiatives. Furthermore, it is suggested that PLC identify “core” objectives that span the different programs and contexts of PLC curricula in pursuit of broad-based assessments. Clearly, this process will include a prioritization of efforts, time, and expense.
- As the PLC seeks to explore new way of developing and delivering curricula, inquiry into the integration of technology (i.e. peace game programs, peace education curriculum via computer) into peace education curriculum could provide important insights into new directions for PLC and peace education efforts.
- Finally, the frequency reporting by program directors on PLC components reveals certain patterns in enacted program across the various initiatives. This finding only suggests to

the program directors and PLC administration that consideration be given to program components and the curricular commitments in various contexts.

6.0 References

- Adkins, P. (2007). *Character Counts! What is character and how is it formed*. Los Angeles, CA: Josephson Institute.
- Ashton, C. V. (2007). Using theory of change to enhance peace education evaluation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 25(1), 39-53.
- Baldwin, C., Persing, J., & Magnuson, D. (2004). The role of theory, research, and evaluation in adventure education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26(3), 167-183.
- Benne, C. G., & W. M. Garrard. (2003). Collaborative program development and evaluation: A case study in conflict resolution education. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 26(2), 71-87.
- Benton, J. (2005). *Using Action Research to Foster Positive Social Values*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Bickmore, K. (1997). Preparation for pluralism: Curricular and extracurricular practice with conflict resolution. *Theory into Practice*, 36(1), 3-11.
- Birchistle, U. (2000). *Peace education: The importance of social engagement skills and a human rights framework*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Bjerstedt, A. (1993). The "Didactic Locus" of peace education: Extra-curricular, mono-curricular, cross-curricular, or trans-curricular approaches. *Didakometry*, 74, 48.
- Bousfield, D. (2007). Beginnings, middles and ends: A biopsy of the dynamics of impolite exchanges. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(12), 2185-2216.
- Brandhorst, A. R. (2004). Identity-Centered conflicts, authority, and dogmatism: Challenges for the design of social studies curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 32(1), 10.
- Brantmeier, E. J. (2003). *Peace pedagogy: Exposing and integrating peace education in teacher education*. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Education, Jacksonville, FL.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1987). *Developing Critical Thinkers: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting*. Great Britain: Open University Press.
- Brugman, D., & A. E. Aleva. (2004). Developmental delay or regression in moral reasoning by juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33(3), 321-338.
- Burnard, P. (2006). Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis. *Nurse Researcher*, 13(4), 84.

- Callahan, J. P. (1980). *Evaluating Indian education programs: Development of instruments in the affective domain*. Paper presented at the Tenth Annual Montana Indian Education Conference, Billings, MT.
- Carter, C. C. (2002). Conflict resolution at school: Building compassionate communities. *Social Alternatives*, 21(1), 49.
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, L., Ryan, J., Lonczak, H., & Hawkins, J. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention and Treatment*, 5(1), 1-111.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods. In N. Denzin & Lincoln, Y. (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (535-590). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chetkow-Yanoov, B. (1996). Conflict-resolution skills can be taught. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(3), 12.
- Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(2), 201-237.
- Cole, D. (2007). Do interracial interactions matter? An examination of student-faculty contact and intellectual self-concept. *Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 249-281.
- Cragen, N., Gentry, K., & Wright, L. (2001). *Title I and Special Education: A Guide to Integrating Programs, Services and Funding*.
- Crawford, P. A. (2005). Primarily peaceful: Nurturing peace in the primary grades. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(5), 321-328.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Cuhadar Gurkaynak, E. & Genc, O. G. (2007). *Evaluating peacebuilding initiatives using multiple methodologies: Lessons learned from a Greek-Turkish peace education initiative*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association Forty-eighth Annual Convention, Hilton Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Deutsch, M. (1993). Educating for a peaceful world. *American Psychologist*, 48(5), 510-517.
- Diamond, N., & Murray, M. (2007). Managing ethical concerns in marketing courses. *Academic Leader*, 23(9), 4-6.
- Donnelly, C., & Hughes, J. (2006). Contact, culture and context: Evidence from mixed faith schools in Northern Ireland and Israel. *Comparative Education*, 42(4), 493.
- Estrella, K., & Forinash, M. (2007). Narrative inquiry and arts-based inquiry: Multinarrative perspectives. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 47(3), 373-383.
- Fast, J. & Fanelli, F. (2003). How becoming mediators affects aggressive students. *Children and Schools*, 25(3), 161-167.
- Fennimore, B. S. (1997). When mediation and equity are at odds: Potential lessons in democracy. *Theory into Practice*, 36(1), 59-64.

- Fisher, R. M. (2000). *Unveiling the hidden curriculum in conflict resolution and peace education: Future directions toward a critical conflict education and "conflict" pedagogy* (Technical Paper No. 10). British Columbia: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (4th ed.). New York and Toronto: Pantheon Books as a division of Random House, Inc.
- Francis, G. (2000). *Preventing Deadly Conflict: Toward a World without War*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, CA.
- Girard, K. L. (1995). *Preparing Teachers for Conflict Resolution in the Schools*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED387456).
- Glaser, B. G., & A.L. Strauss. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Goldstone, R. L., & B. J. Rogosky. (2002). *The role of roles in translating across conceptual systems*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., Utne-O'Brian, M., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H. & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466-474.
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2001). Philosophy of peace education in a postmodern era. *Educational Theory, 51*(3), 315.
- Hall, B. L. (2006). Rethinking leadership education for the real world. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(7), 524-525.
- Harris, I. M. (2002). *Peace Education Theory*. Paper presented at the Eighty-third Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Hedeen, T. (2005). Dialogue and democracy, community and capacity: Lessons for conflict resolution education from Montessori, Dewey, and Freire. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 23*(2), 185-202.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data Management and Analysis Methods. In Lincoln, Y. S. & Denzin, N. (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, C. E., Templeton, R. A., & Wan, G. (2000). *Pathways to peace: Promoting non-violent learning environments*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D.W. (2002). Teaching students to be peacemakers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Education, 12*(1), 25-39.
- Johnston, C. W. (1996). Community health centers: Evaluation issues and approaches. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation/La Revue canadienne d'evaluation de programme, 11*(2), 149.
- Jones, T. (2004). Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, and the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 22*(1-2), 233-267.

- Jones, T. S., & R. Compton. (2003). *Kids Working It Out: Stories and Strategies for Making Peace in Our Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. (1977). *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kessler, R. (2003). The Heart of the Matter: Social and Emotional Learning as a Foundation for Conflict Resolution Education. In T. S. Jones & R. Compton (Eds.), *Kids Working It Out: Stories and Strategies for Making Peace in Our Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 63-75.
- Klein, K. (2002). Dialogue: The key to moving beyond structural conflict. *About Campus*, 7(1), 9.
- Kumpulainen, K. & Renshaw, P. (2007). Cultures of learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 46(3-4), 109-115.
- Kupermintz, H. & Salomon, G. (2004). Lessons to be learned from research on peace education in the context of intractable conflict. *Theory into Practice*, 44(4), 293-302.
- Lambert, N. M. (1976). Methodological considerations in the evaluation of differential components of supplementary education programs. *Journal of School Psychology*, 14(3), 171-185.
- Lantieri, L. (2001). *Schools with Spirit: Nurturing the Inner Lives of Children and Teachers*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Lantieri, L., & Patti, J. (1996). *Waging Peace in Our Schools*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Levinson, B., & Brantmeier, E. J. (2006). Secondary schools and communities of practice for democratic civic education: Challenges of authority and authenticity. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 324-346.
- Lincoln, M. G. (2001). Conflict resolution education: A solution for peace. *Communications & the Law*, 23(1), 29.
- Liss, K. (2004). *Help Increase the Peace*. Baltimore, MD: The American Friends Service Committee.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A Radical View* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical Ethnography: Methods, Ethics, and Performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCarthy, C. (2005). Can peace be taught - and learned? *Humanist*, 65(3), 19-46.
- Means, B., Roschelle, J., Penuel, W., Sabelli, N., & Haertel, G. (2003). Technology's contribution to teaching and policy: Efficiency, standardization, or transformation? *Review of Research in Education*, 27, 159-181.
- Moore, J., & Haggard, P. (2008). Awareness and action: Inference and prediction. *Conscious and Cognition*, 17, 136-144.
- Nation, T. (2007). *Executive Director's Report: 2007-08 Program Offerings and Structure*. Indianapolis, IN: Peace Learning Center.
- Noddings, N. (2006). Educating whole people: A response to Jonathan Cohen. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(2), 238-242

- Olssen, M. (1999). *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Ozanne, W. I., Bartram, B., Williams, C., Beech, J., & Eaves, M. (2006). [Review of the book *Confronting Islamophobia in Educational Practice*]. *Comparative Education*, 42(2), 283-297.
- Payton, J. W., Wardlaw, D. M., Graczyk, P. A., Bloodworth, M. R., Tompsett, C. J., Weissberg, R. P. (2000). Social and emotional learning: A framework for promoting mental health and reducing risk behaviors in children and youth. *Journal of School Health*, 70(5), 179-185.
- Peace Learning Center. (2007). *Peace Learning Camp Report: AmeriCorps Quarterly Report Spring 2007*. Indianapolis, IN: Peace Learning Center.
- Raines, S. S. (2004). International education and conflict: Empowering individuals, transforming societies, and making waves- An interview with Jane Benbow from CARE. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 21, 483-490.
- Rehg, W., & Staley, K. (2008). The CDF Collaboration and Argumentation Theory: The role of process in objective knowledge. *Perspectives on Science*, 16(1).
- Ruschman, N. (2007a). *Peace Learning Center teach the facilitator curriculum*. Indianapolis, IN: Peace Learning Center.
- Ruschman, N. (2007b). *Measures of Effectiveness for Adult Program Offerings: Goals for Year 1*. Indianapolis, IN: Peace Learning Center.
- Scott, C. C., Gargan, A. M., & Zakierski, M. M. (1997). *Managing Diversity-Based Conflicts among Children*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Singer, E. (2002). The logic of young children's (nonverbal) behaviour. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 10(1), 55.
- Singley, M., & Anderson, J. (1989). *The Transfer of Cognitive Skill*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, S. W., A. P. Daunic, Miller, M. D., Robinson, T. R. (2002). Conflict resolution and peer mediation in middle schools: Extending the process and outcome knowledge base. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(5), 567-586.
- Stachowski, L. L., & Brantmeier, E. J. (2002). *Understanding self through the other: Changes in student teacher perceptions of home culture from immersion in navajoland and overseas*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Denver, CO.
- Stebbins, R. A. (2006). Constructing Grounded Theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness & Medicine*, 10(3), 378-380.
- Stevahn, L., Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Oberle, K., & Wahl, L. (2000). Effects of conflict resolution training integrated into a kindergarten curriculum. *Child Development*, 71(3), 772.
- Stokes, H. (2002). *Education for conflict--Education for peace*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Orlando, FL.

- Stoloff, D. L. (1992). *Peace education and educational technology*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Storberg-Walker, J. (2007). Understanding the conceptual development phase of Applied Theory-Building Research: A grounded approach. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18(1), 63.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A., & Wheeler, E. (2006). Welcome again to the peaceable classroom. *Childhood Education*, 83(1), 32-E-32-I.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. M. (1994). *Peace Education for Children: Historical Perspectives*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. M. (1996). *Education, Psychology, and Social Science: Common Pathways for Teaching Peace*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. M., & Hinitz, B. F. (1995). *Integration/Infusion of Peace Education into Early Childhood Education Programs*. Roundtable paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. M., & Hinitz, B. F. (1996). *Integration of Peace Education into Multicultural Education/Global Education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Svensson, I. (2007). Fighting with faith. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(6), 930-949.
- Thrush, U. (1993). Peace 101: Implementing the vision. *Montessori Life*, 5(2), 36.
- Tidwell, A. (2004). Conflict, peace, and education: A tangled web. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 21(4), 463-470.
- Tigner, S. S. (1996). Souls in conflict. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 2(4), 349.
- Tillman, Y. R. (1995). *Improving Social Skills in Second Graders through the Implementation of a Peace Education/Conflict Resolution Skills Curriculum*. Paper presented to the Program of Child and Youth Studies, Nova Southeastern University, FL.
- Tint, B. (2004). *Power, Peace and Conflict on the Indian Subcontinent*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Le Centre Sheraton Hotel, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Torrence, M. (2002). Teaching Peace, fall 2001. *Montessori Life*, 14(1).
- Townley, A. (1995). Changing school culture. *Educational Leadership*, 52(8), 80.
- Troester, R., & Mester, C. S. (1987). *Teaching Peace in the College Speech Class: A Survey of Current Practice*. Paper presented at the Seventy-third Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Trotter, J. C., Jones, L. T., (1998). *Create Peace Now. The Peace Project: An In-School Suspension Program for Middle and High School Students with Violent Behaviors*. Atlanta, GA: Holistic Stress Control Institute, Inc.

- Turner, J. (1999). Every day: A new chance for peace. *Montessori Life*, 11(1), 18.
- Tyler, M. C., & Halafoff, A. (2005). Tips for developing peace education curriculum: Some lessons from Vietnam. *Primary & Middle Years Educator*, 3(3), 17-19
- Tzuriel, D., & Shamir, A. (2007). The effects of Peer Mediation with Young Children (PMYC) on children's cognitive modifiability. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 143-165.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Alternate Achievement Standards for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities: "Non-Regulatory Guidance."* Washington DC: US Department of Education.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1996, March). *At-Risk and Delinquent Youth: Multiple Federal Programs Raise Efficiency Questions.* (Publication No. HEHS-96-34). Retrieved January 23, 2008, from General Accounting Office Reports Online via GPO Access: www.gao.gov/archive/1996/he96034.pdf
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1997, September). *At-Risk and Delinquent Youth: Multiple Programs Lack Coordinated Federal Effort.* (Publication No. UD-0320106). Retrieved February 5, 2008, from General Accounting Office Reports Online via GPO Access: www.gao.gov/archive/1998/he98038t.pdf
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1997, November). *Federal Education Funding: Multiple Programs and Lack of Data Raise Efficiency and Effectiveness Concerns.* (Publication No. T-HEHS-98-46). Retrieved March 1, 2008, from General Accounting Office Reports Online via GPO Access: www.gao.gov/archive/1998/he98046t.pdf
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (2004, April). *Nutrition education: USDA provides services through multiple programs, but stronger linkages among efforts are needed.* (Publication No. GAO-04-528). Retrieved March 5, 2008, from General Accounting Office Reports Online via GPO Access: www.gao.gov/new.items/d04528.pdf
- Vrasidas, C., Zembylas, M., Evagorou, M., Avraamidou, L., & Aravi, C. (2007). ICT as a tool for environmental education, peace, and reconciliation. *Educational Media International*, 44(2), 129.
- Warters, W. C. (2000). *Mediation in the Campus Community: Designing and Managing Effective Programs.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wiles, C. (2007). *Description of Interfaith Youth Dialogues.* Indianapolis, IN: Peace Learning Center.
- Williams, S. (2007). *Arguments in favour of a constructivist analysis of peace processes.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association Forty-eighth Annual Convention, Hilton Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yablon, Y. B. (2007). Cognitive rather than emotional modification in peace education programs: Advantages and limitations. *Journal of Moral Education*, 36(1), 51.

Appendix A

Table 1: Example of Survey One (Submitted to each director for completion given the relevance of the component to their respective program)

Components	Objectives – Outcome	PLC Programs
I message	Express your feelings in a respectful way; tell your point of view; establish understanding internally and interpersonally	
Peace breath	Calm down; create opportunity for thought; create space between emotion and reaction or action	
Fouls	Words or behaviors that break down community; competitive language indicators	
Foul buster	Technique for transforming competitive fouls to a cooperative environment; ways to break the foul cycle; response (questions) that invites cooperation	
<i>Stay Cool –</i>	Calm down, are you ready and willing to solve conflict peacefully, famous peacemakers and value	
<i>Tell one Point of View</i>		
<i>Explore other POV</i>		
<i>Problem Solve</i>	What do you need to solve problem? What are you willing to do? getting to action steps, cooperate and collaborate	
Community service		
Rephrasing	Clarity and validation, listening skill, helping the other person know they've been heard, helping to calm emotions - redirecting	

Stereotypes	Acceptance, awareness of differences and similarities, appreciation of each individual	
Peace Table	In-class peer mediation process for conflict resolution, teacher and student tool to improve learning, physical place and process for peacemaking	
Trust building	Clarity of communication – honest and authentic, increase cooperation and understanding, understanding differences and similarities, helps problem solving	
Personal Renewal	Getting to core purpose of who and why you are – understanding why you started in the field – finding the passion – can help individual and impact organization – peace and peacemaker within	
Core values Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Caring, CitizensHIP©, Fairness	Strengthen civil society, helping strengthen individual and community, answers questions of why be a peacemaker?	
Individual Challenge education	Esteem building, helps listening skills, adventure	
Diversity Appreciation	Awareness and understanding, empathy, respect	
Historical/Current Peacemakers	How one individual can make a difference, introducing positive role models, inspire peacemaking, show their hero status	
LeadersHIP©	Help everyone find their own potential to lead in their own way, self responsibility, how to stand up to injustice	
Team Challenge	Have fun, cooperation, and communication skills	
Listening Skills	Clarity, understanding, learning the other's POV, empathy, compassion	

Apology	Resolution, problem solving and accountability,	
Team Building	Cooperation, whole is greater than the sum of its parts	
Kanji Listening	Five parts – listening is more than just hearing – mind, attention, heart, ear, eyes	
Peace Moves	Physical and verbal ways to deal with a potential fight situation, self esteem builder	
Cooperation vs. Competition	How to be successful with others – how to get to win/win	
Bully Awareness	Empathy, safety, how not to be a victim, how bystanders can be key to the solution, inter and intra personal plus intergroup	
Fact vs. Opinion	The difference between the two – statements made, pre-empts conflicts, speaking for yourself	
Body Language	There is more communicated than words,	
POV Questions	Getting the other persons experiences, empathy, investigate before judging, identifying why something happened	
Dialogues	Help people learn they have the same problems as other, increase cross-group understanding, co-celebrate, learn common ground	
Consensus	Getting group buy-in and ownership, win/win, not having wing of no voters, no winners or losers	
Community building	Sharing and caring, addressing problems individual can't, achieving, identifying common values, support, minimizing conflicts and accentuating positivity	
Cooperative learning	Helps to get all the voices in the room,	

Peace Request – would you be willing to	Express your needs in an objective way, problem solve, prevent further conflict, setting boundaries	
Interfaith education	Promote interfaith cooperation and understanding strengthening civil society, increases cultural awareness	

Appendix B

Table 2: Curriculum Analysis Map

	EE1	EE2	LS1	LS2	AP	I.I.	PACE		HIP		FREQUENCY
							I	II	PLP	©	
I message	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Peace breath	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		9
Fouls	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	9
Foul buster	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	8
<i>Stay Cool –</i>	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	8
<i>Tell one Point of View</i>	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	8
<i>Explore other POV</i>	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
<i>Problem Solve</i>	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	8
Community service			1		1	1			1	1	5
Rephrasing	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Stereotypes			1		1	1	1		1	1	6
Peace Table	1										1

Curriculum Mapping Project

Trust building			1		1	1		1	1	1	6
Personal Renewal					1	1					4
Core values											10
Trustworthines s, Respect, Responsibility, Caring, CitizensHIP©, Fairness	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Individual Challenge education								1			3
Diversity Appreciation	1	1	1	1	1	1		1			9
Historical/Curr ent Peacemakers	1						1	1			5
LeadersHIP©					1			1			4
Team Challenge	1	1			1	1		1			7
Listening Skills	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			10
Apology	1		1	1	1		1	1			8
Team Building	1	1	1		1	1		1			8
Kanji Listening	1	1					1	1	1		7
Peace Moves									1		1
Cooperation vs. Competition	1	1	1		1			1			7
Bully Awareness								1			3

Fact vs. Opinion	1	1						1	1	1	5
Body Language	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	8
POV Questions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Dialogues			1		1	1		1	1	1	6
Consensus					1	1		1	1	1	5
Community building	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Cooperative learning	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Peace Request – would you be willing to	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	9
Interfaith education					1	1			1		3
Nature Walk									1		1
The Three "R's" (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle)											0

0.6 0.4 0.6 0.4 0.7 0.6

Component 578 736 315 210 105 84

Frequency 9 8 8 5 3 21 0.5 0.76316 **6.526315789**

Appendix C

Table 3: Example of Standards Correlation Form/ *World History and Civilization* (Column 1=Medieval Europe and the Rise of Western Civilization; Column 2 = Era of Global Conflicts; and Column 3 = Historical Thinking) The bold italicized portion of each description is compared with the description of the provided state standard.

		1	2	3	FREQUENCY
I message	Express your feelings in a respectful way; tell your point of view; <i>establish understanding internally and interpersonally</i>	1		1	2
Peace breath	Calm down; <i>create opportunity for thought</i> ; create space between emotion and reaction or action	1		1	2
Fouls	Words or behaviors that break down community; competitive language indicators	1	1	1	3
<i>Stay Cool –</i>	Calm down, are you ready and willing to solve conflict peacefully, <i>famous peacemakers</i> and value	1	1		2
<i>Tell one Point of View</i>			1	1	2
<i>Explore other POV</i>		1	1	1	3
<i>Problem Solve</i>	<i>What do you need to solve problem</i> , what are you willing to do, getting to action steps, <i>cooperate and collaborate</i>			1	1

Rephrasing	Clarity and validation, listening skill , helping the other person know they've been heard, helping to calm emotions – redirecting	1				1
Core values Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Caring, CitizensHIP©, Fairness	Strengthen civil society, helping strengthen individual and community, answers questions of why be a peacemaker?	1	1	1		3
Diversity Appreciation	Awareness and understanding, empathy, respect	1		1		2
Listening Skills	Clarity, understanding , learning the other's POV, empathy, compassion	1	1			2
Team Building	Cooperation , whole is greater than the sum of its parts	1				1
Body Language	There is more communicated than words,		1			1
POV Questions	Getting the other persons experiences, empathy, investigate before judging, identifying why something happened	1	1	1		3
Community building	Sharing and caring , addressing problems individual can't, achieving, identifying common values, support, minimizing conflicts and accentuating positivity					0
Peace Request – would you be willing to	Express you needs in an objective way, problem solve , prevent further conflict, setting boundaries					0

