

SECTION 2: TRAINING (TRN) TOOLS

Section 2: Note to Users

Effective training of facilitators is best done by or with people who have first-hand experience in using community-led approaches.

This section makes extensive use of participatory role-plays, with group reflection on the process and how to improve the facilitator's skills.

A useful approach, however, is to intermix these activities with the reflective activities promoted in Section 1. For example, if a person who is learning how to facilitate a community-led process shows during a role-play a need for additional practice regarding empathy or asking probing questions, one could have the participant complete that evening the relevant tools on empathy (FAC 4) and asking probing questions (FAC 6).

TRN 1. Role-play: Limits of a Top-Down, Expert-Driven Approach to Child Protection

Note: This role-play works best with 10–25 people. If the role-play were done as part of a small training workshop, it could be useful to bring in other people (including local social workers, child protection workers, etc.) to play the roles of community members.

A. Background

Purpose: Top-down approaches have their value and place in humanitarian and development work on child protection. Yet they also have limits, which may not be readily apparent. The best way to understand and appreciate the impact of the limits is to experience them through the perspective of community people. The purpose of this role-play is to enable practitioners and others to understand and explore the limits or problems associated with a top-down, expert-driven approach to child protection.

Time: 60–90 mins.

No. of participants: 10–25 people, ideally.

Materials needed:

- 2 copies of the role sheets for “the NGO” (attached)
- 2 copies of the role sheets for the “community members”
- 2 scissors
- ideally, 2 separate spaces

B. Workshop Facilitator’s Notes

In this workshop, you will organize a role-play that simulates an interaction between a national, child-focused NGO and a local community. The NGO uses an expert-driven approach in which it seeks to partner with the community to address child-beating (corporal punishment). The role-play is designed to bring out the limits of this approach, enable empathy with local community views, and increase openness to a different way of working with community people.

Your activities will include five steps (time frames are approximate):

1. Describe the setting and divide the participants into two groups: NGO child protection workers and community people (10 mins).

2. Role-play preparation: Ask each group to divide people up according to the different roles for each group (see instructions and handouts on the following pages). Allow the groups time to understand and prepare for their roles in the role-play (10–15 mins).
3. Enable the two groups to conduct the role-play in which the NGO workers visit the community, asking them to partner on a project to reduce child-beating (20 mins).
4. Facilitate a discussion with both groups present and in the same roles they had played during the role-play (20 mins).
5. Facilitate reflection and discussion with participants back in their regular seats, no longer playing the roles that had been assigned (30 mins).

Step 1: Read the setting and divide the participants into two groups afterwards

Setting: In a small town [or, alternately, an urban neighborhood or a rural village] a team of three child protection workers from a hypothetical, national children’s agency, The Healthy Children’s Foundation (HCF), had previously visited with a team of data collectors to conduct a rapid assessment regarding child protection issues. They are now returning to share with the community their main findings—the primary child protection issues are corporal punishment (a form of violence against children) by parents and teachers; early marriage (families marry their daughters at 12–13 years of age to older men who can offer economic support); and child labor (girls are often out of school to do domestic work, and boys are out of school to do heavy mining). The Healthy Children’s Foundation has a one-year external grant to support the development of a community-based child protection program. During the visit, the HCF team will have an open discussion with the community members to ask them to partner with HCF in addressing the problem of violence against children (corporal punishment).

Divide into two teams: The Healthy Children’s Foundation team (3 people who have some child protection expertise) and the community (12 or more people). The roles are outlined for each below:

- A. NGO team: have 3 members be hypothetical child protection workers for the Healthy Children’s Foundation (HCF).
- B. Community members: this group consists of members from the same town who include a chief, elders, imam, pastor, ordinary parents (women and men), and teenage girls and boys.

Step 2: Role-play preparation

Have each group go to different spaces where they can talk without being overheard by the other group. The facilitator gives each group the appropriate role and activity sheets (see following pages, which include cut-outs to hand to each participant), and reminds them that each person is to act not as themselves but according to the role that has been handed out. Each team will

organize itself according to the instructions. Do not allow the teams to see, hear, or read about the roles of the other team. The teams have 10–15 mins to prepare themselves for the role-play before the facilitator calls them to return and begin the role-play. As they prepare, visit each group to make sure they are on track and answer any questions.

Step 3: Conduct the role-play

Announce to each group that in the role-play, the community people will be seated in their town, and the HCF team is coming to visit them again. The chief and the townspeople know HCF is coming. Give the community people time to arrange themselves, and then the HCF team enters, beginning the role-play. Let the role-play run for at least 15–20 minutes and more likely longer, giving everyone a chance to act out their roles. Announce that you may be saying “Time out” or “Cut” to pause the role-play.

[Note: If there is a problem or when the time is up, you can act as a film director might by saying “Cut!” or “Time out,” announcing then that we will end the role-play there and now reflect on what has happened.]

Step 4: Facilitate discussion, with participants staying in their assigned roles

Having interrupted or ended the role-play, tell participants that you would like them to remain seated where they are and to now have a discussion, with them continuing in their assigned roles. Thus, they are not to interject their own personal views but to stay as close to their roles as possible.

Enable discussion by asking the questions below (it is not necessary to ask each question, and improvisation can be very helpful). It is natural that in discussion, some questions will have been answered by previous discussion. Hence, it is essential for you, the facilitator, to be flexible. For each question that you do ask, ask first the community members and then the HCF team, reminding them to stay in role. Notes following each question indicate key points that hopefully will come out of the discussion. If they do not, you could suggest them, possibly by reframing them into questions. As in work with actual communities, it is important to have the key ideas coming not from you but from the group.

Questions for discussion:

1. Did you feel free to say how you really felt during this scenario? What thoughts or feelings did not get expressed? Why were they not expressed?

Sometimes feelings do not get expressed in such settings because of norms of diplomacy or hospitality, which caution against giving offense. However, it’s also possible that the community members were “playing the game” of trying to get the HCF involved because they needed money and help, not because they thought that child-beating needed to change. Or, low levels of trust may have led community people not to speak very openly about their views. Also, community people may not have spoken very openly about their feelings about child rights for fear of

offending and chasing off the NGO workers. Overall, a key point is that the exchange during the role-play did not allow people to express themselves in an authentic manner. Nor did it stimulate deep empathy with the situation of community people.

Similarly, the HCF workers may not have felt free to say how they really felt about the community. They may, for example, have seen child-beating as being more deplorable than they had expressed, and they may see local social norms of child-beating as “harmful traditional practices.”

2. What was it that you really wanted out of the discussions with the other group? Did you get it? Why or why not?

The role-play is structured in a way that ensures that the HCF gets what it wants—community agreement to partner on a program to address child-beating. It is less clear that the community got what it wanted. The community did succeed in engaging the NGO, which they wanted since they were very poor and wanted help addressing issues such as poverty. At the same time, though, most community members wanted to continue child-beating, and they did not get any support on that, nor did they get support in addressing poverty or child labor, the issues they seemed most concerned about.

3. Are there other things that need to be discussed here?

Perceptive participants may note that the full community was not present, recommending caution in describing this as a “community discussion” or “community agreement.”

Step 5: Reflection and discussion outside of assigned roles

Now ask participants to return to their normal seats and to be themselves again. Note how important it is for busy NGO workers to take time out from their complex work, step back, and reflect more deeply on typical practices. Note that this time, the discussion will focus on broader questions, which for the most part do not admit simple answers. Emphasize the importance of each person sharing her or his views and that there are no right or wrong answers.

Questions for discussion:

- Did this role-play reflect things that happen in reality?
- In this role-play, was there good agreement between the values and views of the HCF team and the community?
- In this role-play, who holds the power and makes the main decisions about which harm to children to address and how to intervene?
- Was this an empowering exchange and situation for the community members? Why or why not? Could that be a problem and why? [Note: “Community empowerment” entails a sense of collective agency and activation by the community members. If community

members are not making key decisions or are being led in a particular direction, they will not be likely to experience a sense of empowerment.]

- Is this NGO approach likely to be highly sustainable? Why or why not?
- Will this approach likely create dependency of the community on the NGO? Why or why not?
- Reflecting on what occurred in the role-play, how do you feel about your experience in the role-play? How do you feel now that the role-play is over? [Note: These questions are for purposes of debriefing and dealing with any emotional after-effects of the role-play experience. Debriefing questions are contextual, so please feel free to adapt debriefing questions to your context.]

End by thanking participants for their insights and inputs. Wrap up by summarizing key points made that bring home the limits of the expert-driven approach.

Instructions for The Healthy Children's Foundation Team

You are experienced national NGO workers and passionate supporters of child protection and child rights. Your aim in the meeting with the community members is twofold:

- (1) to briefly summarize the assessment findings for the community members, and
- (2) to encourage and ask the community members to partner with you on a program that is designed to reduce violence against children, particularly corporal punishment.

You have a one-year grant to reduce corporal punishment, and you know you will have to get a quick start and produce immediate results if you are to keep your donor happy. Also, you are genuinely concerned that corporal punishment is harming children.

Your job is to “sell” the community on the value of partnering on the program, which will address corporal punishment. The details of the partnership do not have to be worked out or explained in great depth today—today, your goal is to get them to say, “Yes, we will partner with you.” Broadly, your team will bring the child protection experts who know how to address the problem, and the community will be the beneficiaries (children and parents) and volunteers who implement the program.

Below are your specific roles which you can assign to members of your team (these can be cut out and handed to each of the three team members).

For each set of roles, you will need to improvise and plan what you will say to the community members. Please take a few moments now to think through what you will say. At the start of the role-play, you might want to have the Team Leader greet the community, explain the purpose of your visit, and say that Team member 2 (name) will present the findings of the assessment, and Team member 3 (name) will outline some brief ideas about a program for addressing violence against children.

Team member 1 (Team leader): You are a seasoned child protection expert who speaks with great passion about child rights and their importance for children's healthy development and well-being. You are quick to point out that violence against children (including child-beating) violates child rights and causes psychological harm such as trauma and fear. You see it as your duty to inspire and convince the community to join together to address the problem of child-beating and other forms of violence against children. Your urgent goal is to ask the community to partner with your agency, which has the expertise to address violence against children, and to get the community to agree to partner with you. You will begin and end the dialogue with the community on behalf of The Healthy Children's Foundation.

Team member 2 (Assessment specialist): You, too, are an experienced child protection expert. Your job is to (1) summarize the overall findings (below), and (2) focus on the specific findings (below) related to violence against children.

(1) Overall findings: The primary child protection issues are corporal punishment (a form of violence against children) by parents and teachers; early marriage (families marry their daughters at 12–13 years of age to older men who can offer economic support); and child labor (girls are often out of school to do domestic work, and boys are out of school to do heavy mining).

(2) Here are the main findings related to violence against children:

- 92% of children (6–18 years) reported that in the previous year they had been hit, kicked, punched, or beaten by an adult;
- 37% of children reported that they were beaten at least once a week;
- parents saw child-beating as normal;
- boys were beaten more frequently and more severely than were girls, but girls reported greater fear of being beaten;
- boys reported being bullied at school, where older boys hit them and took their food and books;
- parents, teachers, and, to a lesser extent, elders were the main people who beat children;
- children did not like being beaten, and 7% of children said they stayed home from school sometimes to avoid being beaten.

Team member 3 (Program specialist): Having worked on violence against children in multiple countries, you want to outline how violence could be addressed. Pointing out that science has learned a lot about how violence affects children and how it can be prevented, you suggest that it would be useful to have a community-based program with these elements:

- child rights education;
 - training on nonviolent forms of disciplining children (time-outs or withdrawing privileges);
 - school adoption and enforcement of “no child-beating” policies;
 - workshop on improved parent-child communications and relationships.
-

Instructions for the Community Members

The community members who are present for this meeting with the Healthy Children's Foundation include the chief, two elders, multiple parents, a teacher, an imam, a pastor, and teenage girls and boys. Not all the community members are present because this meeting is taking place in the middle of the day, when many people are out working, selling things, tending farms, etc. Still, the community members are happy to see and talk with members of the Healthy Children's Foundation and want to partner with them. They should say this specifically during the role-play.

Below and on the following page are the individual roles to be assigned to different people who will be "community members." You may cut these out at the dotted lines so that each participant has one. The roles may be decided by the group (preferred), or by the facilitator (if little time is available). Each participant should take five or so minutes to think through what he or she will do and/or say in accordance with their role during the meeting with the representatives from the Healthy Children's Foundation.

When the workshop facilitator calls you, you should make sure you are all gathered and sitting, awaiting the arrival of the HCF team.

Here are your specific roles which you can assign to members of your team (these can be cut out and handed to each of the three team members):

Chief (male): As the community leader, you and the elders will welcome the team from the Healthy Children's Foundation. To do this, you will need to ask before the role-play begins who in the group are the elders and organize yourselves. As Chief, you know that your town has many needs, so you are very happy HCF is back, and you want to partner with them. You are not so sure that the focus should be on child-beating, and you personally prefer traditional practices over child rights, but you are willing to "play along" in hopes that much needed money will come from the NGO into the town.

Elder man: You are happy that HCF is here but tired of how in the past, NGOs have come, made promises, and done little. You are a bit challenging and ask with some frustration what will the NGO do for us, the community.

Elder man: You are a kind, gentle person and welcome HCF and want to partner with them. However, you believe that a well child is one who is obedient and respects the elders. You believe that punishing the child by beating is appropriate when the child has been disobedient, as it teaches good behavior.

Elder woman: You are outspoken and view poverty as the greatest problem facing the community. What HCF found about child labor is an example—children are out of school because they have to work to earn money to support their families. You are a great supporter of education and think children should be in school, but you think poverty has to be addressed to make that happen.

Teacher: Articulate and outspoken, you are regarded as a key authority on children in the community. You believe strongly that children learn good behavior and become good people by being punished (beaten) when they misbehave. You recognize the difference between “moderate beating” and “cruelty” (e.g., beating until a child bleeds, or beating that breaks bones).

Imam (male): As a revered religious leader, you support the use of corporal punishment when children misbehave. Yet you also see the value of talking more with children and making sure they understand their responsibilities.

Christian pastor: You are a highly respected leader but are also a strong supporter of corporal punishment for purposes of teaching children to be obedient and have good values. You like the saying: “Spare the rod, spoil the child.”

Parent: You are an outspoken advocate for children and oppose child-beating (and say so). However, you see poverty as the primary issue that undermines children’s health and well-being.

Parent: You are a traditionalist who believes that disciplining the child for bad behavior is one of the most important parental responsibilities. To be a good parent is to discipline the child, helping him or her become a good member of the family and community. You are suspicious of “child rights.”

Parent: You are a child rights skeptic and are very outspoken on this point. You heard from relatives in other communities in which NGOs worked that “child rights education” had taught children to be unruly and disobedient since parents could not beat them any more for misbehavior. You see this situation as having undermined parental authority.

Teenage boy: You have been beaten repeatedly and harshly by the teacher at school. This has caused you to sometimes stay home from school to avoid beating. You think beating children is bad. Yet you do not state it very forcefully because you know that parents, elders, and teachers favor child-beating, and you don't want to appear disrespectful.

Teenage girl: You are more concerned about children being out of school than about child-beating, yet you are opposed to child-beating. For you, being in school means having hope and a positive future.

(Other, additional roles may be improvised—make the process FUN!)

TRN 2. Facilitation as “Facipulation”

A. Background

Purpose: Most NGOs and child protection workers use and recognize the value of facilitation processes. However, the term “facilitation” can have different meanings, and there are different approaches to facilitation.

In addressing urgent issues of child protection, child protection workers frequently try to facilitate work on an issue such as violence against children by raising awareness of the problem and then encouraging local people to join in addressing the problem. In this approach, facilitation is quite directive as it aims to manipulate or move people in a particular direction.

While this approach has its value, it has significant limits, particularly in regard to community-led work. The purpose of this role-play is to stimulate awareness and discussion of the limits of manipulative, directive approaches to facilitation (i.e., “facipulation”).

Time: 60 mins.

No. of participants: Over 25 people, ideally.

Materials needed:

- 1 role sheet for the facilitator
- 2 copies of the role sheets for the community members (attached)
- relatively large space, with room for 15 people to sit in a circle, with the rest of the people arranged in a wider circle so that everyone can observe what is happening in the inner circle (the “fish bowl”)

B. Workshop Facilitator’s Notes

This is part of an ongoing process in which the community will decide which harm(s) to children it wants to address. In this session, you will organize a role-play that simulates an interaction between a facilitator from the Healthy Children’s Foundation (HCF, a national NGO) and members of an urban neighborhood/community who have low rates of literacy.

The setting is a community meeting convened to discuss how to enable community planning in which each person has a voice in regard to which harm(s) to children the community will select for purposes of subsequent community-led action. The role-play is designed to bring out the limits of facilitation in which the facilitator acts like he is inviting the community to take a decision when in fact he is leading or guiding the community to a particular course of action.

Your activities will include five steps (time frames are approximate):

1. Rearrange the space (5 mins).
2. Select people to play the role of HCF facilitator (1) and community members (14) (5 mins).
3. Role-play preparation: Ask the group of 14 people to divide people up according to the different roles (see instructions and handouts on the following pages). Allow the group time to understand and prepare for the role-play (5 mins).
4. Enable the facilitator and the group to conduct the role-play in which the facilitator works with community members to decide how to create an inclusive planning process in which girls, boys, women, and men each have a voice and participate freely (15 mins).
5. Facilitate reflection and discussion with participants, no longer playing the roles that had been assigned (30 mins).

Step 1: Rearrange the space

Organize the space into two concentric circles. In the inner circle, 15 people sit or gather for “community discussion.” The other participants gather (standing or sitting) outside this inner circle (the “fish bowl”), enabling them to observe what is happening.

Step 2: Role assignment

Select participants to play the role of HCF facilitator (1), and community members (14). The rest of the participants are observers/reflectors.

Step 3: Preparation

A. Read the Setting aloud, so everyone will know what the role-play is about.

Setting: A facilitator from a national children’s agency (the HCF) is working over a period of months to help a community decide which harm to children it wants to address. Previously, the HCF had conducted grounded ethnographic research in this community, and community members had indicated the following top three harms to children. Listed in order of “greatest concern” to local people, they are: early marriage (for girls—the traditional marriage age had been 15 years but it has dropped to 11 years of age), heavy work (boys working in nearby mines), and drug use (marijuana and glue sniffing, mostly by boys).

The facilitator had also had a discussion with the community about how to enable all community members to have a voice in the planning discussions, which will likely extend over several months. At that discussion, community members concluded that large community meetings are not necessarily an effective way of enabling everyone to have a voice since children are very reluctant to speak in community meetings, and women typically stay relatively quiet.

Today the HCF facilitator is visiting the community again, this time to discuss how to enable different subgroups in a community to have a voice in the community decision about which harm to children to address. Twenty-four community members understand that a facilitator from HCF will come and help them to develop a good way of enabling the voices and views of everyone in the community. The Chief is not present, but an Elder is and will welcome the facilitator.

B. Then ask the Elder and community members to stay in the room by themselves to prepare for their roles, without being overheard by others. Meanwhile, the facilitator goes to a separate area to prepare himself or herself, while the other workshop participants stretch their legs outside for several minutes.

C. Distribute the role sheets (see following pages), not letting the community members or the HCF facilitator see each others' role sheets.

D. Give several minutes so the participants can decide how to best play their respective roles. The HCF facilitator can do this on his or her own (and ask questions of you).

Step 4: Enable the role-play

A. Before bringing the facilitator in, have the Elder and community members take their seats in the inner circle. Invite others (observers) to sit in the seats around or to stand around the inner circle and to pay attention to the group process.

B. Invite the facilitator in—they are just arriving in the village and will be greeted by the Elder, thus beginning the role-play.

C. Let the role-play continue for about 15 mins before you step in to say “Cut!” and begin the discussion.

Step 5: Facilitate a reflection and discussion

A. Open with a few questions for observers:

- Did some community members speak but not others? Why do you think this might have occurred?
- What positive things did the facilitator do to enable participation?
- Thinking about what happened in the inner circle, how would you describe the group process during this discussion? Did the facilitator seem to favor some people or views over others? (Please give an example).

B. Then ask questions for everyone:

- This hypothetical discussion was conducted as part of the preparation for community-led action. Was the facilitation approach well suited for community-led decision-making and action?
- Who seemed to make the decisions—was it the community, the facilitator, or both?
- In terms of building community ownership, do you think this is a useful facilitation process or a problematic process? Why?
- What could the facilitator have done to enable a more community-led approach?
- Was it really an either–or decision to make decisions by large community meetings or small group discussion? Aside from small group discussions, are there other ways of enabling the voices of children and marginalized people to be heard?
- Why is it so important that everyone have a voice in the decision-making?

Facilitator's Role

You are working as part of a longer-term process of community decision-making about which harm(s) to children it wants to address through community action. The harms to children in this community were previously identified through ethnographic study. You now aim to help the community members move toward a planning process that includes a mix of full community discussions and small group discussions.

In the previous community meeting, community members agreed on two things:

- (1) in a good community decision-making process, different people have a voice, and
- (2) in full community discussions, not everyone can speak up.

You believe that full community meetings are not the best venues for communities making decisions.

Following custom, the Elder will open the meeting and then hand off to you. To begin the discussion, you should thank the Elder for having called the meeting and thank the community members for coming. You should thank the community for having helped to identify three main harms to children: early marriage, heavy work, and drug use. Then, you should state that your main task today is to work with the community members who are present to decide how to create a planning process in which everyone in the village has a voice.

You will invite the views of the people who are present about how to include the views of different members in the community. Yet you feel strongly (based on your prior experience) that the best way forward is to have a mixture of large group meetings and small group meetings. In small groups, women are more likely to speak openly about the harms to children. Girls, too, will speak more openly than they would if they were in a group discussion with boys and men present. Thus you favor a mix of large community discussions and smaller, subgroup discussions among groups of 10–12 teenage girls, teenage boys, women, or men, respectively.

Initially, you ask people how they would help different people have a voice in deciding which harm(s) to children to address. However, if there is some disagreement, it could take months to resolve.

If this happens (it very likely will), you should decide quietly to move the group toward a mixture of full village meetings and small group discussions by subgroup (teenage girls, teenage boys, women, men). For example, in one week, there could be an open village meeting to discuss which harm to children to address. Then in the following two weeks, there could be small group discussions among each of the subgroups.

The key ideas from each subgroup could be fed back by having each subgroup elect a reporter who will give a summary of the key points discussed in the subgroup but without revealing who said what. You need to make the case for the use of subgroups, inspiring people when you need to.

With these points in mind, you should remind the community that the last time you visited, several community members said that some people in the community could not take part in community meetings, and others were present but did not usually speak up. However, the community also said that the view of every person is important. Our task today is to decide how to make it possible for people to speak openly and for different subgroups to have a voice in the discussions about which harm to children the community should address.

You should wrap up the discussion by leaning strongly toward the mixed model of all community discussions coupled with small, subgroup discussions.

Community Members' Roles

You will be playing the role of community member. Please feel free to improvise your role a bit yet follow the outlines of the role instructions for each person.

Elder: You open the meeting by speaking first, welcoming back the HCF facilitator, who has visited before, and inviting them to speak. After they speak for a bit, you are the first community member to respond to what the facilitator says. You like the traditional means of community decision-making in which the community meets, discusses the issue, and takes a decision. You think people can participate if they are encouraged to speak. You do not think subgroup discussions are necessary, and you do not waiver from this view, and argue back a bit with people who think there should be a combination of small group discussions and open community discussions.

Teacher: You are highly respected by the community. You speak just after the Elder, who favors full community meetings. You state early on and repeatedly that you have learned as a teacher that children frequently have different views than adults and that children—particularly girls—need their own space and small groups to feel safe and talk among themselves.

Outspoken woman: You have strong feelings about this and speak with passion for the value of having small group discussions. You know that girls will not confront men directly or say what their experiences are unless they are in a safe environment talking among themselves. You speak repeatedly and try to move other community members to your side.

Teenage girl: You are respectful and so do not speak up.

Teenage boy: You are respectful and are shy to speak. But you feel strongly that children and young people are in the best position to understand harms to children as they really are. Adults are sometimes too removed from children to know what difficulties children actually face, or adults have their own ideas which differ from those of children. You see having small group discussion among teenage boys as crucial for learning their views and hearing their voices.

Community man: You speak a lot. You like the traditional approach of having the community meet as a whole and take a decision. Yet you also understand that children may not speak very openly in community meetings, and they may have the best information about harms to children that the community needs to address. Ultimately, you favor the small group discussions.

Community woman: You favor having small group discussions among teenage girls for two reasons—they face problems and harms such as sexual exploitation and violence that others do not face, and they will not feel comfortable discussing the problems in open meetings with men and boys present. You speak repeatedly and try to move other community members to your side.

Community man: You agree with the Elder and say that children's role is to be obedient to and respectful of adults. It is not their position to have so much voice in community decisions since they are young and inexperienced. You favor traditional community meetings and think everyone can learn to speak up in them.

Community woman: You point out that when a community takes a decision, it is important for people to speak in front of the whole community, or as many people who can be present as possible. You do not like subgroup discussions since they could imply that the community has secrets and cannot have trustful, open discussion.

Imam: You think that children are wonderful resources but that, at the end of the day, adults should make the key community decisions. You favor the traditional approach of having the full community meet and take a decision. You do not waiver from this position.

Others: Count yourselves up. Assign half of yourselves to adult roles that hold that community meetings are the way of your village, and you should not deviate from that. The other half assign yourself to be supporters of the idea of having some full community meetings coupled with smaller subgroup discussions.

TRN 3. Differences Between Top-Down and Community-Led Approaches to Child Protection

Aspect or element	Top-down approach	Community-led approach
Views of community	Communities are seen typically as implementers or beneficiaries. Often communities are seen as needing education about child rights and child protection and as having harmful norms and traditional practices.	Communities are seen as collectives that have agency, social and cultural strengths, grounded experience caring for and bringing up children, and significant numbers of people who care about children's well-being.
Power	NGOs hold the power since it is they and their child protection experts who guide, manage, and provide the resources for the work on child protection. This power asymmetry is evident in language, since NGOs typically impose on communities a universalized language around child rights, child protection, and associated terms.	Communities hold the main power since they guide, manage, and control the work to support vulnerable children. Without skilled facilitation, it is primarily men in most communities that hold the power. Typically, communities do not use the vocabulary of child protection to speak of things that harm or are good for children.

Aspect or element	Top-down approach	Community-led approach
Role of NGOs and other outside actors	Typically, NGOs act as the experts who analyze the situation, choose the intervention, build capacities for implementation, and then manage the implementation of the intervention, and provide or organize monitoring and evaluation of the intervention's effectiveness. In most cases, the intervention is manualized or follows a protocol, and the NGO manages and directs the intervention, following well-articulated time schedules, logframes, results frameworks, etc.	Communities frequently plan and act on their own. Yet NGOs may have roles as facilitators who help communities engage in constructive, inclusive dialogue and problem-solving but who do not "lead" the community to a predefined endpoint such as child rights. NGOs may also help to build the capacities needed for designing and implementing the intervention, though they usually do so only if invited by the communities. The action is directed and managed by the community and follows "community time" and understanding of the results they want to see, without reference to logframes and manuals.
Actions/Interventions	Selected and designed by child protection specialists according to the issue to be addressed and child protection standards. The implementers are typically the NGO itself or a local CBO partner. Most ordinary people are not seen as having guided the selection of the issue, the selection of the intervention strategy, or its design and implementation.	The community itself defines the issue to be addressed, identifies the action strategy, and, possibly working with CBOs, NGOs, and/or Government actors, designs and implements the action. Usually, the work of selecting the issue and designing and implementing the action is not done by a small committee but by the full community, with ordinary people playing a prominent role.

Aspect or element	Top-down approach	Community-led approach
Strengths focus	The focus on existing community strengths is moderate yet may rely relatively little on existing community processes such as endogenous processes or traditional structures. The latter are viewed with skepticism since they may be sources of child protection risks.	Strong and at the forefront since the emphasis is on sustainable change and excessive focus on harms or risks can be seen by community people as one-sided or even disrespectful. Local community structures and practices are built on whenever possible, with child rights standards quietly used as a guide and social change strategies used to avoid harming children.
Inclusivity	Set as a goal but seldom approached rigorously. Under pressure for quick results, NGOs frequently do not take the time required to reach or engage with the most vulnerable children. Also, community decisions to partner with the NGO on children's protection may be taken following a handful of meetings that are dominated by people who are better off.	Works systematically to achieve high levels of inclusivity. Slow processes of dialogue and observation are used to analyze community dynamics, understand how community decisions are usually taken, and who is left out and why. Using strategies of slow dialogue, outreach to diverse people, and conscientization, communities themselves decide how to include people who do not usually participate in full community decision-making.
Child participation	Low to moderate levels of child participation are typically achieved since in most societies, adults are the decision-makers and holders of power. If children exert too much influence, adults may lash back with criticism or punishment. Where children are members of CWCs, they often wield relatively little power.	Children achieve high levels of participation. Through extended dialogue, adults become more aware of the value of children's views and recognize that particular community problems can only be addressed effectively with leadership by children. Through a social change process, adults willingly "make room at the table" for children.

Aspect or element	Top-down approach	Community-led approach
Initial engagement with community	Usually brief, consisting of several meetings and group discussions and organized around the questions and programming approach of the NGO. It typically does not entail extensive listening, and the discussion frequently centers around universalized categories of child protection concerns such as sexual exploitation and abuse, early marriage, violence against children, etc.	Usually a slow, extended process that involves extensive listening to and learning about the community. Efforts are made early on to not privilege the NGO or its terminology and concerns. The emphasis is on building trust and mutual respect, setting the stage for open learning about the community.
Assessment	Conducted by child protection specialists, assessments focus on child protection risks as defined by international standards. Some focus on protective factors is often included. The approach is judgmental in that it assumes that outside experts know what the key issues are and that local practices such as corporal punishment are harmful. Often the findings of the assessment are not fed back to the community.	Focuses on flexible, open-ended learning rather than on pre-defined questions. The learning approach, which could include methods such as ethnography and participatory ranking, invites local people to “teach us” and is non-judgmental in tone and approach. International terms are avoided, and emphasis is placed on community strengths and also community power dynamics. Local people are viewed as co-learners and, with training, may help to collect data. The findings are shared with the community in a respectful, appropriate manner.

Aspect or element	Top-down approach	Community-led approach
Monitoring & evaluation	Monitoring is conducted by the NGO. Evaluations are organized by the NGO, and conducted by specialists, who may include commissioned research groups. When participatory methods are used, the focus is often on questions formulated by child protection specialists.	Monitoring is done by the community via agreed-upon processes and space for reflection and making adjustments in the action. Communities also evaluate the action using various methods that they decide upon. External evaluations may also be conducted and frequently include locally derived outcome indicators. Evaluation data are shared in a simple, appropriate manner with community people, who discuss the implications of the findings.



TRN 4. Gallery Walk and Discussion on “Community”

A. Background

Purpose: Use of the term “community-led” assumes that one knows what a community is. The term “community” can suggest that communities are relatively homogeneous and have more similarities than differences. However, communities exhibit enormous variety and differences that can have significant implications for how to engage with them and for the development of community-driven action. The purpose of this gallery walk and discussion, then, is to help participants to think in nuanced, critical ways about what is a community and how communities vary.

Time: 60 mins.

No. of participants: Over 25 people, ideally.

Materials needed:

- 3 decks of 30 or so index cards per deck, pens, sticking material
- relatively large space, with ways of displaying the cards (e.g., they can be spread on the ground or be attached to the walls)

B. Facilitator's Notes

It is important to problematize the term “community” and to enrich our understanding of the diversity and complexity of processes that may be hidden within this term. This session is intended to stimulate reflection that help participants unpack what is meant by “community” in different contexts. It seeks to stimulate critical thinking that enables participants to move beyond romanticized ideas of community and to develop a more contextualized view that recognizes the limits of the term.

The activity involves five steps, with approximate time frames as indicated below:

- 1) Assign participants to three groups of approximately equal size, giving index cards to each group (5 mins).
- 2) Give each group its assignment and location in the room (5 mins).
- 3) Through discussion, each group generates key terms that describe “community” in that setting and places them on the wall (15 mins).

- 4) Each group has one person stay with its cards and be a “discussant” while everyone else moves around the room, viewing and commenting on the work of the other groups (15 mins).
- 5) Plenary discussion while standing (20 mins).

Step 1: Formation of three groups

To divide participants into three groups of approximately equal size on a random basis, ask people to count off as “one,” “two,” or “three.” Then ask all the “ones” to stand together, all the “twos” to stand together, and all the “threes” to stand together. Give each group about 25 index cards, several markers, and sticking material if they will be attaching the cards to a wall.

Step 2: Group assignments

Invite each group to move to a particular area, where there is open space for displaying the index cards once they have been written on. Speaking so everyone can hear, tell group 1 that it will be thinking about community in the context of a cohesive, rural village. Tell group 2 that it will be thinking about community in the context of a peri-urban neighborhood that is stable but has significant ethnic and religious differences and some tensions surrounding them. Tell group 3 that it will be thinking about an urban neighborhood with low social cohesion and extensive population movement.

When the three groups are listening, ask each group to write the word “COMMUNITY” on a card and place it at the center of the space so that other cards can also be placed around it. Next, ask each group to discuss for a few minutes how they would describe “community” in that setting. Then, they should as a group generate about 15 words that describe “community” in that setting, discussing among themselves which are most appropriate. One person should take notes during this time. When the 15 (or so) words have been agreed on, write each on a separate index card. Then place the 15 cards in the space around the “community” card, with the most important descriptors placed closest to the “community” card. (Alternately, the group could generate words and place them in the space or on a wall, with discussion and revision [taking down one card and replacing it with another] as they go).

When the cards have been displayed, ask the groups to identify one or two critical questions or observations that should be kept in mind when discussing communities. Each of these questions should be written one per card, with the question cards at the very bottom of the set of cards on display. Tell the groups that they will have 15 minutes to complete their work. Remind them that it is natural for different people to have different ideas and there is no “correct” answer—only the items with the greatest agreement need be displayed. Also remind them that they have extra cards that they can use to revise as they continue their discussions.

Step 3: Groups complete their assignments

During this time (15 minutes), walk around to each group, make sure they have understood the instructions, and answer any questions. It is important to be flexible—if a group can only come up with 9 or 10 words to display, that can be fine. Also, it is natural for the group working on the urban context to experience more challenges, and they may even decide to reject the task since there may be no “community.” If this happens, ask them to write on cards several key points from their group discussion.

Ask the group to indicate to the facilitator when they have completed their assignment. When they have, ask each group to designate one person as a “discussant” who will stay by the group’s cards to share (not defend) the thinking of the group when others come to read their cards.

Step 4: Gallery walk

Invite everyone except the three discussants to leave their own group and visit the other group sites to read their work. Ask them to pay attention to the differences in the descriptors used by the three groups and differences in how the cards were placed as well. Remind people to read the critical questions, too, and to feel free to talk and discuss as they move around with others. Invite people to “mix it up” and talk with lots of people, breaking out of their own group.

Step 5: Plenary reflective discussion

In the plenary reflection, it can be useful to invite discussion about how communities differ, and how they are similar, writing notes on a flipchart as one proceeds. The differences serve as a poignant reminder of how important it is to avoid a cookie-cutter approach to working with communities and to work in a contextually appropriate manner.

Next, it is important to ask participants about the implication these differences have for community-led approaches to children’s protection. You might want to consider that higher levels of social cohesion generally make it easier to do community-led work.

Yet even in peri-urban settings with only moderate social cohesion, community-led approaches have proven to be feasible and useful. By its nature, the community-led process described in this Toolkit helps to build social cohesion, which increases as people focus on a common goal—the well-being of their children—and identify common harm(s) to children to be addressed and a common intervention to address it.

Enabling a community-led approach in urban neighborhoods with high levels of turnover and also competition for scarce resources is likely more complex and may not seem possible except for activists who live there and really understand its nuances. At the very least, using a community-led approach in such a context would require more time devoted to building an inclusive process, managing conflict, and giving time for the planning process to build a sufficient base of social cohesion. Also, the neighborhood collective would need to construct a

means of managing the turnover of people and think in new ways about how to achieve sustainability.

If time permits, it can be useful first to invite discussion of 1–3 of the critical questions that had been raised, making linkage with the question about the implications for community-led approaches.

TRN 5. Dos and Don'ts of a Community-led Approach

In helping to prepare facilitators for their work, it can be useful to think in practical terms about things that facilitators should do (Dos), and things facilitators should not do (Don'ts). By collectively discussing these, the facilitators and others can sharpen their understanding of community-led approaches.

A fun way of developing Dos and Don'ts is to divide into small groups during the training workshop and invite participants to generate a list of “Dos and Don'ts.” This could be followed by a plenary sharing of what each group produced, noting similarities and differences in their lists and discussing further the differences.

It can also be useful to display the lists and ask participants to “vote” for their five top Dos and their five top Don'ts. This could be done by displaying the lists on the floor or on the wall and giving each participant five green stars and five red stars, which they would place beside their preferred Dos and Don'ts, respectively. This approach, coupled with group discussion and correction of any misunderstandings, makes it possible for the workshop to produce its own list of Dos and Don'ts.

Below is an integrated list that reflects group work and learning in countries such as Sierra Leone, Kenya, and Uganda.

Dos	Don'ts
• Listen with empathy and respect, backgrounding one's own views.	• Take a judgmental approach that makes people feel blamed and disrespected.
• Put the power and decision-making responsibility in the hands of the community.	• Tell communities what to do or share only limited power with the community.
• Enable high levels of community ownership and responsibility-taking.	• Focus mainly on NGO projects, activities and accountability, which generates low levels of community ownership and sustainability.
• Analyze and manage the power relations within communities.	• Romanticize communities as places where all community members are equal.

Dos	Don'ts
• Enable an inclusive process of community dialogue and action.	• Work mainly through the chief or the local power elite.
• Reach out to and talk with marginalized people, including people with disabilities.	• Talk and work mainly with the people who are easiest to reach or to interact with.
• Learn about the communities through an open, non-judgmental process using local language and terms.	• Assess as a child protection expert who uses international terms such as “child protection,” “child rights,” “child labor,” “sexual exploitation,” or “female genital mutilation.”
• Understand the values that underlie local practices, including harmful practices that contradict the CRC.	• Condemn harmful practices without helping to develop alternatives that respect positive local values.
• Learn about local ideas about “who is a child” without judging or correcting those views.	• Assume or teach that a child is a person under 18 years of age.
• Help communities reflect on what are the main harms to children aside from poverty and health issues.	• Tell communities as an “expert” what the main child protection issues are in the community.
• Enable communities to decide which harm(s) to children they want to address and how to address it.	• Take an expert-driven approach that tells communities which harms to children are most severe and how to address those harms.
• Ask questions that make people think.	• Tell people answers (“sensitizing” them) or impose solutions.
• Help communities to build supportive connections with formal stakeholders such as district-level social welfare or child protection workers.	• Regard communities as islands or set them apart from formal aspects of the wider child protection system.

Dos	Don'ts
• Enable slow processes of dialogue, reflection, and group decision-making.	• Follow a fixed time-table that reflects the demands of the NGO and the donor.
• Use a facilitation process that helps communities to make their own decisions.	• Use didactic approaches or “facipulation” processes that lead communities to do what the NGO wants them to do or impose outsider approaches.
• Identify and build upon local strengths and resources such as women’s groups, community groups, natural helpers, local practices, etc.	• Create parallel systems that are not sustainable.
• Help communities to develop their own processes of monitoring and responding to harms to children.	• Impose outside structures such as Child Welfare Committees.
• Approach social change by working with insiders who guide the process.	• Impose change through the use of didactic approaches.
• Help to create spaces for community reflection and taking stock of their process and action.	• Emphasize external monitoring of the community-led intervention.
• Enable community evaluation of their process and action.	• Rely on external evaluation alone.
• Work with sustainability and long-term change in mind.	• Assume that sustainable outcomes or processes will grow out of a successful project.

TRN 6. Role-play for Asking Probing Questions

The best way to learn to ask appropriate, well-timed probing questions is to practice with an observer looking on who can provide useful feedback for improvement. During a training workshop for facilitators, it is useful to have the observer be a mentor or someone who is well experienced in asking probing questions.

Below is a scenario and role-play that affords useful practice.

Scenario: Using a community-led process, the community is discussing which harm to children to address. The main harms that have surfaced in discussions thus far are child marriage, teenage pregnancy, children out of school, and children engaged in heavy work. However, you see that the views of teenage girls have not been explored fully, so you, the facilitator, seek to talk with a teenage girl about what she sees as the main harms to children. She has agreed to talk with you.

Tasks: Divide into sets of three people. One person plays the role of a teenage girl (participant); another person plays the role of a facilitator; and the third person plays the role of the observer. The girl should be a healthy young girl who is eager to talk and not burdened with heavy emotions. The facilitator is eager to learn the girl's views and should use a nonjudgmental manner and one or more probing questions to learn more deeply about the girl's views. The observer should watch quietly, without fidgeting or giving nonverbal cues about being happy, impatient, etc. The observer should notice the probing questions, how they were received by the girl, and whether they were well-timed and useful.

Role-play (10 mins): Eager to learn about the girl's views regarding the main harms to children, the facilitator will ask a variety of questions, including probing questions. The third person—the observer—sits and watches but does not intrude. The observer may be introduced to the participant as a co-learner. After 10 mins of discussion, the observer gently interrupts the interview as if they were a film producer by saying “Cut!” This begins the discussion.

Discussion: The discussion can be facilitated by the observer, though it can also be a general discussion by all three people in the triad. Key questions to reflect on include:

- What probing questions were asked?
- Why did the facilitator ask probing questions?
- Did the probing questions help to gather useful information? How?
- How were the probing questions seen by the participant (teenage girl)?
- Were the probing questions appropriate and well-timed?
- Could anything be done to improve the quality of the discussion and learning?

- What questions do we have about how and when to ask good probing questions? These could be shared with the wider group for discussion.

Repeat: Now redo the discussion, this time with the former facilitator playing the role of a teenage boy and the former teenage girl playing the role of facilitator. Repeat the procedure above, only this time asking about views of the boy rather than about views of the girl. At the end of the role-play, the observer can again facilitate the discussion of the questions above.

Variations: Useful variations of this practice process include:

- Repeat the roles above but have one of the hypothetical participants (the girl or the boy) be very excitable and talk nearly nonstop.
- To capture discussion at a different phase, adjust the scenario by assuming that the community has already selected child marriage as the harm to children to be addressed. The discussion that is about to occur is aimed at learning from the participant her (or his) views about how child marriage could be reduced or prevented. This could entail asking probing questions about what families could do and about what communities could do.
- Ask the participants whether in a community-led approach probing questions can be asked for different purposes. [Hint: In the learning phase, probing questions help to illuminate the participant's views, the meanings of the words they use, etc. Later on, probing questions can be used for this purpose or for identifying complexities that warrant additional community discussion. For example, in a discussion of which harm(s) to children to address, a community member might blurt out "I just think it's wrong to teach children about contraceptives." By giving a probing response such as, "Thank you for sharing this view. How do you see it as being wrong?", it is possible for community members to understand the divergent views of different community members. Thus, probing questions are important for more than research purposes and can be used to enable deeper dialogues and problem-solving within the collective.]

Enjoy the practice and make it fun as well as illuminating!

TRN 7. Role-play (Fish Bowl) and Discussion: Building an Inclusive Community Process 1

A. Background

Purpose: The purpose of this role-play is to stimulate awareness of the problems of non-inclusive approaches to community decision-making and enable constructive thinking about how to build a more inclusive process. It shows how enthusiastic participation by community leaders or members of the community elite can make it difficult to have an authentic discussion or to include diverse views. An important takeaway point is that in taking a community-led approach, directive action by the community leader may not be helpful, and steps may be needed to engage and respect community leaders without having them control the process.

Time: 60–90 mins.

No. of participants: Over 20 people, ideally.

Materials needed:

- 1 role sheet for the facilitator
- 2 copies of the role sheets for the community members (attached)
- a relatively large space, with room for 12 people seated in an inner circle (the “fish bowl”), with the rest of the people arranged in a wider circle so that everyone can observe what is happening in the inner circle

B. Workshop Facilitator's Notes

In this session, you will organize a role-play that simulates an interaction between a facilitator from the Healthy Children’s Foundation (HCF, a national NGO) and members of a rural village. The setting is a community meeting convened to discuss which harm to children the community will select for purposes of subsequent community-driven action. The role-play is designed to bring out the limits of “convenience group” meetings and “chief- and elite-driven approaches” as a means of partnering with the community, enable empathy with local community views, and increase openness to a more inclusive way of working with community people.

Your activities will include five steps (time frames are approximate):

1. Rearrange the seating (5 mins).

2. Select people to play the role of HCF facilitator (1), Chief (1), and community members (10).
3. Role-play preparation: Ask each group to divide people up according to the different roles for each group (see instructions and handouts on the following pages). Allow the groups time to understand and prepare for their roles in the role-play (15 mins).
4. Enable the two groups to conduct the role-play in which the facilitator works with community members to decide which harm to children they want to address through community action (15 mins).
5. Facilitate reflection and discussion with participants, no longer playing the roles that had been assigned (30 mins).

Step 1: Rearrange the space

Organize the space into two concentric circles. In the inner circle will be 12 seated participants who take part in a “community discussion.” The other participants will surround this first circle (the “fish bowl”), enabling them to observe what is happening there.

Step 2: Role assignment

Select participants to play the role of HCF facilitator (1), Chief (1), and community members (10). The rest of the participants are observers/reflectors.

Step 3: Preparation

A. Read the setting aloud, so everyone will know what the role-play is about.

Setting: A facilitator from a national children’s agency (The Healthy Children’s Foundation, HCF) wants to enable a highly participatory process in which a community decides which harm(s) to children it wants to address. Previously, the HCF had conducted ethnographic research in which community members had indicated the top three harms to children. Listed in order of “greatest concern” to local people, they are: early marriage (for girls—the traditional marriage age was 15 years but it has dropped to 11 years of age); heavy work (boys working in nearby mines); and drug use (marijuana and glue sniffing, mostly by boys).

Those findings have already been fed back to the community, which is a small, relatively traditional, rural village. The community members understand that a facilitator from HCF will come to help them to decide which harm(s) to children that they can subsequently address through community action.

The facilitator is visiting the community mid-day during the week and has respectfully asked the Chief of the village to convene a community discussion about which harm(s) they want to address. The Chief and the community people understand they will need to select one or several harms to children, and they are eager to partner with HCF. The Chief and the Town Crier went house-to-house to ask everyone to attend the meeting, which will be held in the traditional meeting space outside the Chief's hut. The Chief will welcome the facilitator, who will then begin their work with the community.

B. Then ask the Chief and community members to stay in the room by themselves to prepare for their roles, without being overheard by others. Meanwhile, the facilitator goes to a separate area, while the other workshop participants stretch their legs outside for several minutes.

C. Distribute the role sheets (see following pages), not letting the HCF facilitator see the roles of the Chief and community members.

D. Give several minutes so the participants can decide how to best play their respective roles. The HCF facilitator can do this on his or her own (and ask questions of you). For the Chief and community members, the important thing is that the Chief leads and dominates the discussion.

Step 4: Enable the role-play

A. Before bringing the facilitator in, have the Chief and community members take their seats in the inner circle. Invite others (observers) to sit around but outside of the inner circle and to pay attention to the group process.

B. Invite the facilitator in—he or she is just arriving in the village and will be greeted by the Chief, thus beginning the role-play.

C. Let the role-play continue for about 15 mins before you step in to say “Cut!” and begin the discussion.

Step 5: Facilitate reflection and discussion

A. Open with a few questions for observers:

- What positive things did the facilitator do to enable participation?
- Thinking about what happened in the inner circle, how would you describe the group process during this discussion?

B. Then ask questions for everyone about inclusion, adjusting the order to what had been said in response to the questions above:

- Do you think this is a strong process or a weak process in terms of enabling the community to decide which harm to children to address? Why?

- [If participants are slow to point out issues, you could ask: Did the community members who were present participate equally in this discussion? What role did the Chief play? What are the problems of having an open discussion when the Chief is controlling things or speaking first? Was this really a community decision-making process, when many community members were not present?]
- Who was missing from this discussion or not participating in it?
- Why is it important for a process of community decision-making to be inclusive?
- What could be done to reduce the problem of the Chief controlling the discussion and decision-making?

NOTE: This discussion may continue straight into the following discussion (see next tool), which may also be done as a follow-on session to this one but after taking a break.

Facilitator's Role

As the facilitator, you aim to help the community take a decision about which harm(s) to children the community will address through its own action. During this meeting, you want to respect the Chief, who had organized this meeting at your request. You feel strongly that having the Chief on board with this process will enable it to win community support, to be “legitimate” in the eyes of the community, and to be sustainable. Wanting to make the Chief happy, you sometimes let him speak more than you really think he should be speaking.

Following custom, the Chief will open the meeting and then hand off to you. To begin the discussion, you should thank the Chief for having called the meeting, and thank the community members for coming. There is no pressure for the community to take a decision today, as you recognize that there may need to be many discussions before the community agrees which issue to address.

Early on in the discussion, you should remind the participants that during the learning phase (ethnography), they had identified three main harms to children: early marriage (for girls—the traditional marriage age was 15 years but it has dropped to 11 years of age); heavy work (boys working in nearby mines); and drug use (marijuana and glue sniffing, mostly by boys). You should mention that people may consider other issues as well, though you remind them that this process cannot by itself address poverty. Remind participants, too, that there are no right or wrong answers and that each person’s opinion matters.

With these points in mind, you ask the community “Which harm(s) to children do you think the community should address?” Following up, you ask various participants, including children, what they think.

Chief's Role

As the respected leader of your people, you are a take-charge person and see yourself as speaking for the community. You like when community members speak, but you like it even more when they show respect to you and even defer to your judgment.

You open this role-play by welcoming the facilitator to the village again. Before handing over to him or her, you state that to help the community decide which harm to children to address, you have brought together most of the key people in the village—the opinion leaders and people who are most able to make good decisions. You invite each person to introduce themselves. Then you turn to the facilitator and say, “Now it is your meeting—please go ahead.”

Your role is to lead and control this discussion. After the facilitator invites views of the community, step forward immediately and present your view that drug use is the biggest harm because the drugs are dangerous and they lead children, particularly boys, to drop out of school. Once out of school, the boys do more drugs, gamble, and stop respecting their families and the community elders. In essence, they become a burden on everyone, and they invite other children to misbehave and stop being good future citizens of the community. You let others speak to some extent, yet you are so excited that you keep interrupting or jumping in to assert your own views.

Community Members' Roles

At the beginning of the role-play, the Chief will ask each of you to introduce yourself briefly to the facilitator by saying your name and who you are (as in: “I am John, the Chief's nephew. I’m a farmer.”). You are all highly respectful of your Chief and always let him speak first and interrupt whenever he wants to. You want to express your views yet are eager to agree with the Chief.

Most of you are parents and adults. Please choose among yourselves which of the following roles you wish to play:

- two of you are relatives of the Chief;
- two of you are teenagers, and you remain silent during the meeting, deferring to the Chief if you are asked anything directly;
- three of you think the most important harm to children to address is early marriage;
- four of you think the most important harm to children to address is heavy work;
- three of you think the most important harm to children to address is drug use.

TRN 8. Role-play: Building an Inclusive Community Process 2

This role-play can be done as a stand-alone or as a sequel to the preceding role-play.

A. Background

Purpose

The purpose of this role-play is to give the facilitator in a community-led approach experience in helping community members take stock of how large community meetings are not a fully inclusive means of the community taking a decision. For training purposes, it offers pointers on how to ask questions that stimulate reflection on the limits of large meetings and to invite collective problem-solving about how to overcome those limits.

Background

The facilitator knows the community members well and is working with them to help them select which harm or harms to children to be addressed through community-led action. Because a high level of inclusivity is fundamental in a community-led process, the facilitator wants to help the community think through how it can create a more inclusive process for deciding which harm(s) to children to address.

Participants

The participants consist of 10–20 people who play the role of community members (self-assigned) and a participant who is learning to facilitate a community-led process who plays the facilitator.

B. Workshop Facilitator's Notes

1. The facilitator leaves the meeting space and takes 10 mins to read the facilitator's sheet (see below).
2. With the facilitator away from the meeting space, the other participants assign themselves roles as community members. It is useful to have a mix of elder men, elder women, young mothers, young fathers, teenage girls, and teenage boys. Some people tend to speak more than others or even to dominate the discussion. All the community members agree that every member of the community should have a voice in its decision-making.

3. Some of the community members (self-designated) think initially that large community meetings are the best (and the traditional) way of enabling the community to take a decision on an issue such as which harm to children should they address through community-led action. Yet they loosen up and are willing to consider other options as the facilitator raises questions and invites them to think them through.
4. The community participants like the facilitator and the way he or she asks questions and invites discussion. They offer supportive alternatives such as better announcement of meetings, Town Crier encouragement for everyone to attend the meeting, small group discussions, and home visits as a way of enabling all members of the community to have a voice in discussions of which harm to children to address.
5. Role-play. The role-play begins with the facilitator entering the meeting space, greeting the community, and explaining the purpose of the meeting. The role-play should continue for about 30 mins, with the workshop coordinator playing the role of “movie producer” and intervening with a “Time out” if some adjustment is needed.

Discussion and Reflection

Following the role-play, it is useful to invite everyone to step outside their assigned roles and now share their own opinion on questions such as:

- In the discussions, how well did the facilitator do in enabling or encouraging different people to speak? What could have been done better?
- In reality, what are the limits of community meetings as vehicles for making decisions?
- In a large group meeting with both men and women present, will women likely feel free to discuss openly issues such as gender-based violence? Why or why not?
- How could small group discussions among, for example, a group of 10 women and a group of 10 men, help to address the preceding concern? What challenges could arise in having small group discussions, and how could they be managed?
- How could home visits help to address the preceding concern? Who would make the home visits, and how would the process be? What challenges could arise in having home visits, and how could the challenges be managed?

Facilitator's Sheet

Your goal in this community meeting is to help the community think through its process for taking a decision about which harm to children to address. You know that the community typically takes decisions by having a “full community meeting” in which people discuss the issue and take a decision. However, it is clear that not everyone participates in such meetings—people with disabilities and the poorest of the poor, for example, typically do not participate. Also, children have little voice as they are “expected to be seen but not heard.” Further, women and girls are unlikely to discuss openly issues such as rape and gender-based violence in a setting where men are present.

Your aim in this session is twofold. First, you want to help community members understand that taking decisions at large meetings is not a fully inclusive process. Also, you want to help community members construct a more inclusive process of decision-making. Your strategy is to help people reflect on the importance of each person having a voice and then work to raise awareness of the limits of making decisions at full meetings.

A useful first step in this session is for you to ask questions such as, “What does it mean to say that the community has taken a decision?” or, “Should everyone have input into community decisions?” and “Why is it important that each person participate in decision-making?”

With this as a foundation, you can help people to reflect on how participatory current processes of community decision-making are. Ask questions such as: “How does a community here take a decision?” Typically, people reply along the lines of: “We discuss the issue as a whole community in our community meetings, and everyone participates.” If this happens, you should ask follow-on questions designed to trigger awareness that some people may be left out of those community discussions and that even if people attend the community meetings, it may be challenging for them to speak up. Among such questions are the following:

- “Does everyone attend the community meetings?”
- “Are some people here very poor compared to others? Do they usually attend the community meetings? Why or why not?”
- “Are there people here who have disabilities (maybe they are blind, or cannot hear, or are unable to walk)? Do they attend and take part in the meetings? Why or why not?”
- “Do children, even teenagers, attend the community meetings? Do they regularly speak up and share their perspectives? Why or why not?”

In asking these questions, your role is not to force agreement or suggest solutions but to help the community discuss issues fully before taking a decision. After discussion, people in most communities agree that although community meetings are open to everyone, there are people who seldom, if ever, attend such meetings. These may include people with disabilities, people who are very poor or whose families are most vulnerable, or people who are stigmatized for any reason. People also typically realize that children do not usually speak up at full community

meetings. They may also note that women do not speak as much as men or that only the women who are power brokers speak up.

From here, the next step is to ask questions that invite problem-solving, noting that this may take some time. It may also require a number of discussions, and the discussion today is only the beginning. Try asking open-ended questions that do not blame anyone for having excluded particular subgroups or for not participating themselves. Such questions may include the following:

- “What could enable women to participate more fully or contribute to community discussions and decision-making?”
- “What could enable children to participate more fully or contribute to community discussions and decision-making?”

You could ask similar questions in regard to the poorest people, people with disabilities, or any subgroup that seems to be excluded or somehow less prominent in collective discussions and decision-making.

Asked with patience, such questions help to create a reflective space for group problem-solving. The reflective space enables people to step back and identify possible alternatives that are more inclusive and participatory.

Quite commonly, proponents of large-scale community meetings suggest steps such as going house-to-house well in advance of meetings in order to make sure that everyone in the community knows there will be a meeting and that everyone is welcome. In regard to this option and others that might be suggested, it is not for the facilitator to support or reject the option, as that is up to the community. But you should invite reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of each option, for example, by asking follow-up questions with an appreciative attitude. Such questions could include things such as: “Thank you for this suggestion—what do other people think of this?” or “How is this option helpful?” and subsequently, “Will everyone be able to participate in full community meetings?”

Through the ensuing discussions, most communities come to the realization that even with advance notice and a welcoming attitude, it will likely be difficult for people such as the poorest of the poor and people with particular disabilities to come to the meetings. This realization typically leads people to suggest other options. Home visits and small group discussions are frequently among the options that communities develop. Part of the excitement of community-led work is to see the imaginative solutions that local people can develop.

TRN 9. Keeping One's Boundaries

The facilitator's main function is to support the communities in making inclusive decisions about which harm(s) to children to address through community-driven action. To serve this function, facilitators live in the communities and spend extensive time building trust, listening, learning, asking questions that trigger reflection and dialogue, supporting an inclusive process, observing, dialoguing, and accompanying the community in a spirit of solidarity. Doing these things involves being with the people and not creating too much social distance from community members.

At the same time, though, facilitators are not community people and have an independent role. This tension can create conflicts and ethical challenges, as illustrated in the scenarios below. Consider each, one by one, and write down some ideas about how you as facilitator would deal with the situation.

Scenario 1: You (the facilitator) are sitting in an open meeting of community A, three months into community discussions about which harm(s) to children to address. Through discussion, three issues have surfaced repeatedly—early marriage, out-of-school children, and child-beating. The community discussions are respectful, yet community people continue to differ in regard to which harm or harms they want to address. Getting weary of discussions, the leader puts you on the spot and presses you by asking, “What would you do?” How would you respond in a way that is consistent with the facilitator role, even if other people as well press you for your views?

This one is relatively easy. Did you consider reminding people that it's natural for different people to have different views, and that ongoing dialogue will likely help community members reach a clear idea about which harm(s) to children they want to address?

Also, it might be helpful for you to point out that what is really important are community people's ideas—not your ideas. If they continue pressing you, you could more directly point out that this could compromise your role as facilitator and move the community away from the community-led approach that you are there to support. You could also note that you signed a contract saying that you would stay true to your role as facilitator.

ETHICS



Scenario 2: Please assume you are a male facilitator. After spending much time in Village B and talking with teenage boys at length about the harms to children in the community, you have become friends with the boys. One evening they invite you to come talk with them, and when you arrive you observe that they are drinking a beverage containing alcohol but they do not appear drunk. One of the older boys offers you a drink, and the other boys urge you to take it. You think to yourself that drinking is so normal in this village that it could be seen as disrespectful to refuse the drink. Should you take the drink—what would you say to the group? If you took the drink, what would be the likely implications? If you did not accept the drink, what would be the likely implications? How would you manage this situation?

This one is more complex and may require choosing the least bad of two relatively bad options. One option would be to take a very small sip as a symbolic gesture of solidarity and a means of building trust and relationship with the boys. You might see this as a respectful thing to do, and as facilitator, you are eager to avoid giving any appearance of judging their behavior. This minimalist approach could significantly increase your ability to get the boys more engaged in the community-led process and to learn more deeply about their situation, values, aspirations, etc.

Significant drawbacks of this option include that taking a sip could support and even legitimate an activity that harms children. Some people would say it's unethical to drink with the boys. Also, it could break down the role boundaries in a way that reduces your ability to facilitate, as the boys might come to see you as one of them or as somehow on their side.

A second option is to kindly refuse the drink but do it in a way that does not seem to pass judgment on the boys. You could reiterate your interest in talking with them and ask whether they could talk with you tomorrow morning. A significant drawback of this option is although you have obeyed the law and not condoned a harmful activity, the boys might feel disrespected and judged, leading to reductions in their willingness to engage with the community-led process.

Of course, there are many other options for responding to this situation. Like many issues related to ethics and roles, there may be no tidy answers regarding the "best way to handle it." In view of these complexities, it can be useful to discuss this scenario on going out with an underage girl with your mentor or a larger group in the workshop to prepare facilitators.

TRN 10. Gallery Walk and Discussion on Community Ownership

A. Background

Purpose: Community and child protection workers often speak of “community ownership” as if everyone understands the term as if it had the same meaning. In fact, however, practitioners often use the term in somewhat different ways. An important step, then, is to unpack the meaning of “community ownership.” To strengthen practice, it is also important to identify things that support or limit community ownership. The purpose of this gallery walk and discussion is to help participants to conceptualize community ownership and reflect on what enables it and what impedes it.

Time: 75 mins.

No. of participants: Over 25 people, ideally.

Materials needed:

- 3 decks of 25 or so index cards each, and writing pens
- relatively large space, with walls on which cards can adhere to walls, or space for them to be displayed on the ground
- material for sticking cards to the wall, if relevant

B. Facilitator’s Notes

In learning about and thinking how to develop community ownership, it is important to have a clear understanding of what “community ownership means” and also what promotes it or limits it.

The activity involves 5 steps, with approximate time frames as indicated below:

- (1) Assign participants to three groups of approximately equal size, giving 15–20 index cards to each group and assigning them to particular spaces (5 mins).
- (2) Give the groups their three-part assignment while they stand in their respective areas (5 mins).
- (3) Groups complete their assigned tasks (30–35 mins). Through discussion, each group generates key elements of “community ownership” and places them on the wall or the ground surrounding the term “community ownership” (10–15 mins). Each group also generates five things that are obstacles to community ownership, writing each on a card

and placing the cards in a column to the left of “community ownership” (10 mins). Lastly, each group also generates five things that promote or enable community ownership, writing each on a card and placing the cards in a column to the right of “community ownership” (10 mins).

- (4) Gallery walk. Groups leave their own station and walk around to other stations to view and discuss the work of other groups, leaving one member behind to explain the thinking of one’s own group (15 mins).
- (5) Plenary discussion while standing (15 mins).

Step 1: Formation of three groups

To divide participants into three groups of approximately equal size (ideally, about 8–10 people per group; use more small groups for a large number of people) on a random basis, ask people to count off as “one,” “two,” or “three.” Then ask all the “ones” to stand together, all the “twos” to stand together, and all the “threes” to stand together. Give each group about 20 index cards, several markers, and sticking material for attaching the cards to the wall, if relevant.

Step 2: Group assignments

Invite each group to move to a space, where there is a way of displaying the index cards once they have been written on. At the center of the display space, place a card that says: “COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP.”

Speaking loudly so everyone in the room can hear, tell the groups that they have three tasks.

1. Each group should take a few minutes and identify five main elements of community ownership. They should write each one on a separate card and place the cards in a circle around the card saying “COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP.”
2. Each group should identify five things that block or limit community ownership. Each item should be written on a separate card and placed in a column on the wall to the left of the community-ownership card.
3. Each group should identify five things that promote or encourage community ownership. Each item should be written on a separate card and placed in a column on the wall to the right of the community-ownership card.

Step 3. Groups complete their assignments

During this time (30–35 minutes), walk around to each group, make sure they have understood the instructions, and answer any questions. Ask the group to indicate to the facilitator when they have completed their assignment. When they have, ask each group to designate one person as a

“discussant” who will stay by the group’s cards to share (not defend) the thinking of the group when others come to read their cards.

Step 4. Gallery walk

Invite everyone except the three discussants to leave their own group and visit the other group sites to read their work. Ask them to pay attention to the differences in the descriptors used by the three groups and differences in how the cards were placed as well. Remind people to read the items that block and promote community ownership too, and to feel free to talk and discuss as they move around with others. Invite people to “mix it up” and talk with lots of people, breaking out of their own group as they walk around and learn what other groups have done.

Step 5. Group discussion

With everyone still standing, announce that now there is time for reflection and larger group discussion. Ask questions such as:

- What common elements came up in regard to community ownership?
- Thinking about community ownership, were there elements or aspects that seem more important than others or that were somehow underemphasized in the exercise? [Note: It would be odd not to see items such as “responsibility,” “strong motivation,” “identity—sense that this is ours,” “mobilization of community resources,” and related items coming up.]
- Thinking about the obstacles to community ownership, how strong and widespread are these? Are there steps that could be taken to change them? [Note that a frequently identified obstacle is donor requirements for short-term projects and immediate results. On seeing and recognizing the weight of this obstacle, some participants may become a bit despondent. It is wise to use this as an opportunity to remind participants that donors are people, have their differences, and are educable. It is important that participants see steps that could be taken, even if they are not part of a long-term social change process.]
- Thinking about the things that promote or enable community ownership, do agencies and practitioners do enough of these to promote community ownership? What might encourage them to do more?

TRN 11. Sample Workshop Agenda for Initial Training of Facilitators

A. Background

Purpose

The purpose of this workshop is to prepare the agency facilitators on how to enable and support community-led processes of child protection. It also brings together key stakeholders, strengthening their understanding and support for a bottom-up approach.

Objectives

The main objectives of the workshop are to:

1. Promote collective understanding of the community-led approach and its value-adds;
2. Develop in facilitators the necessary skills, self-awareness, and reflection for using a community-led approach;
3. Enable an ethical approach to facilitation;
4. Construct an initial work plan for facilitators.

B. Facilitator's Notes

The process of this workshop should seek to mirror that of the community-led process. Thus, it should be highly participatory, the participants should make key decisions, and it should be collectively owned. It is highly valuable for the group to decide how to adjust the agenda each day, and to choose and develop particular scenarios and role-plays that will help the facilitators to develop contextually relevant skills.

Although some of the role-plays and activities are scripted in the Toolkit, others are to be creatively constructed by the group. The reflective tools included in the “Facilitation” section of the Toolkit can suggest useful pointers and approaches for the scenarios that the team constructs.

Throughout, the workshop coordinator should model and encourage self-awareness and individual and group reflection. To help the facilitators acquire the skills they need, it can be useful to repeat role-plays or particular parts of them, giving the facilitators an opportunity to criticize how they handled something and to then try to do a better job the next time around.

If a facilitator clearly needs more practice on a particular skill, it is important for the team to provide for that on multiple days of the workshop. Although ethics has its own session, ethical issues and expectations should be discussed throughout the workshop.

Agenda

Monday, Week 1

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 9:00–10:00 | Purpose and overview of this meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions• Purpose of the workshop• Agenda overview |
| 10:00–11:30 | The limits of a top-down approach <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scenario and role-play• Collective reflection |
| 11:30–12:00 | Tea |
| 12:00–1:00 | Dialogue: the limits of top-down approaches |
| 1:00–2:00 | Lunch |
| 2:00–3:30 | What is “community”? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Small group discussions• Gallery walk with plenary reflection |
| 3:30–4:00 | Tea |
| 4:00–5:00 | Community power relations: a social justice framework |

Tuesday, Week 1

- 9:00–10:00 Example of a community-led approach
- Presentation (e.g., the Sierra Leone case study)
 - Discussion
- 10:00–11:00 How to build the community's trust and respect
- Discussion in pairs of what supports or reduces trust
 - Plenary discussion
 - Reflection on how NGOs frequently develop limited community trust and respect
- 11:00–11:30 Tea
- 11:30–1:00 Deep listening
- Group constructed role-play
 - Reflection, with focus on empathy
- 1:00–2:00 Lunch
- 2:00–3:30 Learning by asking open-ended questions and probing questions
- Practice in pairs, with feedback
 - Plenary reflection
- 3:30–4:00 Tea
- 4:00–5:00 Thinking through the role of facilitators in a community-led approach

Wednesday, Week 1

9:00–11:00 Enabling dialogue and inclusive participation

- Group role-plays, with reflection
- Plenary discussion

11:00–11:30 Tea

11:30–1:00 Enabling full participation of teenagers

- Group role-plays, with reflection
- Plenary discussion of complexities and how to manage them

1:00–2:00 Lunch

2:00–3:30 Enabling the participation of younger children

- Group role-plays, with reflection
- Plenary discussion of complexities and how to manage them

3:30–4:00 Tea

4:00–5:00 Mentoring

- Group discussion of mentors' roles
- Discussion of mentor–NGO and management issues

Thursday, Week 1

9:00–11:00 Entering the community

- Role-play on engaging with the chief/leaders, and reflection
- Deciding whether to collaborate

11:00–11:30 Tea

11:30–1:00 How to explain your purpose and role

- Role-play of initial discussion with the full community
- Development of key elements of a scripted explanation

1:00–2:00 Lunch

2:00–3:30 Managing conflict in a constructive manner

- Group constructed role-play, with facilitator practice and reflection
- Plenary discussions, with tips on handling one's own anxiety
- Repeat the process as needed

3:30–4:00 Tea

4:00–5:00 Engaging with people on the margins

- Learning when and how to engage
- Role-play: transect walk and discussions

Friday, Week 1

- 9:00–11:00 Ethical considerations in facilitation
- Group discussion on key ethics issues
 - Child safeguarding
 - Discussions of pros and cons of mandatory direct reporting of violations against children in the context
- 11:00–11:30 Tea
- 11:30–1:00 Managing the ethics issues
- Thinking through how the facilitator should respond when they have learned of a violation against children
 - Possible adjustments in agency expectations and procedures for the facilitator
 - Ongoing importance of reflection and mentor’s advice
- 1:00–2:00 Lunch
- 2:00–3:30 Helping communities to avoid exclusive focus on poverty and health issues in deciding which harm to children to address
- Role-play and discussion
 - Group discussion of framing and setting boundaries
- 3:30–4:00 Tea
- 4:00–5:00 Participant observation (see Learning Tools)

Monday, Week 2

- 9:00–10:00 Gender and inclusivity
- Role-play on learning from girls and women in mixed gender context
 - Discussion of the limits of such an approach
 - Reflection on limits on trust and learning imposed by one’s own gender
- 10:00–11:30 Helping the community to decide through an inclusive process which harm(s) to children to address
- Scenario and role-play
 - Collective reflection
- 11:30–12:00 Tea
- 12:00–1:00 Going deeper on inclusivity: Enabling everyone to have a voice and influence on decisions
- Discussion of contextual problem-solving by the community
 - Locally relevant ideas
- 1:00–2:00 Lunch
- 2:00–3:00 Going deeper on inclusivity, cont.
- Sierra Leone approach (with cautions about imposing it)
 - Plenary discussion of strengths and limits
 - Reflection on facilitator’s responsibility for enabling inclusive participation
- 3:30–3:30 Tea
- 3:30–5:00 Creating space for community dialogue and decision-making
- Role-play on “facipulation”
 - Reflection on how to do facilitation in a way that creates adequate space for communities and places power in the hands of the community

Tuesday, Week 2

9:00–11:00 Enabling inter-community planning

- Discussion of possible benefits of collaboration
- Supporting communities in deciding how to work together (e.g., forming and supporting an inter-community planning group, with roles and functions identified)
- Facilitator's and mentor's roles in enabling collaboration

11:00–11:30 Tea

11:30–1:00 The planning cycle: group discussion and problem-solving

- Linking the inter-community discussions with individual communities
- Feeding from communities (large group discussions, small group discussions, and home visits) to inter-community discussions
- Narrowing down options, and finding common ground

1:00–2:00 Lunch

2:00–3:30 Linkage and collaboration with formal stakeholders

- Discussion of how action considerations could arise even in discussions of which harm(s) to children to select
- Background, exploratory discussions with formal stakeholders—role-play
- Planning how to scope out the formal stakeholders' interest and capacity to deliver

3:30–4:00 Tea

4:00–5:00 Documentation

- Keeping regular records
- Agency expectations
- Value of a journal

Wednesday, Week 2

9:00–10:00 Role-play on community entry

- Group role-plays, with reflection
- Plenary discussion

10:00–11:00 Managing people who dominate discussions

- Role-play
- Group discussion of management strategies

11:00–11:30 Tea

11:30–1:00 Managing difficult people

- Group role-plays, with reflection
- Plenary discussion of complexities and how to manage them

1:00–2:00 Lunch

2:00–3:30 Role-play on community discussions of which harm(s) to children to select

- Group role-plays, with reflection
- Plenary discussion of complexities and how to manage them

3:30–4:00 Tea

4:00–5:00 Work planning for facilitators, with focus on first two months

- Group discussion of key elements of work plans
- Plan who develops full work plan
- Wrap-up and group reflection on the workshop