Executive Summary

The Auschwitz Institute for the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities' (AIPG) Online Education Program builds capacity among state institutions and civil society to prevent genocide and other mass atrocities through virtual trainings and online courses. Every two years, we distribute an impact survey to all alumni who have taken a course with us in that period to assess 1) how the courses have increased their knowledge, skills, and confidence in applying an atrocity prevention lens to their work; 2) whether they have initiated or contributed to any policies or programs in which they used knowledge gained through AIPG's online courses; and 3) what changes, additions, or improvements they would like to see in the future. The first such survey was distributed in 2021 to all alumni who took a course between 2017-2020. The results of this first impact survey were shared internally, but not distributed publicly. This report analyzes the results of the most recent survey, distributed in late 2023 to all alumni who took a course with us between 2021-2022. From the results of this survey, it is evident that our Online Education Program has a significant multiplier effect beyond the online environment, both in terms of how our alumni are able to apply an atrocity prevention lens to their daily work and in how they share the tools from our courses with their colleagues. Key findings include:

Course Material

- Impact on Work
  - 96% of alumni agreed or strongly agreed that AIPG online courses positively impacted their ability to work in atrocity prevention.
  - The mean response was 4.6/5, indicating high overall satisfaction with course impact.

- Growth in Knowledge
  - Alumni reported an increase in knowledge of genocide and mass atrocity prevention concepts from a mean answer of 5.68 out of 10 for before taking an AIPG online course to 8.68 after.
  - The standard deviation value decreased significantly (from 2.61 to 1.07), indicating more consistent knowledge ratings among respondents post-course.
  - A majority of respondents showed significant growth in knowledge, with a few indicating little room for further growth based on pre- and post-course knowledge ratings.

- Confidence
  - 92% of alumni rated their confidence in using concepts and tools of genocide and mass atrocity prevention as confident or highly confident, with a mean response of 8.08/10.
- Continued Learning
  - 67% of respondents indicated motivation to expand their knowledge of atrocity prevention post-course.
  - Common sources for continued learning include internet searches, AIPG newsletters, and membership in relevant associations.

- Recommendation to Colleagues
  - 91% of alumni recommended AIPG online courses to colleagues, with some recommending to over 50 colleagues.
  - A majority of respondents recommended courses within their own institution, but a significant portion recommended outside as well.
  - 89% reported sharing knowledge and tools from courses within their institution.
  - Alumni remain a significant resource in both recommending our courses to new participants and domesticating the knowledge gained through our courses to their colleagues.

**Policies and Programs**

- 43% of respondents contributed to policies or programs using knowledge gained from AIPG courses.
- The multiplier effect for alumni-influenced policies/programs is $17,311,252.66 USD.
- 71% of respondents indicated that they have integrated knowledge from the courses into their day-to-day work.

**Opportunities for Change, Expansion, or Improvement**

- There is a high interest in virtual opportunities such as online courses (92%) and webinars (92%).
- Interest declines for in-person opportunities requiring extensive travel.

Overall, the data indicates that AIPG's online courses effectively enhance knowledge, confidence, and capacity among our alumni, enabling them to make tangible contributions to atrocity prevention efforts around the globe. There is strong interest in continued learning and opportunities for collaboration, highlighting the impact of AIPG's Online Education Program. However, our ability to increase our reach and expand our course offerings is moderated by a dearth of funding.
Background

The Auschwitz Institute for the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities (AIPG) is dedicated to building a world that prevents genocide and other mass atrocities. To do so, we support States to develop or strengthen policies and practices for the prevention of genocide and other mass atrocities through education, training, and technical assistance. Many of our programs emphasize the “power of place.” Introducing the concepts of genocide and mass atrocities and how to prevent them on the grounds of a former site of atrocity, a place where participants can directly see and feel the destructive reality of what happens when prevention work fails, gives a sense of urgency to discussions on these issues. Our founding partnership with the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum in 2007 established our annual Raphael Lemkin Seminar for Genocide Prevention, which convenes 25 government officials across all global regions to learn about atrocity prevention on the grounds of Auschwitz. While Auschwitz remains the primary location for our core seminar, we also recognize that the power of Auschwitz is not bound by its place or location. The power of Auschwitz – its reality, its memory, its legacy – transcends place and inspires the work of AIPG across the globe.

While the Raphael Lemkin Seminar for Genocide Prevention is incredibly impactful for the 25 government officials who are able to attend annually, an impact that influences and inspires their work long after they return home, it is clear that the limited availability of resources to accommodate the desire of everyone who wishes to attend similarly limits the number of people we are able to reach with the seminar.

To meet this demand, AIPG established the Online Education Program in late 2016 with the aim of providing additional educational and training opportunities to our partners in two regions: the Great Lakes Region of Africa and Latin America. Our Online Education Program was originally developed as a response to requests from Lemkin Seminar alumni for 1) training opportunities in atrocity prevention for their colleagues who are unable to attend our annual Raphael Lemkin Seminar and 2) additional training on applying the concepts of atrocity prevention to region-specific issues for those who have already attended the Lemkin Seminar.

While we are not able to replicate the “power of place” in the online sphere that is the cornerstone of the Raphael Lemkin Seminar for Genocide Prevention, our online courses are designed with the same pedagogical practices in mind: all of our courses are facilitated by an expert in the field, they are kept to 25 participants to encourage engagement with each other and with the instructor, and they are designed to encourage practical application of the course material to the participants’ professional work. Our courses train participants on how to apply what prevention scholar Alex Bellamy calls an “atrocity prevention lens” to the policies and programs with which they interact.

After participants graduate from our courses, our hope is not that they have memorized facts and information, but that they have learned how to apply an atrocity-sensitive analysis to their daily professional practice in a way that prioritizes mitigating risk and building resilience. This can be infused into existing resources, capacities, and decision making processes without necessarily designing and implementing a new atrocity prevention policy. This is important because many departments and ministries are working with limited resources and already strained capacities.
Additionally, many governments devote a limited amount of funding towards atrocity prevention policies that are already covered by the mandate of a designated department or bureau. The atrocity prevention lens is not meant to be an expansion of one's scope of work, but rather is a tool to show our participants how every policy and program they are a part of is an opportunity to mitigate risk and build resilience. By doing so, we can maximize the potential preventive impact of our work at every level of government.

About the Online Education Program

The Online Education Program furthers AIPG’s mission by building capacity among state institutions and civil society to prevent genocide and mass atrocity through virtual trainings and online education opportunities. The online learning environment provides an opportunity to maximize our organizational impact by facilitating high quality, low cost programming to a wide range of participants, offered at no cost to participants from the Global South. As of January 2024, we have offered 100 online courses and have more than 1,200 alumni representing 60 countries.

Our courses have consistently seen high completion rates of 85-95%, compared to the much lower completion rates of less than 10% for many Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) that prioritize enrollment numbers over successful course completions. This is accomplished through an array of strategies that are standard across all of our courses:

- All participants, regardless of background, must first complete our Foundations in Mass Atrocity Prevention course, which introduces participants to basic concepts in genocide and mass atrocity prevention and the three streams of prevention framework we use at AIPG. This ensures all participants have the same foundational understanding of atrocity prevention. After participants successfully complete this course, they are added to a global network of alumni and have a range of additional courses and learning opportunities available to them.

- All of our courses are asynchronous with the same weekly submission deadline. Each week of material is designed to take about four hours to complete. This flexible format was selected since all of our participants are working professionals with obligations outside of the course.

- We contract externally with instructors who are experts in the field, preferably from the region in which the course is being offered. Since the material is already developed for them, their energies are devoted to keeping participants on track with the course material, sending weekly updates and reminders to each participant, and providing personalized feedback to participant discussion board posts.

- Since our courses are limited to 25 participants, the instructor is able to personally engage with and establish relationships with each participant, and participants are able to interact with each of their peers. This creates a system of accountability in meeting course requirements and expectations, as well as relationship building that can extend to creating networks outside of the course.
Reflection questions and graded discussion boards are designed to encourage practical application of the week’s material to the participants’ daily work.

After completion of each course, participants are awarded a Certificate of Completion certifying the number of course hours they have completed. This can be used to get continuing education credits with their institution or ministry.

Over the years, the Online Education Program has been able to expand our course offerings and global reach to meet existing and emerging thematic needs in the genocide and mass atrocity prevention field, including early warning, transitional justice, memorialization, the role of non-state actors, and the rights of Indigenous people, the LGBTI+ community, and migrants. Reflective of our global reach, we currently offer courses in English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Romanian, Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian, (BCMS), and Thai.

While our regularly scheduled courses are still largely offered in Latin America and Africa, we have been able to expand our reach within each of these regions with the addition of courses in Brazilian Portuguese and French for Francophone countries in Africa. We saw another wave of expansion during the COVID-19 pandemic when we began working alongside each of AIPG’s program offices to convert in-person programming to online courses. As COVID-19 restrictions have eased, we continue to facilitate online courses for other programs, often using a hybrid model with an online course followed by an in-person meeting or synchronous virtual session. While this does not replace the value of in-person meetings and seminars, for certain programs we have found the fully online or hybrid model to be more cost-effective and efficient for our participants’ work schedules.

Lastly, we have begun to work with governments in the Global North to offer our courses specifically to their institutional personnel. While the brunt of the course material remains the same, these national courses are tailored to highlight pressing issues facing the State, at home or abroad. These national courses are a unique opportunity for States to give their personnel an in-depth training on the concepts of atrocity prevention, and to receive feedback from an expert in the field on how to apply the principles of atrocity prevention to their daily work.

Since we first began offering courses, we have developed and refined our pedagogical approach to be accessible to a range of learning styles and abilities. We welcome participant feedback, and are continuously seeking ways to improve the online experience while maximizing our impact beyond the online environment. This is accomplished through a multi-stage evaluation and follow-up process with alumni:

- In the short-term, participants are sent a standardized evaluation at the end of each course that assesses any challenges they experienced during the course, what they feel was most useful or missing from the course material, and their experience with the instructor.
  - Instructors are also sent an evaluation that asks about their experience instructing and with the participants, and if there is anything they would add or change about the course material.
In the mid-term, we have a discussion forum entitled “Next Steps” in the final week of each course that asks participants to think about how they will be able to apply the course material to their work. We compile all of the responses to this forum and follow up with participants in the first few months after the course to ask how their projects are progressing, and if we can be of assistance in implementation.

In the long-term, we distribute an in-depth impact survey to all alumni every two years that assesses how AIPG’s online courses have impacted or influenced their daily work.

The following sections outline the results of our most recent impact survey, which was distributed to all alumni who took a course between 2021-2022.

**Methodology**

Between September and November of 2023 we distributed an impact survey to all alumni who took a course with us between 2021-2022 to evaluate how our alumni have used the knowledge
and concepts gained from the courses in their professional life.\textsuperscript{1} (While this survey is assessing the impact of our online courses, alumni may have participated in other AIPG programs.) The survey primarily assessed 1) how our online courses increased the knowledge, skills, and confidence of alumni in applying an atrocity prevention lens to their work, 2) whether they have initiated or contributed to any policies or programs in which they used the knowledge gained through AIPG online courses, and 3) what changes, additions, or improvements they would like to see in the future, and if there are any specific projects they would like to receive technical assistance from AIPG on.

Since the purpose of this survey is to assess the long-term impact of our online courses, we omitted any new alumni from 2023 in order to give them time to domesticate the knowledge from our courses in their daily professional life, as well as to incorporate knowledge into or develop new policies and/or programs.

The survey was distributed using Watermark, our evaluation software. We created three different projects: one in English and French that was sent to all of our alumni in Africa, one in Spanish and Portuguese that was sent to all of our alumni in Latin America, and one in English, Romanian, and BCMS that was sent to all of our alumni in the United States, Europe, Oceania, and Asia.\textsuperscript{2} This allows for easier regional analysis with the potential to aggregate the results. We also sent automated reminder emails to all nonrespondents every 5 days during the two month response period.

In total, we had a 25% response rate with 173 respondents of the 700 it was sent to, which is higher than the average online survey response rate (~15%).

**Demographics of Respondents**

Of the 700 alumni the survey was sent to, we received 173 responses representing 43 different countries: 62 responses came from Africa, 64 from Latin America, and 47 from Europe, Asia, and Oceania.\textsuperscript{3} The distribution of respondents reflects both our regular course offerings in Latin America and Africa, and program-specific course offerings delivered during this time period. In Africa, our alumni have predominantly come from the Great Lakes Region because our Africa Programs Office is based in Kampala, Uganda. This began to change in 2021 and 2022 when we started accepting more participants from across Sub-Saharan Africa into our Foundations in Mass Atrocity Prevention course. In Latin America, we began to see a higher participation rate from Brazil with the addition of courses in Brazilian Portuguese. The expansion of our Conflict-Related Atrocity Crimes Prevention program, a course designed for military, police, and other security sector personnel, allowed us to target a global audience outside of our usual demographic, as well as the inclusion of national courses for States who showed particularly high

---

\textsuperscript{1} The survey questions can be found in Appendix A.
\textsuperscript{2} Unfortunately, we were not able to have the survey translated into Thai. Additionally, we grouped the United States, Europe, Asia, and Oceania together since we do not have a significant number of alumni from each of these regions on their own, and we do not regularly offer courses in each of these regions. We did not receive any responses from alumni in the United States - we refer to this project as Europe, Asia, and Oceania moving forward.
\textsuperscript{3} For a full breakdown of survey respondents by region and country, see Appendix B.
interest in the program (offered to Nigeria in this time period). Additionally, programs in Moldova, Bosnia, Thailand, and Australia in this time period yielded higher than expected response rates from these countries.

Of all respondents, 42 indicated that they served in the armed forces or police, 46 in various government ministries, 8 in an ombudsperson’s office, and 42 in an NGO or university. 35 selected “other.” The most common ministries were human rights secretariat/ministry (15), ministry of defense (11), and ministry of foreign affairs (12). Common responses in the “other” category include ministry of home affairs, ministry of the interior, independent commissions on human rights, and the legal field. The high number of responses from the security sector (31%) is reflective of the expansion of our Conflict-Related Atrocity Crimes Prevention program. Although our programs reach people from a wide variety of professions, the primary target audience of our courses remains government officials.

---

4 For a full breakdown of institutions by region, see Appendix C.
The plurality of respondents (76, or 44%) last completed an online course with us more than 1 year ago. This aligns with the number of one-time courses we offered as part of virtual programs that were converted from in person programming during the COVID-19 pandemic, as many of the participants in those courses would not be eligible to take our other courses. 64 (37%) last completed a course 6 months to 1 year ago, and 32 (18%) last completed a course less than 6 months ago. That 81% of respondents last completed a course 6 months or longer ago well positions the responses to this survey to demonstrate the long-term impact of our courses.

Results

The survey can be broadly divided into three sections: 1) assessment of how AIPG’s online courses have impacted alumni perspectives of and approach to their daily work, including growth in knowledge of and confidence in using concepts in atrocity prevention; 2) specific policies and programs that alumni have influenced or contributed to using concepts in atrocity prevention; and 3) what specific changes, additions, or opportunities would be most beneficial to our alumni.
Course Material

1. Impact on work

Using a Likert scale, we asked alumni how strongly they agree with the statement, “An AIPG online course has positively impacted my ability to work in atrocity prevention.” An overwhelming majority, 96% (or 166 respondents) said they agree or strongly agree with the statement. Only 7 respondents were neutral. In Africa and Latin America, more respondents indicated they strongly agree rather than just agree with the statement, with the trend reversing in Europe, Asia, and Oceania. Overall, the mean response was 4.6/5.

2. Growth in Knowledge

Next, we asked alumni to rate their knowledge of genocide and mass atrocity prevention concepts before and after taking an AIPG online course on a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being highly knowledgeable. The mean answer for “before” was 5.68. This increased three points to 8.68 when considering their knowledge after an online course. Significantly, the standard deviation value more than halved from 2.61 to 1.07, demonstrating less variation among respondents when rating their knowledge after taking an AIPG online course. In other words, even if respondents might have varied more widely in their background knowledge on atrocity prevention concepts before taking an AIPG online course, the courses were effective in leveling the field of knowledge among all participants. It is worth
noting that 24 respondents rated their pre- and post-course knowledge a 10, indicating that there is little room for growth with them. We saw the highest number of responses in the 7-9 range, indicating their knowledge has grown significantly, but there is still room to learn more. While the results across regions were comparable, it’s important to note that we regularly offer courses in Africa and Latin America; alumni in these regions have more opportunities to take courses with us and on a wider range of topics.

### Knowledge of atrocity prevention before and after taking an AIIPG online course

![Knowledge of atrocity prevention before and after taking an AIIPG online course](chart.png)

3. **Confidence**

46 respondents rated their post-course confidence a 10, compared to the 24 who rated their post-course knowledge a 10. That more people rated their confidence a 10 than their post-course knowledge indicates that while those additional 22 respondents may feel there is more to learn, they are completely confident in applying what they have learned to their professional practice. It is important to assess not only growth in knowledge, but how confident our alumni are in using concepts and tools in genocide and mass atrocity prevention in their professional practice. Similar to the previous question, we asked alumni to rate their confidence on a scale of 1-10. 92% of respondents rate their confidence in using concepts and tools of GMAP in their professional practice as confident or highly confident (considered as a rating of 6 or higher), with a mean answer of 8.08/10. This is highest among our Latin American alumni, 97% of whom rate their confidence as confident or highly confident (mean 8.67). The mean answer was 8.08 and 7.27 in Africa and Europe, Asia, and Oceania, respectively.
4. Continued learning

An important indicator of curiosity, commitment to atrocity prevention, and confidence in using concepts and tools in genocide and mass atrocity prevention is continuing to seek out new knowledge and tools in prevention after completing a course with us. 67% of all respondents selected yes, indicating our alumni are generally motivated to expand the depth of their knowledge of atrocity prevention. This was highest among African respondents, with 75% selecting yes. 64% and 60% said yes in Latin America and Europe, Asia, and Oceania, respectively.

When asked through which sources they have sought new information, many simply said through the internet or a search engine. Many read and receive news through AIPG’s 2Prevent newsletter, to which all alumni are added after they complete a course with us. Others are members of the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS). Other common responses were university courses, mass media, webinars, ebooks, and journal articles.

5. Recommendation to colleagues

It has long been clear that our alumni are a significant resource for sharing course announcements within their networks, directly recommending courses to colleagues who may be interested, and domesticating knowledge and concepts in prevention in their institutions. We maintain relationships with our alumni beyond course completion; in fact, some of our alumni go
on to collaborate with AIPG on projects implemented by our regional offices, receive technical assistance on project implementation, or even serve as instructors in our courses.

To gauge the above, we asked how many, if any, colleagues they recommended our courses to and if they have shared knowledge from the courses with them. 91% of respondents have recommended our courses to 1 or more colleagues, with 9% of respondents recommending them to 50 or more colleagues. This is highest among our African alumni, 98% of whom have recommended our courses to 1 or more colleagues. 72% of respondents have only recommended our courses to colleagues within their own institution, while 28% have recommended them to people outside their institution.

89% of respondents reported that they have shared knowledge and/or tools with their colleagues or within their institution. This is again highest among our African alumni (95%). 92% of respondents in Latin America reported they have shared knowledge and tools, and 77% of our respondents among Europe, Asia, and Oceania.

### Policies and Programs

Our courses themselves do not prevent genocide and other mass atrocities. Rather, our theory of change posits that such trainings are the first step in equipping governments around the world with the knowledge and tools on how to directly contribute to prevention. The important prevention work is done after the course is completed and the participants return to their positions, equipped with new knowledge, tools, and skills on how to mitigate atrocity risk or respond to ongoing situations of violence. In order to measure our alumni’s commitment to
prevention, we asked a series of questions about what specific policies and programs they have influenced, contributed to, or initiated as a result of their participation in our online courses.

Among all respondents, 43% indicated that they can name a policy or program they contributed to in which they used knowledge gained through an AIPG course. This varied widely across regions, with 64% of respondents (39) from Africa saying yes, 38% (24) from Latin America, and 25% (12) from Europe, Asia, and Oceania.

Some notable program and policy contributions include:\(^5\)

- Development of a project that seeks to map hate speech in Bosnia, with a subsequent action plan
- Genocide prevention education for youth
- Developing national programs on genocide prevention
- Updating due diligence questionnaires to include data points on atrocity prevention
- Institutionalizing international humanitarian law and human rights into compliance training in the armed forces
- Updating migration and internal displacement policies to include an atrocity prevention perspective
- Institutionalizing course concepts and content into military and police training curricula and field exercises
- Development of community sensitization programs to include human rights and prevention principles
- Development of electoral violence prevention programs
- Mobilizing community peace forums to manage local disputes
- Applying an atrocity prevention lens to the evaluation of public policies

Many of the above answers demonstrate the ways in which our alumni are applying an atrocity prevention lens to their existing scope of work. We strive to emphasize to our alumni that they can contribute to atrocity prevention by simply analyzing how their work can either mitigate risk or build resilience, which includes assessing any potential unintended consequences of policy or program implementation. While some of our alumni are living and/or working in contexts of ongoing conflict or countries experiencing outbreaks of limited violence, most are living in societies with a stable level of risk. While the likelihood of violence breaking out varies across the 60 different countries our alumni represent, it is clear that most, if not all, of our alumni understand that genocide and atrocity prevention is something we should be continuously striving towards, and policies that are designed using

\(^5\) See Appendix D for direct quotes from alumni on the policies and programs they have contributed to.
the atrocity prevention lens ultimately contribute to building peaceful societies that respect and protect human rights for all.

In order to calculate the multiplier effect of our courses, we asked participants how much money was budgeted for the policy or program(s) they described. We received 28 responses with a dollar amount. In total, it was determined that $17,311,252.66 USD was allocated to policies or programs contributed to or initiated by our alumni using knowledge and/or tools from our courses. Of any program with a budget, the smallest amount was $500, while the maximum amount was estimated to be $16,000,000 (for a multidimensional, multinational military training exercise). The median response was $12,515.68. This is significantly higher than the multiplier effect from our 2021 impact survey, which was $451,328.91.\(^6\)

![Amount Budgeted for Policy or Program](image)

It is also important to note the number of responses we received that did not have a budget. 26 respondents indicated that there was no specific amount or no budget allocated towards a policy or program. While it is, of course, excellent to be able to attach a dollar amount to the impact of our courses, just as important are the creative and innovative ways our alumni are able to contribute to prevention using limited resources. Many departments, institutions, and organizations have limited budgets and already strained capacities; funds tend to already be committed towards specific projects and programs with none to spare. That 15% of respondents have been able to either initiate or influence a policy or program without a specific budget or

\(^6\) We had one outlier response of $16,000,000 for a multinational military training. If that is removed from the total, the multiplier effect would still be almost three times the amount of the previous survey: $1,311,252.66 compared to $451,328.91. This survey was sent to roughly double the number of alumni who received the previous survey.
reallocating funds demonstrates how an atrocity prevention lens can be applied within an institution without incurring additional costs.\footnote{There are still overhead expenses associated with programs regardless of their budget. Since the cost associated with a program or policy is self-reported, we can’t standardize how respondents report on this. This likely implies the multiplier effect is a lower end estimate. Regardless, it is important that alumni see these programs as cost-neutral.}

We then asked which specific tools and resources from our courses were most helpful in contributing to or developing their policy/policies or program.\footnote{For direct quotes on what tools alumni found most helpful, see Appendix E.} Some common answers include:

- Recognizing early warning signs and response tools
- Understanding identity-based violence, which is shared in localized community peace building initiatives
- Availability of material to be downloaded and outside resources shared by the Online Ed Team
- Strategies for peaceful conflict resolution
- Legal understanding of genocide and mass atrocity
- Ability to interact and engage with other participants in a range of contexts and professions builds networks and offers different perspectives
- Clear conceptual frameworks with supporting tools and reference materials aids in the development of policy

Assessing the more informal ways that our alumni have incorporated knowledge gained from our online courses is just as important as their direct policy contributions or initiatives. Aside from infusing atrocity prevention principles into the development of specific policies or the implementation of certain programs, we wanted to gauge how our courses have impacted our alumni’s approach to their work in general. To do so, we asked “Have you in any way integrated the learning from the course(s) you have taken into your day-to-day work?” Overall, 71\% (115) answered yes, 5\% (8) said they tried but were unsuccessful, and 24\% (39) said no. Answers were commensurate across Africa and Latin America, with 78\% saying yes in both regions, 5\% saying tried but was unsuccessful, and 17\% saying no. In Europe, Asia, and Oceania, 53\% said yes, 4\% said they tried but were unsuccessful, and 42\% said no. That 71\% of respondents have integrated learning from the courses they have taken into their day-to-
day work compared to the 43% who have directly influenced, contributed to, or initiated a policy or program indicates that even if they cannot identify a specific policy or program in which they've used knowledge from our courses, many more of our alumni have found our courses useful in shifting their approach to their work to incorporate an atrocity prevention lens.

For those who answered yes, we asked in what ways. Some common trends in responses include:

- Encouraged critical and independent thinking about the impact of their work
- Fresh approach to training curricula, including incorporating concepts and frameworks from the courses into the trainings they conduct. For trainings that already include a module on genocide, they were able to incorporate a prevention aspect
- For alumni who come from post-atrocity societies, especially for those working in immigration who may interact with people coming from areas experiencing conflict, the courses have provided them with more historical knowledge as well as more empathy for people they interact with
- Incorporating concepts from the course into briefs prepared for senior leadership, or in daily briefings with subordinates
- Awareness raising and sensitization among community members and in conversations with colleagues
- During the provision of humanitarian assistance to refugees and migrants

It is clear that the impact of our online courses transcends what can be measured in specific outcomes and outputs, but has served at the individual level to foster empathy and encourage diversity of perspective. Our alumni have even reported that the atrocity prevention lens has influenced how they approach conversations, both at work and in everyday interactions, and better prepared them for media appearances.

For those who said they tried but were unsuccessful, we asked what challenges they faced. Some common challenges include:

- Funding
- Bureaucracy blocking change
- Corruption
- Mobilizing colleagues, especially those in professions where deployments are common, is difficult
- Difficulty in reaching rural areas
- Existence of a dominant narrative that is promoted by the government
- Change in administration

---

9 For direct quotes on how alumni have integrated knowledge from the courses into their day-to-day work, see Appendix F.  
10 For quotes on challenges alumni faced integrating knowledge from the course into their day-to-day work, see Appendix G.
As noted previously, our alumni represent 60 different countries around the globe. Each of those countries experiences different levels and types of risk that our alumni are striving to mitigate in their daily work. These risk factors themselves can pose challenges to our alumni in their prevention efforts, such as high levels of corruption, autocratic or anocratic regimes, lack of trust in State institutions, and entrenched or intractable identity-based divides, especially when combined with systematic State-led discrimination. Despite these wide-ranging challenges, of which funding continues to be the principal challenge across contexts, our alumni continue to find avenues and opportunities to creatively contribute to prevention work. This can be as simple as altering their approach to a conversation, or speaking with colleagues about how they can contribute to atrocity prevention.

Opportunities for Change, Expansion, or Improvement

The last few questions of the survey assessed alumni interest in attending future courses or other types of programming, topics they wish they had more knowledge about relating to atrocity prevention, and any ideas for collaboration between their institution or organization and AIPG.

First, we asked the likelihood of alumni and their colleagues participating in online courses, webinars, and different locations for in-person seminars. It’s clear that the primary interest remains around virtual opportunities, including other online courses (92%) and webinars (also 92%). There was also high interest in attending seminars within their countries (93%). Interest begins to decline when considering opportunities that would include traveling further, including a seminar in a neighboring country (78%), within their same global region (77%), and in another global region (71%). While response rates for each of these were comparable between Africa and Europe, Asia, and Oceania, interest was much lower in Latin America, particularly for potential opportunities that required further travel.

Next, we asked “In the last month, what topics did you wish you had more knowledge about relating to atrocity prevention?” Answers to this question varied widely and reflect the diverse work of our alumni. Common answers include:

- Rebuilding trust in post-atrocity societies
- Monitoring and evaluation of transitional justice programs
- Promoting equality in training structures
- Specific trainings on atrocity prevention for peacekeeping forces
- Aid to victims of atrocity
- Gender-based violence and atrocity prevention
- Memorialization, including as a tool to reduce risk relating to conflict history and establishing memorials
- Cybersecurity and atrocity prevention
- Open source investigations
We already have a course in development on sexual and gender-based violence, (SGBV), and will consider these other topics for future courses and programs. Many respondents requested more information on midstream prevention, or response tools when violence is imminent or ongoing. Since our courses are designed to be relevant for as long as possible, we typically do not include information on ongoing conflicts or atrocities as the situation is ever evolving, although we do include case studies on historical examples and encourage instructors to send out articles on ongoing issues relevant to the course. Discussion of ongoing atrocities would be more appropriate for a one-time webinar. Many of the topics indicated, such as war crimes, early warning, transitional justice, migration, indigenous rights, the rights of the LGBTI+ community, and corruption we already offer courses on. All alumni are sent course announcements when we begin accepting applications for them.

The last two questions asked participants if AIPG could assist them in any projects they are currently working on or would like to work on, and if they would like to be contacted by a member of the AIPG team to discuss these further. We will share these results with our program offices and do follow ups with alumni on projects we have the capacity to contribute to. To protect the privacy of our alumni, especially because many of them are working on sensitive issues, we will not reproduce those answers here.

If AIPG offered the following training opportunities to your institution, how likely would you and your colleagues be to participate:

- **92%**
  - Online courses: 92% of respondents are likely or somewhat likely to participate

- **92%**
  - 1-time online webinar: 92% of respondents are likely or somewhat likely to participate

- **93%**
  - In-person seminar in country: 93% of respondents are likely or somewhat likely to participate

- **78%**
  - In-person seminar in neighboring country: 78% of respondents are likely or somewhat likely to participate

- **77%**
  - In-person seminar in global region: 77% of respondents are likely or somewhat likely to participate

- **71%**
  - In-person seminar in another global region: 71% of respondents are likely or somewhat likely to participate
Next Steps

While the results of this impact survey have demonstrated that our courses are already an effective tool to help government officials and civil society actors approach their work with an atrocity prevention lens, we have also identified some common requests and trends in our short-, mid-, and long-term follow up with alumni that could further multiply our impact.

Particularly in the Conflict-Related Atrocity Crimes Prevention (CRACP) program, we have seen an increase in curriculum developers and staff trainers from ministries of defense and the interior, peacekeeping training centers, and the armed forces in our courses. In our follow ups, it's become evident that many of these alumni have incorporated content from our courses into their curricula. To assist them with this, we are in the process of developing a toolkit on how to incorporate the course content into their curriculum, and are working on simplifying the CRACP curriculum to be more appropriate for entry-level officers.

While we have been able to initiate these projects in collaboration with our other program offices, we are still constrained by funding, which limits the number of courses we are able to offer each year, the number of courses we are able to develop, and the number of courses we are able to have translated into other languages. With the addition of two courses in Brazilian Portuguese and French, we have been able to establish a strong alumni base in Brazil and French speaking countries in Africa. However, we have not been able to translate other courses into these languages, which limits our ability to keep these alumni engaged long-term in the Online Education Program. We receive high numbers of inquiries about our online courses from individuals in these regions and consistently receive more applications than we can accommodate in each course, but we are only able to offer one course in each of these languages each year.

Additionally, lack of funding limits our ability to develop new courses on commonly requested topics. We have many alumni who have taken all of our courses and are requesting additional online education opportunities. Pressing issues facing our alumni we have considered for course topics include democratic values and atrocity prevention, the prevention of electoral violence, non-state armed groups, and cybersecurity.

One innovation we’ve made to reduce this funding gap is to offer our courses to paid participants in the Global North. Governments have the opportunity to contract a national course specifically for their personnel, or to pay for individual spots in global editions of our courses. For national courses, we work with experts to tailor the course to reflect ongoing issues facing the State. This is a new approach that we are still developing a strategy for, and has yet to reach its full potential. If you or your institution is interested in contracting a course with us, please contact the Online Education Team at online.education@auschwitzinstitute.org.

It’s both evident that our courses have a significant multiplier effect and that demand for our courses far exceeds what we are able to provide at this time. With additional funding, we will be able to further innovate to improve and expand the online experience for our alumni.
Appendix A
Survey Questions

1. When did you last complete an online course with AIPG?
   a. Less than 6 months ago
   b. 6 months to 1 year ago
   c. More than 1 year ago
   d. I don’t remember

2. What is your home country?

3. In what kind of institution, organization, or ministry do you work?
   a. Armed Forces/Police
   b. Human Rights Secretariat/Ministry
   c. Ministry of Culture
   d. Ministry of Defense
   e. Ministry of Education
   f. Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Diplomatic Service
   g. Ministry of Justice
   h. Ministry of Health
   i. Legislative Body
   j. Ombudsperson's Office
   k. Non-Governmental Organization/Civil Society
   l. University / Academia
   m. Other (please specify)

4. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following: An AIPG online course has positively impacted my ability to work in atrocity prevention.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

5. On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate your knowledge of genocide and mass atrocity prevention concepts before taking an AIPG online course, with 1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being highly knowledgeable?

6. On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate your knowledge of genocide and mass atrocity prevention concepts after taking an AIPG online course, with 1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being highly knowledgeable?
7. Have you recommended AIPG online courses to a colleague in your institution or another institution? If so, how many?
   a. 0
   b. 1-10
   c. 11-20
   d. 21-30
   e. 31-40
   f. 41-50
   g. More than 50

8. If yes, to colleagues in which other institutions have you recommended the courses?
   a. Only colleagues in my institution
   b. The following other institutions (please specify):

9. Have you shared knowledge and/or tools from the online courses with your colleagues or institution?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate your confidence in using the concepts and tools of genocide and mass atrocity prevention in your professional practice, with 1 being not at all confident and 10 being highly confident?

11. Can you name a policy or program that you have initiated or contributed to in which you used knowledge gained through an AIPG online course?
   a. Yes
   b. No

12. If yes, please describe this policy or program. If more than one, please describe all.

13. How much money was budgeted for the policy/policies or program(s)? For multiple policies or programs, please provide the combined total budget.

14. In what specific ways did AIPG online courses equip you with tools, training, or resources to contribute successfully to the policy/policies or program(s)?

15. Have you in any way integrated the learning from the course(s) you have taken into your day-to-day work?
   a. Yes
b. Tried but was unsuccessful

c. No

16. If yes, how?

17. If you tried but were unsuccessful, please describe any challenges you faced trying to integrate the learning from the course into your work.

18. Have you continued to seek out new knowledge and tools regarding genocide and mass atrocity prevention?
   a. Yes
   b. No

19. If yes, through what sources?

20. If AIPG offered the following training opportunities to your institution, how likely would you and your colleagues be to participate:
   a. Online courses (4-6 weeks)
   b. Online webinar (1-time event)
   c. In-person seminars in your country
   d. In-person seminars in a neighboring country
   e. In-person seminars in your global region
   f. In-person seminars in another global region
      i. Highly likely
      ii. Somewhat likely
      iii. Somewhat unlikely
      iv. Not at all likely

21. In the last month, what topics did you wish you had more knowledge about relating to atrocity prevention?

22. Could AIPG assist you in any other project that you are working on / would like to work on now or in the future? If yes, please describe the project.

23. Would you be willing to be contacted by a member of the AIPG Online Education Team to discuss your answers further?
   a. Yes
   b. No

24. If yes, please provide your name and email address below:

## Appendix B

### Distribution of Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>US, Europe, Oceania, and Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62 responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 countries</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Institutions by Region

In what kind of institution, organization, or ministry do you work?
Africa
In what kind of institution, organization, or ministry do you work?

Latin America

In what kind of institution, organization, or ministry do you work?

Europe, Asia, and Oceania
Appendix D
Quotes on Policies and Programs Alumni Have Contributed to or Influenced

“1. Reviewed the draft National TJ Bill 2019 to identify opportunities for it to address business-related atrocities in the Ugandan context 2. Produced a documentary featuring the narratives of victims and survivors of terrorist attacks and the excesses of counter-terrorism operations in Uganda and based on that developed IECs to advocate for the rights of the victims. 3. Initiated a project on police accountability and security sector reform to advocate for independent civilian police oversight and monitoring of the security sector for greater accountability to address the gross human rights violations and abuse perpetrated by security agencies in Uganda 5. Initiated a project to address Islamophobia and discrimination in Uganda using comic books.”

“Deux 02 atelier de vulgarisation des outils aux membres des Forces de Défense et de Sécurité - Un atelier de présentation de l’importance et la nécessité de la Mise en place d’un mécanisme de prévention aux acteurs étatiques et non étatiques - Un atelier de prévention des génocides et atrocités a l’attention des leaders jeunesse - Une séance d’information parlementaire avec les députés sur la mise en place d’un mécanisme de prévention.”

“The policy or program I contributed to in which I used knowledge gained through an AIPG online course is the transitional justice, because my country is the post conflict country. We live in civil war during many years, many people are killed by the rebels group, after this tragical situation, we have the post conflict country. We live in civil war during many years, many people are killed by the rebels group, after this tragical situation, we have organized the general elections and today all societies actors are working for the national reconciliation. As the Lecturer, I used the concept of transitional justice according to the AIPG online course to sensibilize people, the students and the CSO to change the mentality of political leaders in our society.”

“After my training, I proposed: 1 - the Peace and Entrepreneurship programme, which is a programme that mentors young victims of the conflicts in the east of the DRC and aims to promote resilience and contribute to their financial empowerment. 2 - I also initiated the "Carrefour des jeunes pour la paix" programme, a forum for young people from different backgrounds and cultural diversity to discuss issues relating to conflict prevention and, reconciliation and cohabitation, and the fight against violent extremism within their communities. The programme is held once a month and regularly brings together between 50 and 50 young people and leaders of youth organisations. 3 - Finally, thanks to the training I have received, I am in the process of setting up a conflict resolution mediation clinic.”

“Los conocimientos adquiridos en el curso de AIPG me permitieron, desde mi trabajo como abogado analista de la Unidad de Políticas Públicas de la Subsecretaría de Derechos Humanos, y con mi experiencia previa como abogado litigante de causas por graves violaciones a los derechos humanos cometidas en dictadura, cooperar con la revisión del Plan Nacional de Búsqueda, a cargo de la Unidad Programa de Derechos Humanos de la misma Subsecretaría. El Plan Nacional de Búsqueda tiene como objetivo general esclarecer las circunstancias de desaparición y/o muerte de las personas víctimas de desaparición forzada, de manera sistemática y permanente, de conformidad con las obligaciones del
Estado de Chile y los estándares internacionales. Adjunto enlace web para más información:
https://www.derechoshumanos.gob.cl/plan-nacional-de-busqueda/
Asimismo, mis conocimientos adquiridos en el curso AIPG los compartí con mis compañeras y compañeros de la Unidad de Formación y Capacitación de la misma Subsecretaría, lo cual permitió la generación del curso virtual "Verdad y Justicia: Pilares del Futuro Democrático", disponible en:
https://formacionddhh.minjusticia.gob.cl/

“Directa o indirectamente, la aplicabilidad de los conocimientos se ha enraizado en las diferentes acciones para mencionar algunas: 1 - Asesoría sobre los efectos de la corrupción y su impacto para el escalamiento de conflictos en relación a los crímenes atroces. 2 - Migración irregular y protección de los grupos en condición de vulnerabilidad. 3 - Formación del personal de los tres poderes del Estado en prevención de crímenes atroces -la idea sembrada en las nuevas autoridades de gobierno.”
Appendix E
Quotes on Useful Tools and Resources from Courses

“Enhanced my knowledge and skill in conducting training, and inspired me to reach out and engage in community peacebuilding initiatives.”

“First of all, it provided me an opportunity to think independently. Secondly, the materials provided by AIPG on a number of courses are enriching. It provided platform of different stakeholder participants where we interacted and engaged with each other, some directly from a policy development role, and that was helpful.”

“My knowledge about atrocities prevention is better structured and equipped with more concrete theoretical and conceptual knowledge together with concrete practical examples from different post-conflict societies.”

“Al tener este tipo de conocimientos y materias pude compartir con los dirigentes para que puedan introducir estos temas en sus diálogos comunitarios.”

“En la labor de presentar la resolución final que firma la titular de mi institución, según la constitución y leyes de la república, cada fallo debe estar debidamente fundamentado, es decir se debe de proveer de elementos y conceptos que sostenga ese fallo, y es en esa etapa en la que los conocimientos adquiridos en los cursos me proporcionan información, legislación, jurisprudencia u otros lugares en donde busca la información que fundamenta el fallo de esta Procuraduría.”

“Incorporating learning into day-to-day work.”
Appendix F
Quotes on Integrating Knowledge from the Courses into Day-to-Day Work

“Knowledge has been integrated into our programs since all programs are approached with an atrocity prevention lens.”

“Whenever crafting project goals, I have been checking which stage the project seeks to intersect the conflict whether upstream, midstream or downstream. This has also informed the specific activities that can be adopted to achieve the goals faster, the partners to work with as well as the mode of work.”

“Whenever I give a presentation during the training sessions at work, I incorporate some of the key lessons learnt from the course to the recommendations I make to improve our work ethics.”

“I am better informed and more conscious of how to relate to people around me.”

“I am more aware of the atrocity prevention data points to look out for. I always consider the atrocity prevention lenses when assessing human rights risks.”

“În elaborarea Instrucțiunilor referitoare la modul de gestionare a fluxului de refugiați pe teritoriul Moldovei”

“Understanding and approach to the legacy of past events in which massive war crimes were committed has shifted after AIPG program. I am no longer “sticked“ to the concepts related to non-recurrence but to prevention mechanisms.”

“Entregando orientación a dirigentes sociales y comunitarios en consultas con respecto a sus comunidades.”

“Este año se conmemoraron 50 años del golpe de Estado en Chile, lo que significó participar activamente de diversas acciones, así como preparar contenidos y materiales de difusión con un enfoque preventivo garantías de no repetición.”
Appendix G

Quotes on Challenges Alumni Faced in Integrating Knowledge into Day-to-Day Work

“The main challenge I have faced is to explain to grantors about the subtle changes the project may require given the change in the conflict dynamics between the grant application and implementation. During application, some projects target to undertake conflict prevention but by the time they are due for implementation, conflict has already begun or is even over. At the same time, amendment of project activities must still be within the organization’s areas of focus.”

“It is very challenging to reach out to the wider public with the issues related to the post-war society development especially if you want to tackle issues which oppose the dominant narrative. Moreover, it is quite challenging to teach and publicly discuss about peace-building in a context which entails ideological perspective and is not related to, sometimes banal understanding of inter-cultural learning.”