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How can we as NHRI work on human rights education? Is there a growing consensus in the international community that national human rights institutions (NHRIs) can play a unique role in the promotion of effective policies for human rights education. But how can we, as NHRIs, improve at setting strategic priorities for human rights education and create more sustainable and far-reaching results?

In this guide we suggest common standards for NHRI work on human rights education. These common standards have been developed on the basis of the direction and framework given to NHRIs in the Paris Principles (1993), as well as on the roles and responsibilities that NHRIs have subsequently been called upon to fulfill as new instruments are adopted. The common standards have been developed with a view to identifying challenges and are based on examples of good practice in work with human rights education across mandate areas.

We hope this guide will provide conceptual clarity on the roles and responsibilities of NHRIs in the field of human rights education. The guide is practical rather than theoretical and therefore contains several hands-on exercises that can be used to facilitate dialogue, debate and reflection among and within NHRIs.

The NHRI Network on Human Rights Education
National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) are key in promoting human rights through human rights education. A 2016 UN resolution on Human Rights Education emphasises the strategic role of NHRIs concerning the promotion of human rights education.¹ The resolution reconfirms and supplements state parties’ commitment to national implementation of international standards for human rights education five years on from the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training of 2011.²

Human rights education is strongly anchored in international standards and norms and the international human rights framework provides NHRIs with a broad range of mandates to monitor and promote the status of human rights, hereunder in relation to education. However, the framework gives little direction on how we, as NHRIs, can prioritise our work in line with our specific roles and responsibilities and thereby ensure the highest quality and impact. As a result, many of us face a number of compound challenges in our human rights education work.

In 2014 The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) conducted a survey amongst sister NHRIs and human rights education experts on the type of human rights education work NHRIs do and prioritise.³ The survey documented that we as NHRIs lack a common understanding and vision for NHRI roles and responsibilities in relation to human rights education. The survey showed that we are challenged by an absence of common standards and guidelines and lack knowledge about strategic approaches to human rights education.³ As a result we often focus on our own face-to-face training activities, and human rights education initiatives and interventions risk being random and scattered. This finding was confirmed on several occasions under the auspices of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education, as well as in a learning needs assessment conducted by The Danish Institute for Human Rights on behalf of The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in 2016.⁵

If we - as NHRIs - are to create long-lasting human rights change through human rights education, there is a need for us to build on the existing focus on conducting our own face-to-face training activities, training of trainers and producing of education materials. Moreover, in addition to this we need to set priorities which allow us to do strategic planning and work across the core NHRI mandates. This should include monitoring of human rights education, strengthening human rights education in the reporting to the UN treaty bodies and the Universal Periodic Review process, and provision of coordination and advisory services to governments, parliaments and education authorities, thereby working on strategic interventions with particular regard to formal and non-formal education.
This guide aims to support NHRIs in adopting a strategic approach to human rights education based on guided exercises and reflections on their contexts, the challenges they meet and the unique roles and responsibilities of NHRIs in the field of human rights education.

A strategic approach to human rights education implies that we as NHRIs focus our work on both the structural level (with the goal of influencing the adoption of effective policies for human rights education, inter alia impacting curriculum development), as well as on contributing to the implementation of education programmes. The conjunction of working at both levels is what qualifies the monitoring and follow-up processes and allows us to provide timely and relevant advice on human rights education to duty-bearers. By embedding human rights standards and principles at policy level, we will have a far greater reach and a more sustainable impact on the education sector than if we focus on transmitting these core values through our own education activities alone.
1.1 TARGET GROUP
This guide is developed for staff and managers in NHRIs who would like to strengthen organisational results by working more strategically with human rights education.

NHRIs differ - each has particular capacities, resources and challenges depending on the context they operate in. Some have departments dedicated to human rights education while others assign human rights education related tasks to a single person.

The use of the guide presupposes basic knowledge of human rights and human rights education.

1.2 CONSULTATION
This guide is a product of joint enterprise and cooperation. The concept, coordination and editing of the publication have been carried out by The Danish Institute for Human Rights.

The Danish Institute for Human Rights has received valuable inputs and inspirational tools and ideas from the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education, including representatives from NHRIs in South Africa, Uganda, Kenya, Germany, Mongolia, Australia, the Philippines, Ecuador, Korea, Holland and Denmark who have shared material, provided input to case studies, as well as testing and qualifying dialogue activities throughout 2015-2017.

The first consultative process was based on a survey of NHRIs followed by two human rights education events, in 2014 and 2016, with the aim of strengthening the capacity of NHRIs on human rights education. The focus was on discussing difficulties and sharing experiences.

Participants included both NHRI specialists from the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education and human rights education experts (from the International Coordinating Committee for NHRIs, the Inter-American Human Rights Institute, Human Rights Education Associates, the Raoul Wallenberg Institute and one human rights education consultant from Tunisia and one from Denmark). Reports summarising conclusions and the respective expertise of participants at both these human rights education events, including a recommendation report, are available.

In addition to drawing on these steps of the consultative process, the guide draws upon: a panel on roles and good practice in the area of human rights education including for NHRIs at the 6th International Human Rights Education Conference in Middelburg in 2015; on ad hoc bilateral consultations with members of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education as the guide has been developed; and finally, it draws upon a 2016 learning needs assessment conducted by The Danish Institute for Human Rights on behalf of The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions of 20 NHRIs (and regional networks), with only a few overlaps with those NHRIs represented in the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education.
Challenges and requests for guidance related to data collection, baseline analysis, National Action Plans, guidelines on strengthening human rights education in the reporting to the UN treaty bodies and UPR process, legal briefs on human rights education, and on measuring the learning effect of human rights education interventions, were raised during the consultation processes.

In addition, the potential role of NHRI s with regard to data collection on human rights education under target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals was raised during the consultation process. However, these specific areas of intervention are considered outside the scope of this guide, and NHRI resources remain yet to be developed in some of these areas of common interest.

With regard to data collection and baseline analysis, the Danish Institute for Human Rights, on behalf of the Global Alliance of NHRI s, subsequently initiated the development of a blended learning course with the overall objective of strengthening the competences of human rights education staff and managers. This was developed in a parallel process intended to advance the competences amongst NHRI s in the area of human rights education data collection and baseline analysis as a planning base for influence at the structural level in formal education. The blended learning course is being conducted in three of the four regions in collaboration with the regional coordinating committees, namely: the European Network of National Human Rights Institutions; the Network of African National Human Rights Institutions; and The Inter-American Institute of Human Rights. A parallel human rights education course for NHRI s was arranged by the Asia Pacific Forum with presentations from the Danish Institute for Human Rights team behind The Global Alliance of NHRI s blended learning course. The online course on human rights education for NHRI s is available free of charge and can be taken independently of the face-to-face part of the blended course.

Concerning the potential role of NHRI s in relation to human rights education and target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals, the Danish Institute for Human Rights has subsequently
been commissioned by the Danish Mission to the UN to develop a framework of indicators for human rights education and to support OHCHR in setting up a global OHCHR mechanism for data collection on human rights education under target 4.7.

In this process, the aim is to position NHRIs - including NHRIs in the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education - as potential data providers on human rights education under target 4.7 of the SDGs.17

“Besides the expressed need for common standards and support in the identification of strategic approaches to human rights education in relation to the particular roles and responsibilities of NHRIs, a specific request from the majority of NHRIs at both NHRI Network meetings and in the two surveys, was for inspiration on the concept of curriculum development.

Therefore a next step will be to develop guidelines for NHRIs on curriculum development under the auspices of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education.
1.3 OUTLINE OF THE GUIDE

2. INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR NHRIs AND HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

In chapter two we explore the international framework for human rights education and particularly NHRI work on human rights education. Looking back, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Paris Principles, the World Programme for Human Rights Education, the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training, documents from the UN Secretary General, The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions and, most recently, the Human Rights Council Resolution marking the fifth anniversary of the declaration on human rights education, together outline a broad range of roles and responsibilities for NHRIs. The chapter also examines the Sustainable Development Goals as an opportunity to position NHRIs as data providers on human rights education, and for us to be more efficient in our human rights education agenda-setting activities.

The chapter ends with a dialogue activity on existing human rights education interventions across core mandate areas.

3. KEY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

In this chapter we present you with an overview of key issues and challenges that we as NHRIs are facing in our human rights education work. The chapter is based on two recent surveys of NHRIs, which have been discussed on various occasions by members of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education as well as during the overall consultation process.

The chapter contains two exercises. The first is designed as an individual exercise where the reader can self assess in relation to key issues and challenges raised in the chapter. The second is a prioritisation of possible actions to be taken according to the factors: projected impact and effort required.
4. UNFOLDING HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION ACROSS CORE MANDATES

In chapter four we elaborate on how NHRI’s can work with human rights education across core mandate areas. We highlight cases from Korea, Denmark, Australia, Germany and Kenya, in which we, in our national contexts, have fulfilled our unique role and responsibilities and worked across core mandate areas. These include monitoring the status of human rights education, conducting training and relation building with key duty-bearers, advising government, parliament and education authorities as well as coordinating and cooperating with national stakeholders and the international human rights system.

The chapter presents three exercises on how to strengthen the scoping of your approach to human rights education. The first is an individual reflection exercise on the monitoring activities of your NHRI. The second exercise is a dialogue activity on human rights education interventions at the individual, organisational, national and international levels and where you think the potential lies to ensure outreach, quality and effect. The last exercise is a dialogue activity to motivate discussion on how best to influence policy-making processes and strengthen relation building with duty-bearers.

5. ADOPTING A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

In this chapter we discuss how adopting strategic approaches to human rights education can help NHRI’s prioritise their resources and efforts to achieve a planned impact or result.

The chapter introduces two exercises. The first is on strategic planning of human rights education interventions with inspiration from the Logical Framework Approach, the second is an exercise in prioritisation of possible actions by factoring in projected impact and effort required.
6. COMMON STANDARDS FOR NHRIS ON HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

Based on the previous chapters we introduce a framework for Common Standards for NHRIs on human rights education including ten NHRI human rights education principles that we believe should guide NHRI work on human rights education.

The chapter introduces two exercises. The first exercise is on setting strategic NHRI priorities for human rights education in relation to human rights challenges. The second one is a checklist exercise comprising a short research assignment and reflection on the Common Standards for NHRIs on human rights education.
2. INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR HRE AND NHRIs

In this chapter we will take you through the international definition of human rights education and provide an overview of states’ hard and soft law obligations. This should inform us as NHRIs on how to develop and adopt human rights education strategies suitable to our national contexts.

The point of departure of this guide is the definition of human rights education as set by the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training (2011), and the specific directions given to NHRIs on their responsibilities in the Paris Principles (1993).

As new instruments are adopted, NHRIs are regularly called upon to play a role, which is why we, in this chapter, extract the sources of the international framework for the roles and responsibilities of NHRIs in relation to human rights education.
2.1 DEFINITION OF HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

In practice human rights education is understood in various ways, and experience shows that as NHRIs we have different understandings of what human rights education encompasses. The definition of human rights education expressed by the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training is widely and internationally accepted.

Learning Dimensions: Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes

The Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training describes human rights education as all types of education, training, information and learning activities that contribute to the prevention of human rights violations and abuses. By providing persons with knowledge, skills and understanding, and developing their attitudes and behaviours, human rights education empowers individuals to contribute to the building and promotion of a universal culture of human rights.

These three learning dimensions - knowledge, skills and attitudes - have been highlighted as central to education in different forms, including by educational psychologist Benjamin Bloom in 1956. Bloom wanted to promote higher forms of thinking in education and suggested a taxonomy of learning objectives which consists of six major categories, namely: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, rather than just memorisation of facts.

Apart from ‘knowledge’, these categories were presented as skills and abilities and based on the understanding also prevailing in the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training, that knowledge is the necessary precondition for putting skills into practice.

In human rights education it is crucial that all the three learning dimensions are addressed. It is not enough for learners to know about human rights; they must also be able to act upon their acquired knowledge and have the confidence to exercise their rights and to respect those of others. To achieve this, the target groups need the skills and willingness to be able to apply, promote and protect human rights.

Didactic Principles: About, Through and For

Human rights education focuses not only on the learning objectives concerning knowledge, skills and attitudes of the individual learner, but also on the learning process, learning environment and context.

This is likewise expressed in the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training, which states that human rights education should encompass education about, through and for human rights:
All three didactic principles are important. However, one could argue that education for human rights is the most crucial, albeit the most complicated, level to achieve. It is one thing to learn the history of human rights or understand the functions of the human rights system. It is quite another to successfully design a didactic setting that enables learners to build skills and attitudes that empower them to enjoy and exercise their rights, and to respect and uphold the rights of others.

2.2 CONVENTIONS AND DECLARATIONS
The preamble to the soft law UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, ‘every individual and every organ of society shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms’. Article 26 furthermore lists the aim of education to be ‘directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace’.

Some UN hard law conventions encompass a similarly worded obligation for states to conduct human rights education and to spread awareness of human rights in general, thereby providing a framework for NHRI work with human rights education. For example, the Interna-
The Convention on the Rights of the Child emphasises that:

 States Parties agree that the education of the child shall be directed to (…) the development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.27

It stresses that the state has an obligation to make the rights contained in the Convention widely known to both children and adults.28

tional Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights stresses that the right to education should aim at strengthening respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms:

‘The States Parties (…) agree that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. They further agree that education shall enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace’.26

The Convention on the Rights of the Child emphasises that:

 States Parties agree that the education of the child shall be directed to (…) the development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.27

It stresses that the state has an obligation to make the rights contained in the Convention widely known to both children and adults.28
2.3 NHRIs AND THE PARIS PRINCIPLES

NHRIs are state-funded institutions within the public administration and function independently from government. This places well-functioning NHRIs in a unique position from where they can act as a bridge between government, parliament, education authorities, educational institutions, civil servants, civil society and civil society organisations, as well as the business community.

The Paris Principles, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1993, are a mix of broad and very specific provisions which direct the establishment and accreditation of NHRIs. The Paris Principles cover i) competences and responsibilities, ii) composition and guarantees of independence and pluralism, iii) methods of operation and, iv) additional principles concerning the status of commissions with quasi-judicial competence.

The Paris Principles have been the subject of General Observations developed over several years by the ICC (now GANHRI) Sub-Committee on Accreditation, and subsequently endorsed by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions. The sub-committee on accreditation provides the following guidance on the meanings of ‘promotion’ and ‘protection’ as competences of NHRIs:

• **Promotion** includes those functions that seek to create a society where human rights are more broadly understood and respected. Such functions may include education, training, advising, public outreach and advocacy.

• **Protection** includes those functions that address and seek to prevent actual human rights violations. Such functions include monitoring, enquiring, investigating and reporting on human rights violations, and may include individual complaint handling.²⁹

The Paris Principles are the international minimum standards for NHRIs. They are not aspirational - what NHRIs should be - but obligatory - what NHRIs must be, if they are to be legitimate, credible and effective in their core competences of promotion and protection of human rights.
With regard to human rights education, the General Assembly (in the preamble to the resolution to which the Paris Principles is an annex) reaffirms the important and constructive role played by national institutions. In its operative clauses, the resolution affirms the advisory capacity of NHRIs in relation to competent authorities, and the role of NHRIs in the dissemination of human rights information and in education in human rights. In relation to responsibilities related to awareness raising and education, The Paris Principles specifically provide NHRIs with the responsibility to:

• Assist in the formulation of programmes for the teaching of, and research into, human rights and to take part in their execution in schools, universities and professional circles.

• Publicise human rights and efforts to combat all forms of discrimination, in particular racial discrimination, by increasing public awareness, especially through information and education and by making use of all press organs.

2.4 PARIS PRINCIPLES AND MANDATE AREAS

Due to institutional diversity among NHRIs - they operate in different regions, countries and legal systems - their mandates and powers vary greatly. However, the areas of responsibility of NHRIs with regard to human rights education are set out in various authoritative sources, not only by the World Programme for Human Rights Education (WPHRE) and the Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. In an extensive OHCHR publication on the history, role and responsibilities of NHRIs, human rights education is placed under the area ‘promotion’, whereas the other areas of responsibility are grouped into ‘protection’, ‘advising’, ‘monitoring’ and ‘coordination and cooperation’. These five overall areas of responsibility we will call ‘core mandate areas’.

In the experience of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education, human rights education is often understood broadly as promotional activities including awareness raising campaigns, informational activities on human rights thematic issues or dissemination of flyers. However, in line with the definition of human rights education set in the International Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training, human rights education is a process that provides persons with knowledge, skills and attitudes, and based on the didactic principles of education about, for and through human rights.

Therefore, we suggest that promotional activities of NHRIs reported as training or awareness raising which do not relate to all three learning dimensions should not qualify as human rights
education learning situations, but as information activities, unless they are awareness raising or training which promote human rights education itself.

2.5 THE ROLE OF NHRIs IN HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION DECLARATION

In 2011 the UN General Assembly adopted the soft law Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. This declaration reaffirms the human rights education principles and standards of human rights treaties and acknowledges the importance of human rights education for the realisation of all human rights. It reiterates that human rights education is key to building a universal culture of human rights and that human rights education is an important contribution to the prevention of human rights violations.

The Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training emphasises that NHRIs should be
included in the member states’ ‘conception, implementation and evaluation of and follow-up to such strategies, action plans, policies and programmes’.

Besides highlighting NHRIs in this paragraph as stakeholders alongside civil society and private sector actors, an entire paragraph is dedicated to the establishment and role of NHRIs.

In this, NHRIs are exclusively recognised and called upon to take on an important and, where necessary, a coordinating role in promoting human rights education.

Moreover, it emphasises that states should ‘promote the establishment, development and strengthening of effective and independent national human rights institutions, in compliance with the Paris Principles, recognising that national human rights institutions can play an important role, including, where necessary, a coordinating role, in promoting human rights education and training by, inter alia, raising awareness and mobilising relevant public and private actors’.

2.6 PROGRAMMES, RESOLUTIONS AND GUIDELINES

In 1978 an intergovernmental seminar organised by the then UN Commission on Human Rights produced the first set of guidelines on NHRIs and formulated the first roles of NHRIs with regard to human rights education. These expressed two important NHRI functions:

- To provide assistance in educating public opinion and promoting awareness of and respect for human rights.
- To act as a source of human rights information for the government and people of the country.

At the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in June 1993, representatives of 171 states adopted the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, reaffirming

...the important and constructive role played by national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights, in particular in their advisory capacity to competent authorities, their role in remedying human rights violations, in the dissemination of human rights information and education in human rights.

The UN Decade for Human Rights Education beginning in 1995 was proclaimed by the UN General Assembly based on a suggestion of the World Conference on Human Rights. The objectives for the decade included assessing the needs and formulating strategies on human rights education and strengthening human rights education programmes, the development
of education materials and disseminating the Universal Declaration on Human Rights globally.

NHRIs were described as playing a central role in the development and coordination and implementation of human rights education on a national level. The World Programme

The World Programme for Human Rights Education (WPHRE, 2005-ongoing) was initiated by the UN General Assembly in response to the achievements of the UN Decade for human rights education. Its aim is to encourage the implementation of human rights education programmes in all sectors. Its goal is to promote a common understanding of the basic principles and methodologies of human rights education. In addition, it is also to provide a framework for action and to strengthen partnerships and cooperation across international and grass-roots levels. The World Programme is structured in consecutive phases of four years each focusing on specific target groups and issues.

The first phase of the World Programme for human rights education (WPHRE I, 2005-2009) focuses on human rights education in the primary and secondary school systems and teacher training. Regarding implementation of human rights education, NHRIs are highlighted as a key national agency that should be involved. In its appendix NHRIs are outlined as playing a role in ‘educational policy development, programme planning, research, teacher training, development and dissemination of materials’. The Plan of Action for WPHRE I stresses that promoting a rights-based approach to education enables the education system to fulfil its fundamental mission to secure quality education for all. Human Rights-Based Approaches (HRBAs) are a set of methods that can help strengthen the way NHRIs plan and carry out human rights education in concrete training activities. Essentially, HRBAs provide tools that help integrate the norms, standards and principles of international human rights into any work process.

HRBAs relate to both means and ends; thus what is achieved is as important as how it is done. This implies that human rights principles should guide the programming of human rights education training activities.

These principles include: universality and inalienability; indivisibility; interdependence and interrelatedness; non-discrimination and equality; participation and inclusion; accountability and the rule of law.

The second phase of the World Programme for human rights education (WPHRE II, 2010-2014)
focuses on human rights education in higher education and human rights training of teachers and educators, civil servants, law enforcement officials and military personnel.

"NHRIs are described as one of several key bodies that work with state agencies in scoping, planning, implementing and evaluating human rights education programmes for these target groups.

Furthermore, NHRIs are tasked with establishing research partnerships with higher education institutions to inform human rights education policies and practice, and ‘establishing links, partnerships and networks to facilitate collaboration and information exchange between researchers of different higher education institutions’.46

The third phase of the World Programme for human rights education (WPHRE III, 2015–2019) focuses on strengthening the implementation of the first two phases and promoting human rights training for media professionals and journalists. 47 NHRIs are assigned ‘responsibility for the design and delivery of appropriate human rights education strategies and activities for media professionals and journalists’.
NHRIs are also identified as key actors for national coordination work and it is proclaimed that ‘governments should identify a relevant department as a focal point for coordinating the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the national strategy, working closely with the relevant ministries and all other national actors, in particular national human rights institutions and civil society.\(^{48}\)

**NHRIs to Promote Effective Human Rights Education Policies**

In 2016 the United Nations Human Rights Council passed the above-mentioned Resolution on Human Rights Education and Training, which supplements and reinforces the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training of 2011.\(^{49}\) The resolution recognises:

The important role of national human rights institutions in promoting effective policies on human rights education and training, and calls upon them to contribute further to the implementation of human rights education programmes.\(^{50}\)

This paragraph marks a shift for us NHRIs, as the resolution recognises the important and strategic role we can play at policy level with a further contribution to the implementation of human rights education programmes. In comparison, the role of civil society organisations is highlighted in relation to promoting and providing human rights education and training only.\(^{51}\)

**Participation at the UN Level**

Moreover, Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs enjoy participation rights in a number of UN intergovernmental working groups. NHRIs can contribute to deliberations at the Human Rights Council in line with our mandates.\(^{52}\) By submitting parallel reports, documents and by meeting informally with members of UN treaty bodies, we as NHRIs can bring valuable information to the international and regional systems and back from the international system to stakeholders at the national level. Thereby we are signified as functioning as independent and critical actors at the UN, which gives us the role of data providers on the challenges that remain for human rights education.

NHRIs are provided with a clear role at the Human Rights Council sessions. This is the case for the Universal Periodic Review sessions where NHRIs can, inter alia, make general comments prior to HRC adoption of the UPR Working Group’s reports on their country.\(^{53}\) In addition, Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs can - along with Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions and regional coordinating bodies - make statements at the Human Rights Council sessions and, for instance, submit documents.
An example of this is the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions statement delivered by the Danish Institute for Human Rights on the unique role of NHRIs in promoting effective policies for human rights education at the Human Rights Council’s 33rd session in Geneva in 2016. The High Level Discussion marked the 5th Anniversary of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training.

In the statement, the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions welcomes the enhanced strategic role of NHRIs recognised in the 2016 resolution on human rights education and elaborates on the potential role of NHRIs to work across their mandate areas.

Moreover, the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions encourages states to invite NHRIs to support the advancement of the implementation of human rights education in formal and nonformal education, and highlights their potential role of serving as independent advisers on human rights education to government, parliament and educational authorities. Finally, the statement emphasises the potential role NHRIs can play with regard to monitoring and data collection on human rights education related to target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

2.7 THE 2030 AGENDA AND HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION
The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is an ambitious global agenda on environmental, social and economic development.

Because the scope of the SDGs is universal, and not limited to ‘developing states’, unlike the preceding Millennium Development Goals, the SDGs present an opportunity to shift conversations about development towards collaborative frameworks for societal change. With the cross-cutting principle of ‘leaving no-one behind’, the sustainable development goals represent a strong commitment to non-discrimination, and highlight the need to make special efforts to reach vulnerable groups.

Goal 4 centres on education and calls on states to ensure inclusive and equitable, good quality education, and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Target 7 under this goal is particularly relevant to human rights education, as it states:

"
States are expected to engage in the systematic follow-up and review of the implementation of this agenda. Whereas the goals and targets prescribe what change is needed, an accompanying set of global indicators defines how progress on each target will be measured. In 2016 indicator 4.7.1 was adopted in relation to goal 4. Opening up new possibilities for monitoring human rights education, this indicator assesses progress on goal 4 by the ‘extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in:

- National education policies
- Curricula
- Teacher education
- Student assessment

With target 4.7 and indicator 4.7.1, states and education stakeholders have new leverage for promoting human rights education and engaging in dialogues with government, parliament and education authorities. With our unique position and in-depth knowledge of the human rights situation in our countries, NHRIs are well suited to take a lead in coordinating relevant education actors to define a nationally relevant approach to human rights education. At the same time, the fact that states are supposed to monitor their progress on human rights education using indicator 4.7.1 provides an opportunity for NHRIs to generate data on the actual implementation of human rights education at the national level - and to feed these data into national monitoring and planning efforts, particularly in formal education.

As there are no minimum requirements for NHRIs’ human rights education priorities in either the Paris Principles or the international framework in general, we as NHRIs can understand our NHRI human rights education mandate to be rather ambiguous. However, the responsibilities given to NHRIs by the Paris Principles and the consequent roles NHRIs are being called upon to play as new programmes and instruments are adopted, provide a broad backdrop for formulating common NHRI standards on human rights education.
2.8 DIALOGUE ACTIVITY

ANALYSING EXISTING INTERVENTIONS ACROSS CORE MANDATE AREAS

AIM  ♦  To reflect upon the roles and responsibilities of your NHRI with regard to the international framework for NHRI and human rights education and to analyse how your institution’s existing human rights education interventions are located across the core mandate areas.

HOW

Step 1: In silence, each participant notes his or her most important human rights education tasks on post-it notes.

Step 2: On flipchart paper or a whiteboard, write a headline for each mandate area leaving space for placing post-it notes.

Step 3: Participants place their notes under the relevant mandate areas (outlined in the table below), explaining how the human rights education task relates to the chosen mandate area.

SUMMING UP AND DIALOGUE

•  What do you think of the distribution of the post-it notes? Does it reflect the amount of resources spent?

•  In what mandate areas do you have the most impact or result?

•  What would be the ideal distribution of human rights education tasks/interventions/ focus in your NHRI in order to leverage your impact and create sustainable human rights education results?

TIP: Since human rights education is an area that would in most contexts not be the object of an individual complaint or alternative dispute resolution, we argue that this part of the core NHRI mandate is seldom relevant for human rights education, even if we as NHRI have quasi-jurisdictional competence. You will therefore most likely not place many interventions in the area ‘Human Rights Protection’.

Copy and use the sheet on page 29.
## CORE MANDATE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN RIGHTS PROMOTION</th>
<th>HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION</th>
<th>ADVISING THE GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT</th>
<th>MONITORING HUMAN RIGHTS</th>
<th>COORDINATION AND COOPERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public education</td>
<td>General human rights</td>
<td>Reviewing existing legislation,</td>
<td>Monitoring a country’s</td>
<td>Relation building to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Formal sector)</td>
<td>investigations</td>
<td>policy or practice</td>
<td>human rights situation</td>
<td>government and parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education</td>
<td>Investigating individual</td>
<td>Reviewing proposed legislation,</td>
<td></td>
<td>The international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Informal sector)</td>
<td>complaints</td>
<td>policy or practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>human rights system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td>Alternative dispute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>institutions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regional networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relation building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with civil society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Notes:
- Notes:
- Notes:
- Notes:
- Notes:
In this chapter, we point to five key issues and challenges for NHRI working with human rights education based on the 2014 and 2016 surveys as well as on reports from the two events in the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education and the overall consultation processes.  

The focus is on the kinds of interventions NHRI are implementing in this period of time, what NHRI see as key challenges and their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of NHRI in relation to human rights education.

At the end of the chapter, we introduce two exercises. The first is designed as an individual exercise where you are to self-assess key issues and challenges for your NHRI based on the issues raised in the chapter. The second exercise is a group exercise for human rights education experts and management designed to foster dialogue on the challenges you see for your NHRI’s human rights education priority setting.
3.1 NHRIs LACK COMMON HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION STANDARDS

The 2014 survey conducted amongst NHRIs and human rights education experts asked NHRIs about their main expectations of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education.

‘Clarity of NHRI role in human rights education’ and ‘How to identify priority areas’ were listed most often.61

As stated, the international human rights framework provides NHRIs with a broad range of responsibilities and roles in relation to human rights education. However, the framework gives NHRIs little direction on how to carry out human rights education more precisely, to ensure best quality and effect, nor on how to take advantage of our unique role as a broker between the state, civil society and, for example, businesses. This makes it a challenge for many NHRIs to plan and prioritise human rights education initiatives.

As there are no minimum standards, NHRIs can do very little human rights education work and still be seen as fulfilling their roles and responsibilities related to human rights education.

3.2 NHRIs DO NOT WORK WITH HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION ACROSS THEIR CORE MANDATE AREAS

Overall, the 2014 survey showed that many NHRIs embrace a narrow understanding of human rights education activities. Based on this, NHRIs have a tendency to confine their human rights education responsibilities to the core mandate area ‘promotion’ that specifically mentions education, in spite of the overall international framework for human rights education which describes potential responsibilities and roles across several core mandate areas.

In the 2016 survey NHRIs were asked to indicate the main human rights education activities that their NHRI had undertaken over the past three years:

• Only 6% indicated that they had worked with national policy activity.
• 50% indicated they had worked with awareness raising campaigns.
• Training of specific target groups (e.g. students or the police) came in second with 22% describing this as their main human rights education activity.62

In addition, from the overall consultation process it has become evident that there are limited experiences with NHRI human rights education participation in the UN system. As argued, NHRIs can play an important role in providing policy advice to government on education reform, on how to integrate human rights education into the official curriculum or by cooperating with international, regional and national organisations on promoting human rights education.

Adjusting this modus operandi of not working with human rights education across several core
mandate areas may, for some NHRI$s$, have organisational implications.

It requires both adopting a strategic approach to human rights education with clear goals adjusted to national challenges, and the development of new staff competences.

For example, human rights education educators might not have experience of drafting legal briefs, and those NHRI staff that usually write legal briefs might not have human rights education expertise.

**3.3 NHRI$s$ LIMIT THEIR ACTIVITIES TO THEIR OWN EDUCATION AND INFORMATION ACTIVITIES**

In the 2014 survey, respondents were asked to assess how important they found the different NHRI core mandate areas with respect to their work on human rights education.

The result from the survey clearly showed a discrepancy between what the NHRI respondents find important with regard to human rights education and what they are actually doing.

When respondents were asked to do the exercise of placing their human rights education activities across the core mandated areas, the result was that ‘Advising the Government and Parliament on human rights education’ and ‘Monitoring human rights education’ are perceived as the most important mandate areas. However, it was noted at the 2014 human rights education event that when we as members of the NHRI Network describe our actual human rights education activities, we have a tendency to prioritise face-to-face training for specific groups and levels.

The 2016 survey supports this tendency amongst NHRI$s$ to focus human rights education activities on ad hoc training, and conducting lectures and seminars as part of e.g. training of civil servants and community outreach.

It is often relevant - and sometimes necessary - for NHRI$s$ to conduct education and public awareness activities to reach otherwise inaccessible target groups. Such activities are feasible for most people and organisations to carry out.

However, in most contexts there will be limitations to how many classrooms and civil servants the NHRI will be able to reach due to resources. If NHRI$s$’ work on human rights education is to have a further-reaching and longer-lasting impact, we need to also promote human rights education in formal educational structures and consequently to work strategically with human rights education monitoring, advice and coordination.
3.4 NHRIs COULD DO MORE STRATEGIC PLANNING ON HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

Even when NHRIs have a unit or department to meet the responsibility of promoting human rights education, it seems from both the 2014 and 2016 surveys that these interventions are sometimes not very strategic. The human rights education priorities that form the basis for the programmes or activities are seldom founded on a systematic baseline or situational analysis of human rights education, nor are they programmed across core mandate areas or directed towards creating structural changes in the education system.

“ This observation of uncertainty about what strategies to adopt, and the lack of common standards for how we as NHRIs can benefit from our unique position for national implementation of human rights education, was confirmed at the two DIHR-facilitated events and in the general consultation process, where NHRIs indicated that they would like support in developing a more strategic approach to their human rights education programming.

3.5 NHRIs DO NOT SYSTEMATICALLY MEASURE HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION IMPACT

As NHRIs we seldom measure the impact of our human rights education training, as we lack adequate tools. NHRIs should place an emphasis not just on what to measure, but also on how it is measured.

“ Ideally, evaluations should go beyond measuring participant satisfaction with a particular course, and include evaluation of participants’ ability to use the acquired knowledge and skills in their practice outside the learning situation. Good practices on this and, eventually, common tools for effect measurement of human rights education training, remain to be developed.

The same is the case for measuring results with regard to adopting a strategic approach to human rights education and working across mandate areas. However, this particular point has not been raised in the consultation process.
AIM ♦ The aim of this exercise is to reflect on what challenges are currently the most important to focus on in relation to your individual and organisational capacities.

HOW

• Answer the questions in the table below and reflect on which type of challenges you want to focus on.

Copy and use the sheet on page 39.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Common NHRI standards for HRE</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you lack common standards that can guide you in setting priorities for your HRE activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mandate</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you as NHRI staff/experts work on HRE across the core mandate areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic approach</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that your NHRI takes a strategic approach to HRE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measuring learning effect</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you have good methods to measure the learning effect of your training activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicators</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you have access to good benchmarks and indicators to measure the impact of your HRE interventions at policy level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Networks and knowledge sharing, nationally</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you have a national forum to share good practice on HRE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Networks and knowledge sharing, internationally</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you have a regional or international forum to share good practices on HRE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Learning materials</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you provide up-to-date quality education materials to a - for you - satisfactory extent for the learners you find most relevant in your context?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relationship with state actors</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you are able to do relation building with government, parliament and education authorities and position yourself as key advisor on education/HRE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Coordination among HRE stakeholders</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you are able to coordinate among HRE stakeholders (for example civil society organisations, educational institutions and state actors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reporting to regional and international human rights mechanisms</strong></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find that you have the organisational capacity to address HRE issues in international reporting to regional and international human rights mechanisms, such as the treaty body system or Universal Periodic Review?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 DIALOGUE ACTIVITY

CHALLENGES FOR NHRIs WORKING WITH HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

AIM  The aim of this dialogue activity is to discuss the challenges you experience related to working across mandated areas. The exercise is particularly suitable for group work and with the management team involved.

HOW

• Copy the sheet below, cut out the individual statements and place them on the table, so they are all visible.
• Discuss the statements with your colleagues and management to identify the three most important and relevant statements for your NHRI.

Copy and use the sheet on page 41.
A. As NHRIs, we need common standards to plan and carry out HRE work more effectively.

B. The definition of HRE is too broad for us to operationalise adequately and there is no common understanding of HRE.

C. We do not have the capacity to address HRE issues in our international reporting to regional and international human rights mechanisms such as the treaty body system or Universal Periodic Review.

D. We have a tendency to focus HRE activities on training and providing information about human rights.

E. There is a lack of understanding of the importance of HRE at senior management level of our NHRI.

F. We lack methods on how to measure HRE effect amongst groups of learners.

G. We need Common Standards for monitoring the status and quality of HRE at national level.

H. We lack HRE materials translated into local languages and cultural contexts.

I. We lack tools and methods to prioritise the most important and effective HRE interventions.

J. It is a challenge to build successful relationships with duty-bearers and influence policies and action plans.

K. We do not have strong relations with universities and colleges training front-desk civil servants, which makes it difficult to position ourselves as key advisors to educational institutions.

L. Other?
In this chapter of the guide we elaborate on the core mandate areas that we argue NHRI should consider carefully when planning which human rights education interventions to prioritise.

These include sharing good practices on monitoring the status of human rights education, conducting training and relation building with key duty-bearers, advising government, parliament and education authorities, as well as coordinating and cooperating with national stakeholders and the international human rights system. As stated in chapter two, human rights education is an area that would in most contexts not be the object of an individual complaint or alternative dispute resolution. Therefore we argue that this part of the core NHRI mandate is seldom relevant for human rights education compared to other human rights violations, even if we as NHRI have quasi-jurisdictional competence.

The chapter highlights some case studies from Korea, Denmark, Australia, Germany and Kenya, in which we - as representatives of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education - have worked across core mandate areas and used our unique NHRI roles and responsibilities.

The chapter presents three exercises on how to broaden your approach to human rights education. The first is an individual reflection exercise on the monitoring activities of your NHRI. The second exercise is a dialogue activity on the different levels of intervention (individual, organisational, national and international), and where you think the potential lies to ensure outreach, quality and effect. The last exercise is a dialogue activity to motivate discussion on how best to influence policy-making processes and strengthen relation building with duty-bearers.
4.1 MONITORING HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

Monitoring is a process of data collection, and analysing and using information. Systematic monitoring of human rights education is an important task for NHRIs that allows us to step into our role as an authority on human rights education. Monitoring the status and quality of human rights education in a country allows us to document what has been accomplished so far, where the gaps are, and which areas need attention.

Monitoring the status of human rights education should be carried out with precision and accuracy in order to create a good basis for providing advice based on facts.

This will boost the arguments of your NHRI and give legitimacy to your NHRI in the area of human rights education. In addition, monitoring human rights education provides NHRIs with insight as to the focus of their human rights education initiatives, and to developments over time - particularly if the monitoring is done on a regular basis. Monitoring the status of human rights education also ensures that planned human rights education interventions are based on fact and solid analysis.

We, as NHRIs, have a monitoring mandate derived from the Paris Principles; our institutions are vested with the competence and responsibility to provide ‘Government, Parliament and any other competent body (…) with (…) opinions, recommendations, proposals and reports on any matters concerning the promotion and protection of human rights (…) and to ensure effective implementation of international human rights instruments’.65

Human rights education monitoring encompasses the analysis of national and international legal frameworks regulating a particular educational level, or training of civil servants such as the police or schoolteachers.

It may also be more comprehensive and include qualitative studies of what is practised on the ground, how teachers interpret curricula, or what gaps exist between legal regulatory frameworks and what is actually taught in classrooms and understood by pupils or participants. This NHRI monitoring responsibility should not be mistaken for an assessment of the learning needs of specific groups of participants.

Depending on its intended goal, a particular human rights education monitoring activity may result in such outputs as:

- Suggestion of policies or revision of existing policies regulating the inclusion of human rights education in national curricula.
- Periodic status reports on developments within the national education system.
• Baseline studies of human rights education within a certain educational level or profession or across levels and professions.\textsuperscript{66}
• Submission of data from the national context on the status and quality of human rights education to treaty bodies, the Human Rights Council, the Universal Periodic Review or to Special Procedures mandate holders such as Special Rapporteurs.
• Transmitting information from the international and regional human rights systems back to national stakeholders.

To be truly effective human rights education monitoring should be a two-part process. For the one part, NHRIs must systematically assess the human rights education situation through data collection and trend analysis. For the other, such data and analysis must be used to carry out strategic follow-up activities with, inter alia, policy makers, education authorities and even civil society organisations. In other words, outputs from monitoring activities should be subject to careful planning and follow-up, and form the basis for a dialogue with duty-bearers and civil society.

Follow-up activities should draw on the unique roles and responsibilities of NHRIs, which make it possible to engage in direct and close dialogue with duty-bearers such as government officials, parliamentarians and education authorities, or to coordinate more open processes by engaging senior civil servants, civil society organisations and other stakeholders, including the media.
4.2 ADVISING GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT

Many NHRI can serve as key independent advisors and dialogue partners for governments and parliamentarians and be consulted when policies on education or human rights education are being reviewed or developed. NHRIs could initiate this by making proposals and by ensuring their expertise is tapped. This potential role is especially salient in relation to legal revisions and policy development. This is also stressed by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights OHCHR:

"... NHRI can be an important and useful ally for the Government when it wants to change a law, policy or practice, or when the NHRI is to assume new responsibilities. Institutions should therefore develop relations with parliament, parliamentary bodies and parliamentarians so that they have the opportunity to influence policy and programme decisions. Regularly appearing before standing parliamentary committees, or their equivalent, to present a human rights analysis of governmental proposals is one important way of ensuring that human rights issues are heard."

The quote in the box above describes an important part of our core NHRI mandate area on advising and building relations, also relevant for our human rights education activities. As NHRIs we can lobby and influence governments on how to incorporate human rights education in formal education curricula and, where relevant, push for curriculum guidelines and learning materials to be shaped in accordance with the international framework and based on the national context. Moreover, NHRIs are well positioned to play a coordinating role with regard to National Human Rights Action Plans and in the undertaking of baseline studies of human rights education.

To strengthen relations with government and parliament, we as NHRIs may choose different strategies dependent on the context in which we serve.

"Part of this could be to provide human rights seminars or courses for parliamentarians as part of positioning ourselves as key advisors on human rights education and as a way of fulfilling the mandate to conduct own training activities.

4.3 COORDINATION AND COOPERATION AMONG HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS

In our strategic planning we must strike a balance between influencing governments’
human rights education policies and responding to the immediate needs of communities. As stated in chapter two of this guide, NHRIs are provided with a unique coordinating role in promoting human rights education efforts. According to the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training:

NHRIs play an important role, including, where necessary, a coordinating role, in promoting human rights education and training by, inter alia, raising awareness and mobilizing relevant public and private actors.69

As NHRIs we can assume the responsibility to cooperate with other key stakeholders and institutions, including with relevant civil society organisations,70 the courts, law enforcement, educational institutions and private businesses.71

Such collaborative and coordinated efforts minimise the risk of gaps in programmes and activities, and of duplicated efforts among stakeholders.

Some NHRIs, for example, have created National Promotion and Education Committees that include representatives from civil society organisations, government and community leadership for the specific purpose of encouraging and facilitating cooperation and collaboration.72

Another core aspect of coordination and cooperation is reporting to international and regional human rights systems as well as other institutions and regional networks, based on human rights education monitoring at the national level.

By providing information to treaty bodies, the Human Rights Council, the Universal Periodic Review or by submitting statements and documents to meetings at the Human Rights Council, NHRIs are increasingly playing a more direct role in human rights reporting. As a result, the Human Rights Council and treaty bodies often rely on the input of the NHRI when assessing the reports submitted by states. NHRIs are, in turn, encouraged to bring back information to the national level and follow-up with duty-bearers. For instance by letting the relevant international recommendations inform their strategic planning.

4.4 HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION FOR PROTECTION OF CHILDREN IN KOREA

Following an amendment of the ‘Infant Care Act’ in 2004, the number of private, for-profit day care centres increased, while teachers - many of whom lacked professional training - were faced with declining wages and working conditions. Childcare facilities grew even greater in number.
as free childcare was implemented in 2013. Unfortunately, so did cases of child abuse by day care teachers.

Since 2014, in cooperation with private organisations such as ‘Korea Federation of Preschools’ and ‘Korea Federation of Day Care Centres,’ The National Human Rights Commission of Korea has provided human rights education for preschool teachers and promoted training of human rights instructors.

In 2015, in response to the outcry over the abuse cases, the National Assembly made human rights education a compulsory part of supplementary training for day care teachers. However, despite The National Human Rights Commission of Korea’s recommendation, the Ministry of Health and Welfare failed to clearly define the training system and curriculum, limiting the effectiveness of the compulsory teacher-training programme.

In an attempt to address this gap, The National Human Rights Commission of Korea launched a ‘Conference on Human Rights Education Regarding Infants’ in cooperation with municipal government officials charged with supplementary training of day care teachers.

The National Human Rights Commission of Korea was also awarded KRW 100 million by the Ministry of Strategy and Finance, in support of its efforts to train human rights education instructors.

In 2016, 280 trainees were selected to be educated as human rights instructors and underwent an 80-hour training programme, conducted in five regions nationwide, incorporating both cyber tutoring and offline classes.

Upon completion of the assigned curriculum and a separate evaluation, trainees were appointed as human rights instructors, and are expected to undergo supplementary training after their first year of work.

In developing the curriculum for human rights instructor training, The National Human Rights Commission of Korea welcomed input from day care teachers through a survey conducted in 2015. The survey results reflected that most teachers desired case-based and participation-based programmes, whose teachings could be applied directly to their work. Based on this need, researchers developed textbooks that focused on categorising the duties of day care teachers and providing examples of adequate human rights protection related to each duty.

Looking forward, The National Human Rights Commission of Korea’s approach to monitoring child abuse cases will address the low reporting rates that persist despite Korea’s mandatory child abuse reporting laws. Having implemented ‘Field Monitoring of Child Abuse in 2015’, the Commission now plans to recommend policies to relevant ministries, with a particular focus
on how to improve reporting mechanisms and ensure stronger protection for reporters of abuse.

Target groups
- Duty-bearers: The government (the Ministry of Welfare), local governments.
- Rights-holders: Children in early childhood.

About, through and for human rights
In the education area, The National Human Rights Commission of Korea tried to reflect the three didactic principles in a balanced way. In awareness raising courses for public officials and the general public, various participatory learning methods were used. However, for training of trainers, The National Human Rights Commission of Korea put more emphasis on education about human rights to enhance their understanding and expertise on human rights.

Knowledge, skills and attitudes
In training of trainers, knowledge, attitudes and skills were carefully dealt with throughout the courses.

" Especially in delivering principles and methods of human rights education, attitudes and skills of trainers were stressed. During and after the training period, The National Human Rights Commission of Korea encourages trainers to participate in voluntary workshops and networking activities for knowledge sharing.

CORE MANDATE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN RIGHTS PROMOTION</th>
<th>HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION</th>
<th>ADVISING THE GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT</th>
<th>MONITORING HUMAN RIGHTS</th>
<th>COORDINATION AND COOPERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 CASE: ANNUAL STATUS REPORT ON EDUCATION IN DENMARK

Once a year The Danish Institute for Human Rights publishes an overview of the human rights situation in Denmark. In the most recent one, Status 2016-17, twenty-two areas are reviewed and presented in individual thematic reports. Each of these describes recent developments and offers recommendations. One of these thematic reports concerns the area of education, specifically human rights education and the right to education.

Each thematic report follows the same thorough and clear structure, describing the international and national legal framework, the latest human rights developments, identifying challenges and providing short and precise recommendations targeted at duty-bearers, such as the Government, the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry for Education, municipalities and educational institutions.

The latest status report on education identifies and follows up on challenges in the areas of inclusion, accessibility, teaching of Danish as a second language, bullying and general school climate, ethnic minority dropout rates from vocational training, and the absence of a national action plan on human rights education.
The status reports are a key source of information in strategic planning and serve as the basis for The Danish Institute for Human Rights' work with the structural anchoring of human rights in the education sector. The institute offers concrete recommendations with direct follow-up activities across the NHRI mandates, particularly in relation to advising, monitoring, coordination and cooperation.

It is published and available in print and on the institute’s website, along with the other thematic reports. Every year it is shared with relevant stakeholders, including government, parliament, relevant ministries, senior civil servants and educational institutions and civil society organisations.

The launch of the report is followed up by strategic interventions directed at relevant duty-bearers.

These include meetings with relevant parliamentarians, ministries, senior civil servants and educational institutions, and the coordination of civil society organisations and other relevant stakeholders working with formal and non-formal education.

This allows for a fact-based dialogue with relevant duty-bearers and other stakeholders and enables the annual status report to become an effective and useful tool for coordination and cooperation.

Target groups
• Duty-bearers: government, parliamentarians, ministries, senior civil servants, educational institutions, municipalities.
• Stakeholders: civil society organisations, labour unions, student associations, researchers.

About, through and for human rights
The status report takes its point of departure in the international human rights framework and systematically describes the standards and recommendations given to Denmark.

The didactic principles of human rights education constitute the springboard for identifying challenges and formulating recommendations. For instance, the Danish Institute for Human Rights recommends:
• To adopt a national action plan on human rights education (about human rights)
• To establish concrete goals for accessibility in Danish educational institutions (through human rights)
• To adjust the curriculum at university colleges with the aim of strengthening the relevant competencies in human rights education of BA Education graduates in accordance with the learning objectives of Danish primary schools (for human rights).
In 2015 the New South Wales (NSW) Minister for Disability Services launched the NSW Disability Inclusion Plan. The plan aligns with the NSW Government’s obligations under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It is a state-wide commitment to identifying and breaking down the barriers that prevent people with disabilities from enjoying the same opportunities and choices as everyone else.

To support the implementation of the NSW Disability Inclusion Plan, the NSW Department of Family and Community Services (FACS) contracted The Australian Human Rights Commission to develop a training package for policy and projects staff working across the NSW pub-
lic services. The training was piloted in early 2015 and involved:

- Developing an effective and relevant disability rights education and training strategy targeted to policy and project staff in mainstream NSW government agencies.
- Providing advice to FACS about, and content for inclusion in, an online e-learning package.
- Delivering four full-day face-to-face training sessions and associated resources to the target group.
- Conducting an evaluation of the training package and providing an evaluation report to FACS.
- Reviewing and refining the training package to reflect the outcomes of the evaluation.

Evaluation of the programme indicated an overall high level of satisfaction with the training package. Survey data, along with comments taken from the evaluation interviews, demonstrated that the package met each of the following learning outcomes:

- Increased participants’ understanding of the disability policy framework that exists in Australia at state and national level.
- Increased participants’ understanding of the barriers to the full and equal participation of people with a disability.

During the evaluation process many participants explained that the training improved their understanding and changed their perceptions of people with disabilities, which has positively affected the way they consider matters of access and inclusion in their day-to-day work. One interviewee commented:

“I think I understand disability issues better in the sense that I look at it from a different perspective. So instead of thinking of people with disability as just at the margin of the society or at work... or expecting only marginal... or even no involvement of them in anything in which we could organise in projects or policies. Or only thinking of them being outside of that. Now I think of them as a part of everything we do.”

Subsequent to the success of the training programme, the NSW Government has announced a future rollout of the training, including continued delivery of the existing training package, as well as the development and delivery of a ‘train the trainer’ programme that will ensure the future sustainability of the project.

The Australian Human Rights Commission has also received requests from other local governments for training of a similar nature, which will expand the impact of this project.
Target groups

- Duty-bearers: NSW Government staff involved in policy development, analysis and research, as well as staff responsible for the development and implementation of projects and programmes (primary target group).

About, through, and for human rights
The training programme developed by the commission addresses the didactic principles about, through and for human rights by:

- Using participatory and critical pedagogy in the training sessions.
- Equipping staff with tools and strategies to help respect, uphold and promote the rights of people with disability in their work.

Knowledge, skills and attitudes
Providing NSW government staff with the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to respond effectively to the issues that affect people with disabilities in their policy and project work.

CORE MANDATE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMANRIGHTS PROMOTION</th>
<th>HUMANRIGHTS PROTECTION</th>
<th>ADVISING THE GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT</th>
<th>MONITORING HUMAN RIGHTS</th>
<th>COORDINATION AND COOPERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Want to know more? Australian Human Rights Commission
4.7 BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION MAPPING IN GERMANY

The education policy field in Germany is quite complex, as 16 federal states (Bundesländer) - assisted by some coordinating structures - bear the responsibility for formulating education policy. In The German Institute for Human Rights’ experience, sustainably and systematically anchoring human rights education requires a combination of ‘bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ approaches.

As part of its policy advisory role, The German Institute for Human Rights conducted a survey of the ministries of education, in an effort to map the anchoring of human rights education in six different fields: school law, curriculum, educational materials, training of educators, participatory rights for the youth, and organisational development.

The German Institute for Human Rights disseminated human rights education related UN documents and published results and recommendations for the benefit of the wider human rights education community. Also, perhaps more importantly, this survey helped The German Institute for Human Rights identify key contacts for partnership in relevant ministries and provided an opportunity to conduct follow-up meetings with key actors and identify possibilities for collaboration and cooperation in the future.

Target groups

- Duty-bearers: Parliament’s and ministries (especially on the federal level), Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder (KMK), municipalities, universities that conduct teacher training, schools and non-formal educational institutions.
- Stakeholders: Civil society organisations, labour unions, student associations, researchers.
- Rights-holders: Children and youths, teachers.

About, through, and for human rights

The survey explicitly referred to the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. The introductory remarks explained the three

‘Bottom-up’ approaches include targeting educators, developing educational materials etc., while the ‘top-down’ approach refers to attempts to convince policy makers that explicit human rights education should be included in curricula and teacher training programmes.
dimensions of human rights education. Additionally, the dimension of learning through human rights education was addressed by different questions in the survey: questions referred, for example, to the structural participation of children and the consideration of human rights within processes of organisational development in schools. Therefore the survey was also a tool to raise awareness among the ministries of the different dimensions of human rights education.

**Knowledge, skills and attitudes**
The survey underlined the necessity of including knowledge, skills, and attitudes in human rights education learning processes and also referred to national policies relevant for human rights education in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE MANDATE AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMANRIGHTS PROMOTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMANRIGHTS PROTECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISING THE GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING HUMAN RIGHTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORDINATION AND COOPERATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Want to know more?** http://tinyurl.com/gl386vg
The ministries’ answers are also available online: : http://tinyurl.com/yaaakpso
4.8 CASE: BALANCING NEEDS THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION IN KENYA

The Kenya National Human Rights Commission has had experience with balancing community needs and environmental protection through human rights education in Kenya. The Kenya Forest Service (KFS) is a public institution mandated to efficiently protect, conserve and manage forests and the environment in a sustainable way. The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights had received numerous complaints and allegations from members of the public living around the forests, of harassment by KSF guards when they tried to access resources such as firewood.

In response to these claims, The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights has since partnered with KFS to mainstream human rights in its policy and training programmes in order to ensure human rights compliance as it realises its mandate.

The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights began this project by using human rights-based approaches (HRBA) and conducting a stakeholder analysis and needs assessment to identify the problems. The NHRI then developed training tools and methodologies, and conducted training.

The training programme outlined basic human rights principles, including the legal obligations of KSF officers in their law enforcement role.

These were also mainstreamed into the training curriculum and manual, as the materials included a right-based approach to the officers’ duties, from managing arrests to special operations such as enforcing relocations.

In evaluating the effects of this training programme, The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights noted:

- Reduced tension and complaints from the communities on KFS violations.
- Community members are more knowledgeable and respectful of the rule of law while accessing forest resources.
- KFS law enforcement officers are more respectful of the rule of law while protecting the forest resources.

Target groups

- Duty-bearers: The Kenya Forest Service (KFS) with a focus on KSF officers
- Rights-holders: Communities living in forest areas
About, through, and for human rights
In its partnership with KFS, the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights sought to reflect the three didactic principles of education about, through and for human rights. Through the training, the participants gained knowledge and understanding regarding rule of law and the legal obligations of KFS officers. However, a focus was also on ensuring that participants, as a result of the training, would become more respectful of the rule of law.

Knowledge, skills and attitudes
Through the training programmes targeting the KFS, the learning dimensions knowledge, attitude and skills were specifically dealt with. The training programme focused on introducing KFS officers to the legal obligations of KSF officers in their law enforcement role but focus was also on strengthening the skills of the KSF officers in terms of respecting the rule of law in their work with forest protection.

CORE MANDATE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMANRIGHTS PROMOTION</th>
<th>HUMANRIGHTS PROTECTION</th>
<th>ADVISING THE GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT</th>
<th>MONITORING HUMAN RIGHTS</th>
<th>COORDINATION AND COOPERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIM ♦ To inspire you to evaluate the monitoring practice of your NHRI and reflect on potentials with regard to human rights education monitoring.

HOW

Step 1: Think about how you would define monitoring?
• Write down on a piece of paper your definition of monitoring from the angle of an NHRI.

Step 2: Think about your NHRI’s experiences of day-to-day work with monitoring.
• Why is monitoring important/not important in your opinion?
• Why is monitoring of the status and quality of human rights education important/not important in your opinion?
• Does your NHRI have experience with monitoring?

Step 3: Do you or your NHRI have experience with human rights education monitoring?
• Why is it important/not important in your context to monitor human rights education?
• Why is monitoring of the status and quality of human rights education important/not important in your opinion?
• Could you enhance the impact of your human rights education interventions by prioritising monitoring of human rights education for particular levels or professions in formal education?
• How would monitoring the status and quality of human rights education position you to step into your role and responsibilities as an authority on human rights education?

TIP: This reflection exercise can also be done together with colleagues, possibly both with colleagues working within human rights education and with colleagues who are involved in monitoring and reporting.
4.10 DIALOGUE ACTIVITY
DIFFERENT LEVELS OF HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION INTERVENTION

AIM ♦ To facilitate dialogue on the differences concerning sustainability of human rights education interventions directed at 1. individual learners/groups of learners, 2. At organisations or institutions, 3. At the national policy level, and 4. At international (or regional) level.

HOW

Step 1: List your NHRI human rights education interventions of the last 1-3 years on post-it notes and place them in the four squares.

Step 2: Discuss which interventions have had the most sustainable impact.
• Which mandate areas did you activate?
• How many people/groups were reached approximately following the intervention?
• What made the intervention successful?
• At what level do you have the potential to reach most people?
• Where do you have the potential to ensure the highest quality?
• At what level do you have the potential to create a long-lasting sustainable impact?
• What were the pros and cons of the human rights education interventions at each level (individual learners/groups of learners, organisational or institutional, national, international)?
• Who were the rights-holders and duty-bearers?
• Which of the levels or professions as outlined by the World Programme for Human Rights Education were the end learners in each intervention?

Copy and use the sheet on page 63.
DIFFERENT LEVELS OF HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION INTERVENTION

International

National

Organisational

Individual

4.10 Dialogue Activity. Copy the sheet
AIM • To encourage analysis and discussion of how best to influence policy-making processes and to strengthen relation building with government, parliament, education authorities, civil servants and civil society organisations in the promotion of human rights education.

HOW

Step 1: Participants discuss their most successful initiatives and actions aimed at influencing policy processes to promote human rights education.
• What parts went well?
• What was difficult?

Step 2: Participants map each initiative/action and insert them into the different policy-making stages in the figure below.

Then all participants discuss which persons and offices they engaged in dialogue with during the various stages.

SUMMING UP & REFLECTION

• At what stage of the political process do we as an NHRI have the most influence?
• With regard to human rights education, what types of relation with parliamentarians and officials needs to be fostered and/or improved?
• What will it take to strengthen these relations?
• Do we need to be a step ahead in our planning process?
• Are there any education reforms coming up which it is relevant for us to influence?
• Are we prepared to position ourselves as key advisors in upcoming education reforms?
• Should we initiate policy reform or propose changes to existing policies for a particular level or profession?

Copy and use the sheet on page 65.
INFLUENCE ON POLICY PROCESSES

4.11 Dialogue Activity. Copy the sheet
5. ADOPTING A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

In this chapter we outline what is meant by adopting a strategic approach to human rights education and summarise what the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education understands by a strategic approach to human rights education.

We address how adopting a strategic approach can help NHRIIs prioritise resources and efforts in order to achieve a planned effect.

At the end of the chapter, we introduce two exercises. The first is distinctively a group exercise on strategic planning of human rights education interventions inspired by the Logical Framework Approach. The second is a reflection exercise on prioritisation of possible actions by factoring in projected impact and effort required.
Strategic approaches are developed through planning. They are about setting goals based on national challenges and international standards, as well as devising plans on how we can achieve them.

Taking a strategic approach to human rights education is essential, as it helps NHRIs adopt a helicopter perspective and prioritise from among many goals.

Moreover, developing and adopting a strategic approach strengthens the likelihood that we spend our limited resources and time on the right tasks, in the right way, with the greatest possible impact or result, outreach and sustainability, and that we do it at the right time.

As NHRIs we get direction from the national and international legal framework. Demands on NHRIs are most likely to be greater than the resources at hand, including in the area of human rights education. Therefore, taking a strategic approach to human rights education can help us to be more effective. Development of a strategic approach concerns different phases of planning and implementation, as well as coordinating efforts among many stakeholders. It assists in setting priorities when allocating resources, accounting for external contexts and internal capacities.
In short, a strategic approach is important because it:

• Helps us set specific priorities and achieve goals.
• Directs resources towards the most important, achievable initiatives.
• Connects the approach to national policies as well as global trends.
• Can be used to communicate and coordinate with other stakeholders in a transparent and respectful manner.
• Reassures donors and sources of funding that resources are being thoughtfully managed.
• Promotes close contact with relevant actors.

A strategic approach consists of two elements: 1. Strategic planning and 2. Working strategically

**Strategic planning**

Taking a strategic approach requires strategic planning, a sequential process in which you first formulate a strategy with prioritised goals based on analysis, and thereafter work out a plan describing a sequence of well-coordinated and systematic steps, which together lead towards the goal(s). However, strategic planning is not an end in itself. It offers ‘road maps’ to get us from where we are now to where we want to be.

While there are not absolute rules regarding making strategic plans, most follow a similar pattern and have common phases:

• Analysis or assessment, where an understanding of the current situation in relation to the thematic focus is developed.
• Strategy formulation, where a strategy with goals is developed.
• Strategy execution, where the strategy is translated into a more operational action plan and indicators are formulated.
• Evaluation, where ongoing refinement and evaluation of performance and - for instance - stakeholders, takes place.

**Action plan**

An action plan helps realise goals outlined in the strategy, and is a way to ensure the strategy is concrete.

An action plan consists of a number of steps and could include the following information:

• What actions or changes will occur?
• Who will be responsible for carrying out these changes?
• When will they take place, and when will they be achieved?
• What resources are required to carry out these changes?
• Communication - who should know what?

"In themselves, plans are only effective if they lead to action and are adjusted regularly to achieve the goals."
Working strategically
Strategic work is not easy to systematise in an action plan - it is a holistic process, which ‘connects the steps’. Whereas strategic planning is analytic, designed at your desk or institute, and based on assumptions on how a given situation or human rights education intervention will evolve, strategic working requires close contact with relevant stakeholders. It also requires continuous adjustment to a given situation, possibility or challenge, always with the strategic goal in mind.

5.2 A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION
A strategic approach to human rights education embraces goals for national implementation of human rights education and strategic planning across core NHRI mandated areas. This includes taking advantage of the unique NHRI roles and responsibilities to monitor the status of human rights education and give advice to government, parliament and education authorities on national implementation of human rights education. In addition, a strategic approach to human rights...
Education implies coordinating and cooperating with national and international stakeholders for the greater benefit of creating long-lasting change for human rights education in formal and non-formal education.

In other words, it is an approach that encompasses strategic planning and working strategically within a broad set of intervention areas that goes beyond conducting one’s own education and information activities.

It combines activities such as training of trainers with working at the structural level with the goal of influencing education policies and strengthening human rights education in the curricula of formal education. By making use of our unique roles and responsibilities to have influence at policy level, we have the possibility of reaching a larger number of people than if we only conduct our own training activities.

For example, imagine one NHRI which sets goals for conducting x number of training sessions at, for instance, a police academy and succeeds in working strategically and implementing its action plan. This NHRI can reach a fair group of police recruits. If this NHRI instead chooses to set goals for and actually train the teachers, who then teach the police recruits, even more people can be reached and the goals and priority-setting will change accordingly.

If the NHRI sets goals for influencing the national curriculum for police academies and succeeds in executing the strategy, then this intervention would ensure that all police officers at all police academies will receive human rights education.

Of course, this latter would also require competencies amongst the teachers who would be obliged to teach human rights.

Ensuring that the state takes it upon itself to integrate human rights education into obligatory curricula for relevant levels and professions is an important step in achieving a sustainable impact. It means that the teaching of, for example, police recruits is not dependent on a human rights educator from the NHRI standing in the classroom to provide regular face-to-face training.

This special role that we NHRI can take as advocates for effective policies for human rights education enables us to set long-term goals for human rights education and have a far wider reach in our human rights education work.

Once human rights education is anchored in a particular profession at the policy level, inter
alia in the official curriculum, the NHRI will be able to start over with a new level or another profession.\textsuperscript{80}

On this note, the goal setting in the strategic planning prioritisation of human rights education interventions should be informed by an assessment of the human rights situation in the country, including the context-specific challenges for human rights education as well as by an assessment of the international framework for human rights education, including the World Programme for Human Rights Education and the suggested levels and professions defined as target groups in the different phases of the programme.

Through strategic planning and by adopting a strategic approach to human rights education we, as NHRI\text{s}, have the potential to be more efficient and to get more out of our limited resources. To do so, however, we must prioritise work with human rights education across mandated areas and - when relevant to our contexts - we must accept the role that we are increasingly finding ourselves called upon to fulfil as new instruments are adopted.

By doing so, we are less likely to end up competing with civil society organisations but rather function as complementary to them in the establishment of a strong human rights culture in our countries.\textsuperscript{81}

"Unlike us, other actors, such as civil society organisations within the human rights field or labour unions, do not have this mandate provided by the international framework with regard to human rights education. They will often tend to conduct their own training activities on the ground, and set their goals in terms of the number of workshops or courses they have held at, for instance, the Police Academy, or for pupils, teachers or community leaders."
5.3 GROUP WORK

STRATEGIC PLANNING OF HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION INTERVENTIONS

AIM ✷ To plan your human rights education work drawing inspiration from the Logical Framework Approach, and to discuss how a focus on long-term change can be used as a planning and reflection tool. The exercise can also be used to qualify an action plan.

HOW
• Invite colleagues to a workshop during the planning phase of setting human rights education priorities. Fill out the form, including your responses to the questions below. Fill it in ‘backwards’, i.e. from right to left and start by:

Step 1: Selecting goal(s) for your human rights education work:
• What is the desired long-term goal or change that you want to see?
• What short-term goals are necessary to achieve the desired impact?

Step 2: Stakeholder analysis:
• Who are the stakeholders and do they have expectations from their side?

Step 3: Activities and indicators:
• What activities should be initiated?
• What indicators can be used to measure the desired impact?

Step 4: Project/team organisation and staffing:
• What are the tasks and responsibilities of the project/team?
• What is the time frame?

Step 5: Uncertainties and risks:
• What can be defined as the 5 greatest risks?
• What preventive and mitigating actions can be put in place?

Step 6: Overall reflections:
• What is the relation to the overall strategy of your NHRI?
• What is the anchoring of the HRE strategic approach in your NHRI?
• How do you expect that a strengthened focus on strategic planning can be of help in your HRE work?

TIP: This exercise can provide inspiration at different phases of your strategic planning. You can use it as you formulate overall goals for your work with human rights education, or you can use it for particular areas of intervention related to any of the mandate areas.

Copy and use the sheet on page 75.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Short-term goals</th>
<th>Long-term goals</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainties/risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall reflections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 REFLECTION EXERCISE
PRIORITISING INTERVENTIONS
- IMPACT AND EFFORT

**AIM**
To help you prioritise between different actions leading to the goal(s) for human rights education you have previously identified, by mapping possible actions against two factors: the potential effects and the effort required to implement them.

**HOW**

**Step 1:** Identify actions.
- Write all the possible actions you have identified in your strategic planning process on post-it notes.
- Place them in the matrix.

**Step 2:** Decide.
- Decide which interventions you want to make now, plan for which to do later or not do at all, bearing the achievement of the formulated goals in mind.
- ‘High impact, low effort’ are often where you will want to spend time. The ‘high impact, high effort’ can be difficult, but these actions may have a large strategic impact which means that they need to be dealt with.

**TIP:** As stated earlier, an action plan helps realise goals outlined in the strategy, and is a way to ensure the strategy is concrete. But how should you prioritise between different steps or actions when you do strategic planning?

*Copy and use the sheet on page 77.*
PRIORITISING INTERVENTIONS - IMPACT AND EFFORT

High Impact

Low Effort

HIGH IMPACT
LOW EFFORT

HIGH IMPACT
HIGH EFFORT

LOW EFFORT
LOW IMPACT

LOW IMPACT
HIGH EFFORT

Low Impact
In this chapter we introduce a framework for Common Standards for NHRIs on Human Rights Education. The Common Standards for NHRIs on Human Rights Education include ten NHRI human rights education principles that we believe should guide NHRI work on human rights education.

As stated in the preface of this guide, the common standards are developed on the basis of the direction and framework given to NHRIs in the Paris Principles, as well as the roles and responsibilities that NHRIs subsequently are called upon to play as new instruments are adopted. They are also developed with a view to identified challenges and based on good practice examples of working with human rights education across mandate areas.

In this chapter we conclude with two exercises. The first one is on setting strategic priorities in relation to different criteria and is intended to stimulate reflection on the human rights issues you consider addressing through your human rights education interventions. In the second exercise we introduce a checklist exercise comprising a short research assignment.
6.1 ADOPTING A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

1. The unique roles and responsibilities of NHRIs mean that they can leverage their work and focus human rights education interventions across core mandate areas in response to the more ambitious roles and responsibilities NHRIs are tasked with in the international framework for human rights education.

2. Strategic planning is based on an analysis of the national context and challenges, as well as on the international framework for human rights education and country-specific recommendations.

EXAMPLES

• NHRIs do strategic planning on human rights education with clear and long-term goals that go beyond their own training activities, and thereby leverage the effectiveness, results, outreach and sustainability of their work.

• NHRIs do strategic planning on human rights education that takes the national context, and challenges and recommendations from the international framework, into consideration, including the target groups suggested by the World Programme for Human Rights Education.

6.2 TRAINING ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION RESOURCES

3. Planning, management and evaluation of education programmes should have clear learning objectives related to knowledge, skills and attitudes and be designed around didactic principles about, through and for human rights.

4. Training activities and development of education resources should be founded on a human rights-based approach to human rights education as suggested by the WPHRE.

5. Training activities and development of educational resources should be prioritised if these support the overall goal of a strategic approach to human rights education.

EXAMPLES

• Training of trainers.

• Training of parliamentarians and central and local administration.

• Selected training of key civil servants such as the police, teachers, social workers or legal staff.

• Conducting learning programmes for civil society organisations and selected rights-holders.

• Developing relevant learning material and methodologies for key levels and professions.

• Community outreach through seminars and workshops.

• E-learning and blended learning.
6.3 MONITORING AND DOCUMENTING THE STATUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

6. NHRIs regularly monitor the status of human rights education with accuracy and precision.

EXAMPLES

• Monitoring and documenting the quality and extent of human rights education for relevant levels and professions.
• Including the developments in human rights education in annual NHRI status reports.
• Monitoring and data collection related to target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

6.4 ADVISE GOVERNMENTS, PARLIAMENTS AND EDUCATION AUTHORITIES

7. As key actors on human rights education, NHRIs should be consulted when policies on education or human rights education are reviewed or developed.

NHRIs should initiate this by developing proposals and by seeking to ensure that relevant international standards are met and that their expertise is tapped.

EXAMPLES

• Providing advice to governments, parliaments and education authorities on human rights education and curriculum development based on independent opinions, recommendations, proposals and reports.
• Drawing attention to gaps between the international framework for human rights education and national implementation.
• Doing baseline analysis of human rights education and involvement of relevant stakeholders.
• Working with relevant ministries, state departments or focal points of a national strategy or national action plan on human rights education, in particular on the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the strategy or national action plan.
6.5 COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

8. NHRIs raise awareness of human rights education and build relations with parliaments, the regional and international human rights system and its agencies, NHRIs in other countries and network on human rights education, as well as coordinating with civil society.

9. NHRIs act as bridges between governments, parliaments, education authorities, educational institutions, civil servants, civil society and civil society organisations as well as the business community.

10. NHRIs strengthen human rights education by reporting to international bodies such as the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, participating.

EXAMPLES

- Strengthening human rights education through reporting to international bodies such as the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, special procedures or in the UPR process.
- Making oral statements, taking separate seating and submitting documents on human rights education under specific human rights education agenda items of the Human Rights Council, including during the UPR process.
- Cooperating with other human rights institutions and networks on promotion of human rights education.
- Facilitating collaboration and information exchange between researchers of different higher education institutions.
- Coordinating and mobilising relevant public and private actors including civil society organisations.
- Bringing data to the international human rights system and back to stakeholders at national level.
AIM  To reflect on which human rights education interventions to prioritise in the face of different human rights challenges and guide the prioritization of human rights education interventions based on a range of criteria.

HOW

Step 1: Reflect on challenges or issues of concern.
• What is the human rights issue or challenge at stake?
• Who are the rights-holders and duty-bearers?
• Is it a challenge suitable or possible for an NHRI to address?
• Is it a challenge, which is possible to solve or address through human rights education interventions?
• Is it a challenge which is suitable for human rights education intervention, or would other interventions be more effective?
• Is it a serious or significant challenge?
• Is it legally entrenched in human rights and is it possible to explain how, when and by whom it is identified as a human rights issue?
• Is it a structural challenge, does it affect many or few?

Step 2: Reflect on effort or action.
• What do you consider should be the action of your NHRI towards the challenge?
• Who do you intend to influence?

• Who are the target groups and what knowledge, skills and attitudes should they acquire through your effort?
• Why do you think that the proposed action leads to change?
• Why now?
• Why should this be solved by an NHRI?

Step 3: Consider how the NHRI Common Standards for human rights education can guide your planning.
• Which mandate areas will you act upon? Will you do monitoring of human rights education, provide advice, take on the roles of coordination and cooperation or will you conduct training or a combination of these?
• How does the effort or action correspond to your strategic goal(s)?

Step 4: Economy/Financial Considerations.
• What is the cost price of the effort or action?
• Does it represent value for money?

TIP: Use the steps as a basis for discussing whether or not an idea for an human rights education activity or intervention should be prioritised.
6.7 Checklist Exercise

Motivations for Your Areas of Intervention

**AIM** ♦ The aim of this exercise is to make you reflect on why a desired human rights education intervention or action is important besides leading to the goal identified in your strategic plan.

**HOW**

**Step 1:** Assess the following national motivations with regard to your chosen area of intervention:

- Status reports on human rights issues: Assess national status reports (e.g. from state departments, your NHRI and civil society organisations) on the human rights situation. What are the human rights issues related to your area of intervention?
- Research: Is there any ongoing or conducted research which could support a push for your area of intervention?
- Government platform: Does the government platform entail formulated visions/strategies related to your area of intervention?
- Action Plans and National Strategies: Are there any relevant Action Plans and National Strategies related to your area of intervention?
- National surveys and public opinion polls: Are there any recent surveys or public opinion polls undertaken by state departments, civil society organisations or your NHRI on levels of knowledge or attitudes related to your area of intervention?
- International comparative analysis: Are there any relevant international comparative analyses ranking countries within your area of intervention?

**Step 2:** Assess international recommendations with regard to your chosen area of intervention:

- Are there recent international or regional recommendations on strengthening human rights education for that particular level or profession?
- Do the recent comments or recommendations to your country specifically address human rights challenges related to respect for, protection or fulfilment of human rights for that particular level or profession?
- Are the recent comments or recommendations to your country specifically on human rights challenges related to the lack of respect, protection or fulfilment of human rights involving your chosen level or profession?
Step 3: Reflect on your NHRI roles and responsibilities with regard to the human rights education intervention:

• Which mandate area(s) can be activated to lead to the desired goal in your strategic plan?

• What principle(s) from the Common NHRI Standards for human rights education are relevant?

• What mechanisms or tools within the mandate area(s) can be used to obtain the impact?

TIP: This exercise is similar to a small research assignment. Go through the steps in the checklist and answer the questions. You can do it either alone or in your team, assigning the different questions/areas among the team. The exercise can strengthen the legitimacy of your arguments in future communication with public authorities and key stakeholders on why the focus of your human rights education interventions and choice of target group (level or profession) is important.
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This guide seeks to inspire the community of national human rights institutions (NHRIs) to be more effective in our agenda-setting efforts for the advancement of human rights education. As NHRIs, we need to set priorities for human rights education so we can position ourselves as key advisors to governments, parliaments and education authorities and thereby influence education policies, curriculum development and stakeholder engagement.

In this guide we suggest common standards for NHRI work on human rights education. As a basis for this, we explain the unique role of NHRIs in human rights education and present examples of challenges and good practice. We take the reader through numerous hands-on exercises which seek to provide new perspectives on setting strategic priorities for the further implementation of human rights education policies and programmes.

This guide is the first product of the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education. The Network is facilitated by the Danish Institute for Human Rights and coordinated with the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions.

You can read more about the NHRI Network on Human Rights Education at: www.humanrights.dk/projects/nhri-network-human-rights-education