

IIHR

Inter-American Institute
of Human Rights

VII Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education

**Development of specific
human rights concepts in the curriculum
for students from 10 to 14 years of age**



Danish
International
Development
Agency
DANIDA



NORWEGIAN MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

**Inter-American Report
on Human Rights Education**

A study in 19 countries

**Development of specific human rights concepts in the curriculum
for students from 10 to 14 years of age**

San Jose - December, 2008

© 2008 Inter-American Institute of Human Rights
San Jose, Costa Rica. First Edition. All rights reserved.

The material published herein may be duplicated, in full or in part, so long as it remains unaltered, is duly credited, and a copy of the publication or duplication is provided to the publisher.

Production team for this publication:

Ana María Rodino, Coordinator of the Education Unit
Marisol Molestina, Coordinator of the Information Unit
Randall Brenes, Program Officer of the Education Unit
Jorge Padilla, Assistant in the Education Unit
Ricardo Castro, Assistant Research Consultant

Layout, artwork and printing: Ediciones Sanabria

Information was obtained with the assistance of the following consultants in the countries:

Argentina, María Marta Scariota, Francisco Scarfó; Bolivia, María del Pilar Chávez; Brazil, María Elisa Almeida; Colombia, María del Rosario Bonilla, Sandra Morelo; Costa Rica, Luis Ricardo Montoya, Juan Carlos Méndez; Chile, Luis Felipe de la Vega, Enrique Azúa; Dominican Republic, Luisa Mateo; Ecuador, María Eugenia Gutiérrez, DNI Ecuador; El Salvador, Manuel Antonio Menjívar, Zulema Lara; Guatemala, Susana Gularte; Mexico, Lilian Álvarez, Citlalin Castañeda; Nicaragua, Alex Díaz, Sonia Durán; Panama, José Antonio Grenard; Paraguay, Daniel Oviedo; Peru, Patricia Luque; Suriname, Rinette Telting; Uruguay, Ana Everett; Venezuela, Ana Pino Pasquier, Carlos Domínguez.

Ricardo Castro was in charge of documenting and digitizing data. Ana María Rodino was responsible for data analysis and writing the report, with the support of Ricardo Castro and Randall Brenes. Marisol Molestina oversaw editorial production.

Inter-American Institute of Human Rights

Apartado Postal 10.081-1000 San José, Costa Rica
(506) 2234 0404 - Fax (506) 2234 0955
e-mail: uinformacion@iidh.ed.cr
<http://www.iidh.ed.cr>

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
Section I: The IIHR report on human rights education	9
Background and institutional setting	9
Nature and scope of the <i>Inter-American HRE Report</i>	10
Regulatory foundations: the right to human rights education	11
Conceptual and methodological foundations: studying progress	12
The first cycle of HRE reports: 2002-2006	15
Hypotheses and matrices	18
Section II: The Seventh Report and the second cycle of HRE reporting	23
A unique Institute project: The <i>Curricular and methodological proposal</i> for HRE	23
Second cycle of the Inter-American Report	26
The Seventh Report	28
Section III: Research findings	39
Courses and curricula analyzed	39
The design of school programs: scope and development	50
Specific components of human rights knowledge in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age	51
Inclusion of concepts and basic conceptual developments on Human Rights	52
Inclusion of the history of human rights	63
Inclusion of basic human rights standards and institutions	69
Section IV: Conclusions	77
Courses that cover human rights	77
Curricular programs	77
The scope and development of programs	78
Specific components of human rights knowledge	78
Section V: Recommendations	85
Section VI: Appendices	87

List of tables

Approaches to human rights research	13
General structure of the HRE report cycle.....	16
Structure of a system of indicators.....	17
First HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis	18
Second HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis.....	19
Third HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis	20
Fourth HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis.....	21
Fifth HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis.....	22
Sixth HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis.....	27
Components or categories of HRE content.....	31
Seventh HRE Report: Data collection matrix and outcome analysis	34
Courses and curricula analyzed	39
Approval dates of programs examined	42
The institutional setting of programs studied (a)	44
The institutional setting of programs studied (b).....	45
Indicator 1.1 Concept of human rights or rights of persons	52
Indicator 1.3 Characteristics of human rights	54
Indicator 1.6 Rights enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child	56
Indicator 1.7 Equality and freedom from discrimination.....	57
Indicator 1.8 Gender equality or equity	58
Indicator 1.11 Poverty, hunger and inequality	60
Indicator 1.12 Citizenship - Indicator 1.13 Global citizenship.....	62
Indicator 2.2 Modern construction of human rights: American and French Revolutions	64
Indicator 2.3 The United Nations.....	64
Indicator 2.6 Individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights	66
Indicator 2.7 History and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in each country.....	67
Indicator 3.1 Concept of democracy	70
Indicator 3.3 Equal protection of the law.....	71
Indicator 3.4 Due process	71
Indicator 3.4.1 Transparency and accountability	72
Indicator 3.7.1 Regional human rights protection system	74
Indicator 3.7.2 International human rights protection system	74
Indicator 3.8 Organizations for student participation in the school.....	75
Context information for the two years in the comparison: 2000 and 2008-09	87
Indicator 1.2 Definition of human rights.....	88

Indicator 1.4 Human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration	88
Indicator 1.4.1 Classification of human rights	88
Indicator 1.4.2 Civil and political rights	89
Indicator 1.4.3 Economic, social and cultural rights	89
Indicator 1.4.4 Collective rights.....	89
Indicator 1.5 Concept of children's rights.....	90
Indicator 1.9 Prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination	90
Indicator 1.10 Different types of discrimination.....	90
Indicator 1.14 Economic and social development. Sustainable development	91
Indicator 2.1 Historical background of human rights in antiquity and the Middle Ages.....	91
Indicator 2.2.1 Development of human rights in the 20th and 21st centuries	91
Indicator 2.4 Universal Declaration of Human Rights	92
Indicator 2.4.1 International covenants.....	92
Indicator 2.5 The Convention on the Rights of the Child.....	92
Indicator 2.5.1 CEDAW Convention	93
Indicator 2.5.2 Other human rights instruments for specific populations.....	93
Indicator 2.8 Cases of massive human rights violations.....	93
Indicator 3.1.1 Historical development of the concept of democracy	94
Indicator 3.2 The State or Rule of Law.....	94
Indicator 3.2.1 Elections and suffrage	94
Indicator 3.5 Human rights in the national Constitution.....	95
Indicator 3.6 Institutions that protect human rights at the national level.....	95
Indicator 3.7 International organizations for human rights cooperation and promotion	95

Introduction

Human rights and the school curriculum

In the year 2000, the IIHR introduced a significant innovation in the inter-American system designed to lend greater momentum to the right to human rights education (HRE). The stated goal was to set up a system of regular reports on progress made for giving effective exercise to this right through public policies in the 19 States that were signatories of the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Protocol of San Salvador). Altogether, the reports have provided greater insight into this right, which is now better accepted as a legitimate part of the political agenda and is more widely understood as obligatory. For the IIHR, human rights education is not just one more item on the curriculum. Instead and above all, it is a human right that stands at the very core of the development of democracy.

Taken as a whole, the HRE reports were made possible by the development of a system of progress indicators on human rights that the Institute began preparing in 2001. Many stakeholders have explicitly recognized the usefulness of this effort: the OAS, the inter-American human rights system, international organizations, regional organizations such as Mercosur, and national entities, including electoral organizations and ombudsman offices in Central America, and similar institutions in other countries such as Bolivia. Aside from this recognition, the effort itself holds intrinsic value. It also provides a foundation for all the research work stipulated in the Institute's mandate. The exercise of applying a system of indicators to the development of the right to human rights education for seven consecutive years now stands as a backdrop to the other two missions set forth in the IIHR mandate: outreach and teaching.

The IIHR is convinced that much comprehensive, in-depth work remains to be done to foster a solid base of human rights culture in every country of the region. This can be achieved only by means of human rights education. Progress in HRE will be made if the curriculum of the formal educational system fully incorporates explicit concepts in this field as a clear sign of political will in the States and a technical guarantee that human rights will be part of the teaching and learning process. In December 2003, we introduced the *Second Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education*. Its findings bore out the general trends already described in the First Report, identifying greater progress with human rights content in the school curriculum for children and young people throughout the hemisphere.

The study drew a comparison between the situation in 1990 and that of 2003 and the degree to which human rights values, principles and content had been added to official curriculum guidelines, study programs for school subjects and classroom textbooks. It also examined the use of language and images and the examples, illustrations and activities that educational texts offered for our students from 10 to 16 years of age.

Last year's Sixth HRE Report was not only the sixth in the IIHR series that had begun in 2002, but was also the first in the second stage of measurement. This year's new report, seventh in the series, returns to the general theme targeted by the second report, but with a focus limited to only one of the domains examined at that time: school curriculum. Next year, the Eighth Report (2009) will look at school textbooks. The study of the curriculum was separated from the analysis of textbooks in the interest of allowing for a more in-depth study, with an entire annual report devoted to each one. This report also takes a closer look at the subtopic of student government introduced in the Sixth Report (2007). The idea is to develop a specific indicator for determining whether the experience of student

organization and participation is approached as explicit material in the curriculum, associated with the exercise and learning of human rights.

So this report brings a number of innovations. It adopts an exclusive focus on the curriculum. It also redefines the sample and the selection of variables and indicators used for the analysis. The sample no longer consists of alternating grades in the school system, but instead focuses on a block of successive grades pertaining to a specific age group: 10 to 14 years. This group currently holds top priority within the IIHR educational strategy.

Most significantly, this Seventh Report finds overall steady progress in curriculum development. The schools are lending greater attention to human rights values and attitudes than they did when the IIHR prepared its research for the Second Report (2003). The new approach has revealed that human rights education in the public sphere of the region's countries is advancing gradually, but still lacks a substantive theoretical framework. As the countries of the Americas have made clear moves toward democratization, they have also achieved visible progress developing human rights education. The research for this Seventh Report found that human rights material is assigned mostly to the areas of social studies and civics. In some cases, results have been quite progressive, while in others, the impact has been more rhetorical. Even so, the ministries have been making clear efforts to bring about curricular changes during these decades, even though the history of Latin American education has been characterized by processes that are slow-moving and occur only occasionally. This research found at least six countries where very recent changes include the introduction of educational values inspired in principles of human rights. In at least four others, such changes are associated with commitments by States undergoing a transition to democracy in the aftermath of conflict situations.

The production of an annual report on development of the right to HRE has become a trademark of the IIHR, demonstrating a sense of identity and earning regional recognition, even as it lends guidance and direction to the Institute's work with the inter-American system. As a product, it is unique in the region. Even as it maintains its overall direction and format, its quality has improved steadily, and it has given the IIHR greater visibility on the OAS agenda. As the quality of the research continues to improve, the annual report system will become increasingly consolidated. This is why the decision was made to restart the cycle traced over the last five reports, which does not mean being redundant. It is the only way to monitor human rights education in school systems of the Americas. A true monitoring system provides regular updates of information so as to reflect more clearly the situation it claims to measure.

Roberto Cuéllar M.
Executive Director
December 10, 2008

Section I

The IIHR report on human rights education

Background and institutional setting

Since the early 1990s, the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR) has been working with the ministries of education in the countries of the region to facilitate the addition of human rights instruction into the formal educational system. It built this work on lessons it had learned over many years of educational programs. In the early years, the Institute had mostly trained human rights workers involved with civil society entities that were promoting and protecting human rights through urgent appeals for protection. From this starting point, it has gradually extended its coverage to address the need for training and upgrading teams working in public institutions that safeguard and monitor human rights (HR) and democracy.

The Institute decided to emphasize formal educational systems, without overlooking action in other training spheres, in view of several considerations based on its past experience. In the first place, it was convinced that an effective tool for protecting rights is to impart knowledge of rights and fundamental duties from an early age. Second, it hoped to seize the moment when democratic governments were being reinstated in the region, seeing this as an opportunity to pursue human rights promotion beyond simply responding to violations, and begin understanding human rights as a key component for life in democracy.

In keeping with these convictions, throughout the 1990s, the Institute undertook a major effort to produce and distribute teaching materials in support of educational activities in the schools. Education authorities in several countries of the region had been requesting technical assistance as they introduced new education reform processes. The arsenal of tools developed at that time was widely replicated by national institutions and used by pioneering educators to incorporate human rights education into the schools.¹

At the same time, through the assistance it was lending to several ministries of education, the IIHR discovered an urgent need to promote the systematic inclusion of human rights concepts as a permanent fixture in the educational system. It also came to understand that such a task is highly complex, dependent on innumerable political, regulatory, institutional and practical factors.

As the 21st century dawned, the IIHR undertook an intense process of rethinking and strategic redesign under the new administration begun in 2000, and decided to modernize its working strategies in the face of new and changing circumstances on the regional stage in the field of human rights and democracy.² The idea was to boost the capacities it had acquired over 20 years of action and respond more effectively to the challenges deeply felt by its counterparts in the countries, as well as new concerns among donor agencies that supported its operations.

IIHR leadership identified three sets of high-priority rights around which Institute activities would be organized: the inclusion of human rights education (HRE) as a fundamental component of formal educational processes, promotion of access to justice, and development of the right to political

¹ See *Carpeta de materiales didácticos del Centro de Recursos Educativos*, IIHR/Amnesty International, San Jose, Costa Rica, 1993; *Educación en derechos humanos. Texto autoformativo*, IIHR/UNESCO, San Jose, Costa Rica, 1994 and *Manual de Educación en Derechos Humanos. Niveles Primario y Secundario*, IIHR/UNESCO, San Jose, Costa Rica, 1999.

² See Institute documents *The current outlook for human rights and democracy*, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003 and *Framework for the development of an institutional strategy (2003-2005)*, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003.

participation. These issues were increasingly relevant to the critical dramas unfolding in the countries of the region at that time. Starting in 2005, a fourth set of rights was added as a focus of Institute work: economic, social and cultural rights. This decision coincided with the recent entry into force of the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, known as the “Protocol of San Salvador.”

The Institute then adopted a number of measures to propel strategic action on these sets of rights, including a program of applied research by which to ascertain with certainty the main trends in the development of legal protection and to gauge political conditions compatible with the exercise of rights. At the same time, it embraced three crosscutting perspectives reflecting three types of relationships critical to building equality and good government: the gender approach, the specificities of ethnic diversity and the dynamics between State and civil society.

From 2000 to 2001, the program designed a methodology for measuring progress (or setbacks) in the protection of rights and in the conditions for exercising them. The methodology was built on three systems (access to justice, political participation and HRE) that combine working hypotheses, domains for monitoring, variables of time and content, and progress indicators. The system was discussed with numerous groups of social stakeholders in the countries of the region. The Institute convened consultations for this specific purpose and also took advantage of specialized courses and workshops on its regular calendar of activities. It applied the system on a trial basis in six countries (Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela) and conducted a final validation in Bolivia. These early measurement exercises were published under the title *Map of Progress in Human Rights*.³

Armed with the findings from this exercise, the Institute then decided to deepen the system on the right most closely associated with its founding mandate—the right to HRE—to be applied more broadly in the region. It set the objective of producing an annual report on a variety of issues relevant to the primary purpose of promoting the incorporation of the HRE into formal education. These reports would describe progress the countries had made since 1990 in incorporating HRE; they would be submitted to the Organization of American States (OAS) as a friendly rapporteurship. They would also be submitted to government and civil society organizations in the countries and used as a discussion text in outreach and training activities.

The project fully met its goals. Every year, studies took place in the 19 signatory countries of the Protocol of San Salvador. The resulting reports were delivered to and discussed by the Permanent Council of the OAS and in sessions of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR). Simultaneous presentations were held in several countries on December 10 of each year. The English and Spanish versions were widely distributed and used as training material in courses and other events.

Nature and scope of the Inter-American HRE Report

The *Inter-American HRE Report* that the IIHR prepares every year is the result of a set of studies conducted simultaneously according to a standard design in 19 countries of the region. The report collects findings obtained in each country and compares them with the use of a data collection matrix that feeds into a system of indicators. The resulting indicators gauge the performance of each different variable; the variables reflect significant changes in the exercise of some critical aspect of the right to HRE over a given period, usually the decade prior to measurement.

³ Available in digital format on the Institute website (www.iidh.ed.cr).

The report reveals regional and national trends—whether progress, setbacks or stagnation—in legislative and judicial protection and in political, institutional and practical conditions on the exercise of a right or set of rights. It does not measure the status of a particular right at a given moment, nor does it report violations that may have infringed this right.

It is not a report on the right to education, but on the right to HRE. It avoids the objectives pursued by other reports that examine the degree to which the right to receive educational services has been respected without discrimination. Instead, it targets one of the particular qualities that educational services should possess—inclusion of human rights content—understood as an essential element of this right and a right in and of itself. The report assumes that access to education is a prior condition for enjoying the right to HRE and that the latter, in turn, is a guarantee of the right to high-quality education.

The overall system and the specific indicators emphasize qualitative aspects of the relations being studied. It makes no claim to draw quantitative conclusions or to build an equation that will sort the countries in order of priority or rank-order the different aspects of a right. The report does not establish a regional index of performance. It does, however, identify conditions and opportunities for promoting progress and, to some extent, it offers examples of good practices that may be replicated or considered for developing solutions to critical issues.

The IIHR intends for these reports to provide input to the inter-American organizations for monitoring, promoting and protecting human rights; to the ombudsman institutions (variously known as human rights commissions, prosecutors and defenders) that perform similar roles in each country; to public institutions responsible for creating conditions that foster the effective exercise of the right to human rights education, and to civil society entities active in this field.

It has taken on this task in response to the provisions of its own charter that mandates it to perform studies on human rights, and in fulfillment of its mission as an institution devoted to human rights education, research and outreach. While it fully respects the universal protection system, it particularly focuses on standards derived from instruments that have emerged within the inter-American system, taking an interdisciplinary approach and always considering problems specific to the Americas.

The goal of this report is to produce tools for on-going evaluation of the inclusion of HRE in the political and social life of the region's countries, as an international pledge and obligation. It does not claim, and indeed is not empowered, to judge the responsibilities of the States. Its role is auxiliary to that of the protection bodies—the Inter-American Human Rights Court and Commission—and it takes the vantage point of an independent academic organization. It is able to interact with all the stakeholders on the human rights scene outside the realm of adjudicatory proceedings, promote dialogue among them and propose technical instruments and institutional solutions that will not hinder the progress of ongoing petitions or judicial cases.

Regulatory foundations: the right to human rights education

International standards derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and in the Americas, the Protocol of San Salvador clearly establish the right to human rights education as part of the right to education. Indeed, as the Protocol states in article 13, subparagraphs 1 and 2:

Everyone has the right to education. ... education should be directed towards the full development of the human personality and human dignity and should strengthen respect for human rights, ideological pluralism,

fundamental freedoms, justice and peace. ... education ought to enable everyone to participate effectively in a democratic and pluralistic society and achieve a decent existence and should foster understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups and promote activities for the maintenance of peace.

The Protocol of San Salvador gains legal effect only upon ratification by each State; thus the 19 countries that have signed and/or ratified the Protocol hold a proactive commitment to design a legal and logistic platform for promoting and protecting economic, social and cultural rights (ESCRs) in all their dimensions. This includes the commitment to ratify the Protocol, if they have not yet done so, and the duty to progressively carry out their obligations to adapt domestic legislation, design public policies and effectively implement activities to comply with these precepts.

States that have ratified the Protocol hold the additional obligation created in article 19.2 to submit regular reports to the OAS Secretary General, who will transmit them to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Council for Education, Science and Culture for examination. An additional copy of these reports is sent to the Commission.

Moreover, from 2004 to 2007, after the Protocol of San Salvador received its 12th ratification and entered into effect, the OAS General Assembly resolved to design and implement a procedure whereby the States parties should submit their reports, emulating the system of progress indicators adopted by the ICHR for analysis of HRE. For this purpose, it entrusted the Permanent Council, and by extension the Commission, to develop a proposal with support from the Institute. As of this date, the proposal is now in development.⁴

These State obligations go hand in hand with others defined in international instruments establishing further commitments for HRE: Convention against Discrimination in Education, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, ILO Convention 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, Convention on the Rights of the Child, Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence Against Women (Convention of Belem do Pará) and the Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities.

Conceptual and methodological foundations: studying progress

Approaches to human rights research

Human rights research endeavors over the past half century have tended to adopt variations on three major approaches:

- One approach could be considered the most traditional, that is, the most long-standing and widespread; it identifies *cases of human-rights violation*, documents them, discusses legal and procedural considerations, establishes responsibility and finally, contributes to reporting and prosecuting these violations.
- A second approach focuses on *human rights situations*; it gauges the effective exercise of rights at a given moment, in the understanding that this reveals how fully the State is complying with its obligations to respect certain conditions and guarantees, or whether the State is promoting measures to provide access to fundamental rights without discrimination.

⁴ See Guidelines for preparation of progress indicators in the area of economic, social and cultural rights on the Commission website: http://www.cidh.org/pdf_files/guidelines_progress_indicators_desc.july.2008.doc

- A third research approach can be called *human rights progress*; it seeks to demonstrate changes over time in the degree to which State human rights commitments have been fulfilled, based on the standard of progressive achievement. It asks whether or not progress has been made in the population's ability to enjoy these rights.

Given the nature of the research target, the violation approach essentially adopts a case-by-case methodology and is very well suited to the field of civil and political rights. Such investigations have been and continue to be critically important for unearthing specific cases of rights violations. They set in motion the legal and socio-political processes needed to clarify the facts, punish perpetrators and provide justice and reparation to victims, at the same time alerting to the possibility of future violations.⁵

The second approach seeks correlations between statistical results and public policy measures in fields relevant to human rights, and it applies particularly well to rights involving political participation and access to ESCRs.⁶ It generally produces research that combines examination of human rights standards with statistical information describing general situations, or reflecting widespread opinions.

Finally, the progress measurement approach takes a long-term view by examining relatively lengthy periods to assess whether or not real progress is being made in the effective exercise of rights, based on minimum standards set forth in international law and adopted by the countries upon ratification of conventions. It does not replace monitoring and reporting of violations, nor does it attempt to mask setbacks in achieving desired goals. It is innovative because of its potential to portray human rights concerns as *processes*, or phenomena that change over time, rather than merely taking a photograph of the status quo at a given moment.⁷

The following table summarizes the main aspects of these approaches.

Approaches to human rights research			
Approach	Methodology	Type of results	Uses
Violation	Descriptive methodology	Identify frequency	Denounce and defend
Situation	Comparative methodology	Assess	Identify problems and set goals
Progress	Forward-looking methodology	Identify trends	Monitor compliance and stimulate dialogue

The IIHR has been developing the progress approach since 2000, using it ever since as a basis on which to design and implement applied research.

Human rights reports and monitoring

Human rights research commonly takes the form of regular reports that serve as a monitoring mechanism for the international and inter-American protection systems. Several international instruments call for

⁵ In Latin America, this approach in recent decades has been enriched by expanding access to public information associated with the restoration of democracy.

⁶ The findings of these studies are then used to develop recommendations for public action, many of which entail legal and institutional considerations as well as public investment decisions.

⁷ This approach helps identify not only shortcomings, but also the potential to overcome them in the medium and long term and to help various stakeholders in society as they develop shared, complementary priorities and working strategies.

the States to submit compliance reports. Others allow protection bodies to develop these reports, including the use of rapporteurs or reports based on *in loco* visits conducted for specific purposes. Official reports reflect the government's viewpoint on particular situations and on efforts they are making to abide by their convention-based commitments.

Numerous national and international civil society entities also publish their own research findings in the form of periodic general or specialized reports, sometimes provided to supervision bodies as support material. They are known as *shadow reports*. Because some of these national reports are periodic and systematic, they have become useful tools for monitoring public-sector performance in the field of human rights.⁸

Meanwhile, more and more of the countries have created ombudsman institutions, giving rise to a new type of report that the head of this institution (variously known as human rights defender, prosecutor or commissioner) regularly submits to the legislative branch as the body responsible for overseeing defense of the Constitution and compliance with international human rights commitments. These reports describe and analyze complaints received by the institution or critical situations in which it has intervened, as well as the impact and outcome of its recommendations to public-sector institutions.

With very few exceptions, no systematic mechanisms have been developed for overseeing compliance with the recommendations of international oversight institutions or the judgments of judicial bodies. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) has been conducting regular analysis of progress in meeting the Millennium Development Goals. Part of this process has been a recent systematic effort to monitor compliance with commitments for development, taking the perspective of implied rights.

*New instruments for new scenarios*⁹

IIHR became interested in developing new approaches for studying and monitoring human rights when it began to observe changes that had unfolded on the human rights scene over the past 20 years and saw the need to foster dialogue on these processes. Such changes include, for example, diversification of stakeholders both in the public sector and in civil society, and greater interaction among them. Newly emerging social dramas demand innovative responses. International cooperation has begun to emphasize more direct and effective investments in the countries. New standards for project management and impact are being emphasized. Finally, there is a greater need to build consensus among civil society organizations, the State and the international community.

As the scenario grows more complex, human rights work becomes more demanding. To begin with, new tools are needed to document current processes objectively, identify trends and outline well-directed strategies for advocacy. At the same time, it is critical to foster greater dialogue on human rights between civil society and the State, and between these and the international community. Consequently, in addition to the problems of rights violations and establishing responsibility, attention must also focus on developing assessments and setting common goals, at least in areas where gaps remain or where promising directions are emerging.

Admittedly, the use of progress indicators does not paint an exhaustive picture of real-life situations. Nonetheless, there is no question that this approach and its instruments are of great practical value for showing the direction in which a particular phenomenon is moving and highlighting its signs

⁸ Examples include the PROVEA reports in Venezuela, CELS reports in Argentina and reports by the coordinators of human rights organizations in Peru and Paraguay. At the regional level, the annual report of the *Plataforma Interamericana de Derechos Humanos y Democracia* has been acquiring this same status

⁹ See *The current outlook for human rights and democracy*, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003.

or symptoms, in order to identify trends in the field of human rights and democracy and anticipate possible new developments. This is why the IIHR focused its efforts on defining indicators based on the progressive development of human rights.¹⁰ It chose to prepare reports that would serve as “roadmaps” for institutions and individuals active in this field.

The use of these progress indicators offers a number of advantages for research:

- they can be applied simultaneously in all the countries, guaranteeing that data and results will be reasonably comparable;
- they draw on data from hard sources, such as legislation, official documents and textbooks, and this lessens the risks inherent in interpreting and handling opinions, and
- they measure actual efforts that have been made in each country; the study is able to look beyond tangible results, which in the case of education also depend on factors outside the realm of the research.

The first cycle of HRE reports: 2002-2006

The general structure of research

The research behind the first five reports is based on three assumptions drawn from underlying legal provisions:

- That all individuals, without distinction, have the right to receive HRE.
- That the State has the obligation to provide it.
- That this obligation must be met as a high priority of the formal education system, regardless of whether educational services are centralized or decentralized.

The general hypothesis of these studies is that evolution or progress in the effective exercise of the right to HRE depends on a range of factors involving legal certainty, institutional development, adoption of relevant policies, how these policies are translated into operating rules and educational instruments, the endowment of human resources and the provision of material resources for education.

In short, the right to receive HRE is highly dependent on a number of specific factors:

- Whether the national legal system has embodied international standards establishing this right and its corresponding obligations, and whether the State is developing public policies for education that are consistent with these standards.
- Whether human rights content has been truly incorporated into the formal educational curriculum and other school activities, and whether textbooks reflect this content and are free of references contrary to human rights values.
- Whether this content and the methodologies for teaching it are clearly reflected in training programs for teachers and others involved in educational processes.
- Whether planning for national education includes the development of measures for progressively incorporating HRE at all educational levels.
- Whether curriculum slots and extracurricular activities addressing this type of education are sufficient and are increasing over time.

¹⁰ For more extensive discussion of the institutional basis for this work, see: *Framework for the development of an institutional strategy*, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003.

The purpose of the research is to find out how, to what extent and in what direction compliance with these obligations is evolving in each State; the following research fields were defined initially:¹¹

- Legal provisions, institutions and public policies.
- Curriculum and textbooks.
- Teacher training.
- National education planning.
- Specific curriculum courses and content.

Work in each field covers several sub-topics within each domain:

- The regulatory or legal domain includes accession to international standards, recognition in the Constitution, legal guarantees and other legislative or regulatory measures.
- The political or institutional domain examines the existence of public policies and administrative guidelines, the creation of institutions responsible for the effective exercise of this right and development of action instruments.
- Another domain is the educational practices that give tangible effect to the chain of decisions and instructions developed for carrying out legal provisions and policies.
- For each of these domains, the research team identified a set of variables that would reveal the most significant changes occurring over a 10- to 15-year period beginning in 1990 and ending the year immediately prior to the study. These variables would also reveal whether all the relevant legal provisions, policies and practices were developing at a consistent rate.

Finally, to measure the performance of each variable over time, a set of indicators was established that would be applied at the beginning and end of the period under study. The indicators were supplemented with information from written, verifiable official sources such as legislation, program documents, budgets and administrative instructions, current school curricula and textbooks, management reports, the results of evaluations or studies, statistics, and the like. The system does not contain opinions, nor does it claim to reflect the perception of users or their degree of satisfaction with the exercise of the right. Such sources (interviews, focus groups or reviews of general literature) were used only in the initial phase when the conceptual and methodological framework was first being designed. They were also used occasionally to enrich the results of data collection by giving a sense of context.

The following table summarizes the structure of research conducted during the entire first cycle, indicating the resulting reports and the year they were produced.

General structure of the HRE report cycle					
Subject fields	Domains	Variables	Indicators	Report N°	Year
Normative and institutional development	1	4	10	I	2002
Development of school curricula and textbooks	3	6	28	II	2003
Development of teacher education	4	11	38	III	2004
Developments in educational planning at the national level	3	8	26	IV	2005
Developments in curriculum contents and courses: 10-14 years of age	3	9	28	V	2006
Total	14	38	130		

¹¹ Each of these is understood as a complex web of relationships among many domains: regulatory or legal, political or institutional and practical, all of which combine to yield a particular level of performance.

Data collection, analysis and writing

Part of the information for the First Report was supplied by participants in the Twentieth Interdisciplinary Course on Human Rights held in San Jose in July and August of 2002. Before attending the course, each of the 120 students from over 20 countries of the region prepared a brief report based on a data collection matrix provided by the IIHR. During the two-week course, they shared their reports and together developed possible conclusions and recommendations. The IIHR research team completed the exercise and prepared the First Report. The students, in turn, undertook to disseminate the report in their countries, and some also expressed willingness to cooperate in future studies.

All this came about when a new Institute administration began in 2000 and proceeded to redefine strategies, providing clearer political and pedagogical direction to IIHR activities. The Institute's new strategy was built on a foundation of clear progress in the area of technology and pedagogy. To this it added specific actions for advocacy in the political realm based on the legal provisions given by the inter-American system, particularly the Protocol of San Salvador. The final outcome will consist of deepened and sustained changes in the formal educational system, in this case by building a system of indicators and developing regular reports on the subject. The Institute thus makes a substantive contribution to efforts for giving fuller expression to the right to education, particularly human rights education.

Research work undertaken for the Second through the Fifth Report followed a specific pattern:

1. The Institute team developed a working hypothesis and designed a system of variables and indicators.
2. In-country researchers collected information based on the system of indicators.¹²
3. The Institute team collated, sorted and harmonized the information.
4. Results were analyzed and a comparative synthesis of findings was developed (patterns and specificities).
5. Conclusions and recommendations were discussed.
6. The IIHR team wrote and published the reports.
7. The reports were launched in public ceremonies.

The system of indicators used in the reports can be synthesized as follows:¹³

Structure of a system of indicators				
Field	Domains	Variables	Indicators	Means of verification
The set of everything included in a certain activity. For example, all the rights and actions associated with a major theme.	The set of all issues (relationships) embodied in a concept or those that receive the influence or action of something expressed. For example: each regulatory level (Kelsen pyramid).	Magnitude able to take on different values. For example: the factor's relative proximity to a given standard.	"Key" indicators that point to trends for each variable over time. For example: legislation in effect at two different times.	Sources of information supporting the proposed indicators. For example: laws, official documents, school textbooks.

¹² This includes both individual researchers and collectives organized through human rights NGOs. Most of the cooperating researchers were alumni of IIHR courses.

¹³ These terms in Spanish were taken from the dictionary M. Moliner, *Diccionario de uso del español*, Editorial Gredos, Madrid, 2001.

Associates in the countries collected data by applying a matrix received from the IIHR and in accordance with a protocol of instructions to ensure that replies would be as comparable as possible.

Institute staff then processed data submitted by local researchers. They began with a preliminary screening of the quantity and quality of responses received. Any missing information could then be completed and, in case of doubt, information was verified with the use of secondary sources. Finally, they developed documents of responses by country. These results, presented as text or tables, were recorded on a compact disc, complete with a search system, to be included as appendices to the report.

To facilitate comparative analysis, the staff developed tables containing syntheses (sometimes, but not always, expressed as values or percentages) of responses to each variable in all countries. This made it easier to identify patterns, recurrences and specificities useful for inferring general and specific trends reflecting progress under each domain in the system.

The final Report has been launched every year on December 10 in public events at IIHR headquarters in Costa Rica and in several other countries, with support from members of the General Assembly, Institute staff, local consultants and in cooperation with a particular public institution or civil society entity. At the beginning of the following year, it has been presented to the OAS Permanent Council and Committee on Juridical and Political Affairs and Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in Washington, DC.

Hypotheses and matrices

First Report (2002): Normative Development

The working hypothesis was that protection of the right to HRE depends on whether the State has adopted international standards providing this right and its concomitant obligations and whether public policies consistent with these standards are being developed. These conditions must be weighed in terms of the more general context of the overall right to education.

This is why a specific initial domain was created on the right to education, thus providing additional information on surrounding conditions, as well as the target domain on the right to HRE. The table for collecting data and analyzing findings was as follows:

Variables	Indicators
Right to education	Constitutional norms on the right to education.
	Percent of the national budget allocated in the Constitution to education.
	Compulsory nature of education.
	Educational enrollment.
Adoption of norms on HRE	Ratification of international instruments.
	Inclusion of HRE in national laws.
Adoption of public policies	Inclusion of HRE in decrees, rulings and other public policy documents.
	Inclusion of HRE in official documents and educational course plans.
Institutional development	Existence of government departments specialized in HRE.
	Government programs specialized in HRE.

Second Report (2003): Development of school curricula and textbooks

This study was based on the hypothesis that progress in HRE depends on whether human rights content has been effectively incorporated into the curriculum of the formal education system and whether school textbooks reflect this content and are free of references that run counter to fundamental values.

The guidelines for this work were developed by breaking down the text of article 13.2 of the Protocol of San Salvador. Special attention focused on variables concerning educational content on the State, rule of law, justice, democracy and values in general. For practical reasons, school curriculum and textbooks were analyzed according to a sampling taken from three grades of the educational system, as seen in the following table.

Variables	Indicators
Domain 1: Curricular regime	
Incorporation of HRE content into the official document that directs the objectives and content of the curriculum	Content on human rights and constitutional guarantees.
	Content on justice, State institutions and the Rule of Law.
	Content on democracy, voting rights, elections, political and ideological pluralism.
	Content on education in values (solidarity, human dignity, peace, tolerance and understanding among nations).
Incorporation of HRE contents into the official course programs for 5th, 8th and 11th grades	Content on human rights and constitutional guarantees.
	Content on justice, State institutions and the Rule of Law.
	Content on democracy, voting rights, elections, political and ideological pluralism.
	Content on education in values (solidarity, human dignity, peace, tolerance and understanding among nations).
Domain 2: School textbooks	
Incorporation of HRE contents into educational textbooks for 5th, 8th and 11th grades	Content on human rights and constitutional guarantees.
	Content on justice, State institutions and the Rule of Law.
	Content on democracy, voting rights, elections, political and ideological pluralism.
	Content on education in values (solidarity, human dignity, peace, tolerance and understanding among nations).
Domain 3: Cross-cutting perspectives	
Gender equity	Content on gender equity in: 1) Official document setting the objectives and contents of the curriculum, 2) Course programs, 3) Textbooks.
	Language used in textbooks.
	Roles in which women are depicted in textbook illustrations.
	Number of women in relation to men in textbook illustrations.
Ethnic diversity	Content on ethnic diversity in: 1) Official document setting the objectives and contents of the curriculum, 2) Course programs, 3) Textbooks.
	Roles in which indigenous and Afro-descendant peoples are depicted in textbook illustrations.
	Number of indigenous and Afro-descendant peoples in textbook illustrations.
	Auxiliary or complementary bibliography on intercultural issues and bilingualism.
Interaction between civil society and the State	The role of civil society in the process of preparing the curriculum.
	Contents that address the knowledge and/or participation of civil society in different governmental and non-governmental organizations in course programs and textbooks.

Third Report (2004): The development of teacher education

The working hypothesis assumed that content, values, attitudes and skills for teaching human rights should be an integral part of training for teachers and other participants in education.

The study therefore explored changes that had occurred from 1990 through 2003 in the training given to teachers, whether for aspiring new professionals being trained as first-time teachers, or in-service teacher training through refresher courses, seminars, workshops or other such activities. Research focused on whether general education laws, special labor laws for teachers, other regulatory provisions and policy documents in general had established the need for teachers to receive adequate instruction so as to understand and impart human rights topics. Two questions needed to be asked: first, whether training programs in institutions that educate new teachers had incorporated this type of content, and second, whether refresher training activities for active teachers had done so.

Variables	Indicators
Domain 1: Basic and advanced training in legislation and policy documents and institutions	
Content of laws with regard to teacher education and training	Chapter or section on teacher education and training.
	Provisions stipulating that teachers must acquire skills and knowledge for human rights teaching.
Content of national education plans	Chapter or section on teacher education and training.
	Guidelines on acquiring skills and knowledge for human rights teaching.
Structure of the ministry with regard to training in the teaching of human rights	A unit in charge of training educators to teach human rights.
	A unit that establishes pedagogical outlines and guidelines for training educators in teacher training schools and institutes of education.
	Pedagogical outlines and guidelines for teaching human rights in teacher training schools and institutes of education.
Domain 2: Basic or initial training	
Curricula of teaching training schools	Course content on human rights.
	Didactic content on human rights teaching.
	Research papers, theses, essays on the teaching of human rights.
Curricula of other higher education teacher training institutions	Course content on human rights.
	Didactic content on human rights teaching.
	Research papers, theses, essays on human rights education.
Domain 3: In-service training for educators	
Courses, one-day events or activities for educators provided by ministries of education	Courses, workshops or one-day events on human rights.
	Agreements between ministries and other organizations.
	Material on the teaching of human rights.
Courses, one-day events, activities for educators provided by office of the ombudsman	Courses, workshops or one-day events on human rights.
	Agreements between ombudsman and other organizations.
	Material on the teaching of human rights.

Fourth Report (2005): Developments in national planning

This study examined the development of national human rights plans, national plans for human rights education, or equivalent policy documents. It assumed that such plans serve as significant

indicators that public policies have been developed for including HRE as a component of educational processes at all levels, and setting their basic direction. Accordingly, the working hypothesis was that progress in HRE depends, among other things, on whether education planning in any given country expressly calls for the development of measures to incorporate HRE at all levels of education and in other realms of social life in addition to the formal education system.

The table of indicators was based on guidelines proposed by the United Nations for developing national HRE plans.

Variables	Indicators
Domain 1: Developing the plan	
Establishing a committee or entity to develop the HREPLAN (council, committee, commission or work group)	Nature of the committee or entity.
	Mandate and functions.
	Membership.
	Activities it has performed (meetings, workshops, etc.).
Assessment of the state of HRE in the country	One or more studies were performed on the state of HRE
	Existing studies on the state of HRE were taken into consideration.
	The committee requested technical assistance for preparing the plan (consultancies, meetings of experts, etc.) from international or national organizations.
Setting priorities for preparing the plan	Priorities have been set on particular human rights included in the plan.
	Priorities have been set on the rights of particular social groups or individuals.
	Priorities have been set on the educational levels in which HRE will be incorporated.
Procedures and activities for developing the plan	Activities performed to develop the plan.
	Current state of preparation of the plan
	Actions pending to complete preparation of the plan
Domain 2: Contents of the plan	
Formal contents of the HREPLAN	Timetable for developing the plan.
	Responsibilities are assigned for implementing the plan.
	Provisions are made to review and revise content.
	A specific budget allocation has been provided to implement the plan.
Technical components of the HREPLAN	Main content.
	The human rights expressly mentioned in the plan.
	Other educational content mentioned in the plan (democracy, Rule of Law, justice, tolerance, etc.).
Crosscutting perspectives in the HREPLAN	Gender equality.
	Recognition of ethnic and cultural diversity.
	Interaction between the State and society in the field of HRE.
Domain 3: Implementing the plan	
Degree of implementation of the HREPLAN	Overall state of implementation of the national HREPLAN.
	An institutional structure is responsible for implementing the HREPLAN.
	The expense budget allocated for the HREPLAN is being used.

Fifth Report (2006): Developments in curriculum contents and courses

The first four reports offered a general assessment. The Fifth Report combined this assessment with the hypothesis that inclusion of human rights in education entails a process of negotiation on curriculum content and courses. Accordingly, research examined current status and trends in the development of curriculum courses that currently or potentially provide a vehicle for the content suggested in the IHR educational proposal, which will be discussed in the next section. Following the same structure as the educational proposal, the Fifth Report trained its view on students between 10 and 14 years of age, using the following table.

Variables	Indicators
Domain 1: Process of curriculum design	
Level of decision-making	National.
	State, provincial, municipal.
	Local and school.
Institutional responsibility for curriculum design	Professional level of curriculum designers.
	Development and preparation of curriculum.
	Responsibilities of the curriculum department or division.
Domain 2: Curriculum slots for 2000 and 2005	
Courses for 12-year programs	Map by grades.
	Curriculum format and design.
Course load (hours) of the map	Classroom hours by grade.
Human rights content	For 10-year-olds.
	For 11-year-olds.
	For 12-year-olds.
	For 13-year-olds.
	For 14-year-olds.
Domain 3: Teaching resources for 2000 and 2005	
Presence of human rights content in schoolbooks	For 10-year-olds.
	For 11-year-olds.
	For 12-year-olds.
	For 13-year-olds.
	For 14-year-olds.
Presence of human rights content in graded assignments	For 10-year-olds.
	For 11-year-olds.
	For 12-year-olds.
	For 13-year-olds.
	For 14-year-olds.
Extra-curricular activities	Visits to government institutions
Special commemoration days	On ethnic diversity.
	On gender equity.
	Others associated with human rights.

Section II

The Seventh Report and the second cycle of HRE reporting

A unique Institute project: *The Curricular and methodological proposal for HRE*

Purpose and objectives of the Proposal

Alongside its research for the Inter-American HRE Report, the IIHR developed a specialized technical educational proposal for incorporating human rights instruction into the school curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age. The idea was to provide human rights and democracy content for inclusion in the curriculum, or to expand and strengthen material already present.¹⁴

The Proposal was developed in 2006 through a discussion process based on the Institute's many years of experience in this field. It also drew on regional assessments presented in the first five inter-American HRE reports and the Institute's participation in a variety of educational initiatives. Finally, it built on interactions with educational counterparts throughout the hemisphere, material developed by other institutions in related areas, and existing doctrine in this field.

The IIHR pursued two interlinked objectives with its new product:

- To build on its earlier contributions by developing a strategic, all-encompassing proposal for introducing or strengthening systematic human rights education for children from 10 to 14 years of age; despite its focus on one particular age group, the proposal would stand on a theoretical and methodological foundation applicable to diverse national settings and potentially adaptable to other age groups.
- To meet a need, in those countries of the region that were aware of the importance of HRE and concerned about meeting their commitments to the regional and international community, to incorporate such instruction into mass school education for their children and adolescents.

Clearly, the Inter-American reports had revealed significant progress; they also identified limitations and gaps, as well as highly unequal degrees of development from one country to another. This is why the IIHR educational proposal was intended to help the countries overcome shortfalls and gaps and provide a broad, all-encompassing, rigorous vision for incorporating human rights into formal education. It is directed at top-level authorities and technical teams in the countries' ministries of education and other academic institutions and should serve as a contribution to the development of educational policies, plans and practices in this field. It will equip signatory States to the Protocol of San Salvador to abide by their commitments and will shore up their efforts to carry out the United Nations World Programme for Human Rights Education (2005-2007) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

The proposal recognizes and builds on progress this hemisphere has made over the past decade in the field of HRE in national regulatory systems, in political agreements by presidents and ministers of education, and in gradual implementation by the States of the region. At the same time, it reflects the urging of the international community to go even farther.¹⁵

¹⁴ *Curricular and methodological proposal for incorporating human rights education into formal schooling for children from 10 to 14 years of age*; in several languages, IIHR website http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/PaginaExterna.aspx?url=/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD_119984550/Propuesta%20curricular%20ingles.pdf

¹⁵ *World Programme for Human Rights Education* (http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/dpage_s.aspx?si=E/cn.4/RES/2005/61) and plan of action (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001478/147853e.pdf>).

The IIHR decided to focus its curricular and methodological proposal on students from 10 to 14 years of age for both qualitative and quantitative reasons. Qualitatively speaking, the stages of development most children experience from 10 to 14 years of age entail major psychosocial transformations. These young people are passing through a growth phase in which they must actively internalize the sense of otherness, learning to recognize others as distinct from themselves. They begin to understand social relationships as delicately balanced interactions between rights and obligations built on a foundation of values and fitting into given institutional frameworks. This is an ideal educational state, perfectly suited for instilling the basic principles of human rights and democracy in individuals and the group.

Quantitatively speaking, this age group makes up nearly 75% of the school population, and the majority of these young people are enrolled in the public school system. At this age, school attendance is obligatory in most countries and, at least formally, their schooling is covered by State budget allocations. The ministries of education directly regulate the curriculum for this age group and are also responsible for training, certifying and retaining teachers. Therefore the education of this specific segment of the population remains under the responsibility and protection of public policy, including curriculum design, supervision of text materials and oversight of teacher training.

All these considerations led the Institute to emphasize this age group in its HRE studies, although in no sense does this mean that other age groups are excluded. Ideally, the entire school program, even from the earliest age, is an appropriate setting for HRE, but the period from 10 to 14 years of age represents the inescapable lowest common denominator.

The Proposal and the ministries of education: progress and regional synergy

At the time of the Thirty-seventh session of the OAS General Assembly, held in Panama from May 31 to June 2, 2007, the *Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education on Human Rights Education* was organized jointly by the government of the host country and the IIHR, with support from UNICEF. The activity brought together 17 official delegations of ministers and other high-level education authorities from the countries of the region. Participants analyzed the state of HRE in the region, identified progress made and pending challenges and proposed ways to strengthen inter-institutional linkages for developing future actions in compliance with the commitments acquired when international instruments on this subject were signed.

Before they began their actual work, the delegations attending the event took time to examine the curricular and methodological proposal developed by the IIHR. They studied it in detail, shared their comments and worked out a common horizon within which to tackle challenges for improving the inclusion of human rights material in formal education, especially for students from 10 to 14 years of age. The activity closed with the signing of the *Panama Declaration on Human Rights Education*.¹⁶

Upon completion of the meeting of ministers, the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the OAS (Panama, June 3-5, 2007) adopted a firm resolution supporting the deliberations of the ministers and emphasizing the need to advance toward full incorporation of HRE in the educational systems of the region.¹⁷ The General Assembly resolved:

1. To acknowledge the progress, actions, and policies gradually being implemented by member states with respect to human rights education for children and young people in academic institutions, as documented by the Inter-American Reports on Human Rights Education.

¹⁶ The Declaration can be seen (in Spanish) in the 98th issue of the IIHR Newsletter (http://www.iidh.ed.cr/multiCom/paginaInterna_IIDH.aspx?pagina_destino=ASP.bibliotecaDigital_ascx&biblio=62&IdPortal=6&Nav=R).

¹⁷ The resolution [AG/RES. 2321 (XXXVII– O/07)] can be found by clicking “Thirty-seventh regular session” on the OAS Website at <http://www.oas.org/consejo/GENERAL%20ASSEMBLY/Resoluciones-Declaraciones.asp>.

2. To suggest that member states implement, if, and to the extent that, they have not yet done so, the recommendations contained in the Inter-American Reports on Human Rights Education at different levels in their formal education systems.
3. To suggest to member states that they analyze the contributions of the Curricular and Methodological Proposal for Incorporating Human Rights Education into Formal Schooling for Children from 10 to 14 Years of Age of the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR) with a view to their adopting it and in accordance with Article 13.2 of the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Accordingly, to recommend to member states that have not already done so that they adopt, sign, and ratify this instrument.
4. To underscore the work and achievements of the Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education on Human Rights Education in the states parties to the Protocol of San Salvador, in which participants shared their experience and discussed the curricular and methodological developments needed to introduce or strengthen human rights education in each state party's educational system.

The following year, in the framework of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly of the OAS (Medellín, June 1-3, 2008), the IIHR organized the *Dialogue of ministers on human rights education*. It took place from May 29-30 in Medellín, with support from the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Colombia. Following up on the work and agreements of the meeting of ministers in Panama (2007), this dialogue facilitated an exchange of national experiences with HRE. Minister-level delegations were present from Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica and Panama. Once again, the General Assembly of the Organization of American States unanimously adopted a resolution recognizing the efforts of the IIHR and the ministries of education of the region to incorporate human rights more effectively into the formal education system. It also reiterated its support of the curricular and methodological proposal and the inter-American reports on human rights education, recommending that they be considered seriously by the member States [AG/RES. 2404 (XXXVIII– O/08)].

Subsequently, in coordination with the Ministry of Education of El Salvador and with support from the UNESCO Regional Bureau for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean, the IIHR held the *First Inter-American Course on Human Rights Education* (San Salvador, June 17-20, 2008). The course was attended by specialized technical experts from the ministries of education who hold leadership positions either in the area of curriculum, or in supervision of courses where HRE issues are taught; they hailed from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic, Suriname and Uruguay. Also present were representatives of the ombudsman offices of Central America and the directors of specialized university programs, especially the schools of education.

In addition to promoting exchange and cooperation among the ministries of education, the course emphasized intersectoral participation geared toward building synergy among different institutions that, from their particular spheres of expertise, are associated with HRE in the formal education system. It included the ministries, as leaders of national education policy, along with universities, where future teachers are prepared, and ombudsman offices that monitor the work of public institutions responsible for promoting the effective exercise of human rights. The IIHR is convinced that, given their nature and function, all three types of entities can and must find opportunities to cooperate with one another in initiatives to promote the right to education and HRE.

Additional actions have also been taken to comply with the agreements of the ministerial meeting in Panama (2007), cited above, and relevant resolutions of the OAS General Assembly. The IIHR

and the ministries of education have built stronger working relations by renewing agreements for inter-institutional cooperation. During this year, the Institute formalized agreements with ministries in El Salvador, Panama and Guatemala. Similar agreements are forthcoming with ministries and secretariats of public education in other countries of the region as well.

At this point, the IIHR plans to build on the achievements of the Proposal, the OAS resolutions and the findings of the inter-American reports. It will continue contributing to the efforts of the ministries of education in the field of HRE by holding more training activities, both face-to-face and online. It will continue to provide specialized technical assistance and to produce and distribute print, audiovisual and electronic materials. The inter-American reports still provide the best possible assessment of the region's strengths, weaknesses and shortcomings in this field.

Second cycle of the Inter-American Report

An exercise in permanence and innovation

Results from the 2007 meeting of ministers in Panama and the encouraging reaction by the OAS General Assembly, as well as expressions of interest by ministries of education from various countries eager to pursue this line of inquiry with the IIHR, clearly reveal the wisdom of the decision to implement a new cycle of the Inter-American Report on HRE.

The new cycle of reports will focus each year on one of the topics explored during the first cycle, drawing a second measurement of progress. Thus it will identify changes made more recently in the education program under new international regulatory provisions and in response to shifting conditions and developments internal to each country.

Every year, new components will be introduced into the measurement system, whether to expand the arsenal of indicators used, or to add previously unexplored research domains or relevant variables that were not considered in the first five reports. Thus the IIHR strategic approach combines and balances the *permanence* or *continuity* of practices that have proved necessary or valuable for HRE work in the past, with *innovation*, addressing new practices if the evolving challenges for human rights in the region so indicate.

The effects of innovation were also felt in the actual process of writing reports. The 2007 ministerial meeting in Panama served as an opportunity to introduce direct participation by the ministries of education in this second research cycle on HRE progress. Accordingly, the group of researchers for the Sixth and subsequent Reports would be larger than in the past. Now the team combines independent IIHR consultants with officers appointed by the ministries of education in target countries, creating a valuable new opportunity for inter-institutional synergy.

Sixth Report (2007): Normative development of HRE and student government

The Sixth Report goes back to the starting point of the research cycle, revisiting the topic discussed in the First Report (2002) to apply a second progress measurement. It also introduces a new domain: developments with student government in educational systems.

The selection of this new research domain is important because student government serves as a concrete, real-life, practical opportunity for students to both practice and learn about their human rights and democratic principles by exercising them actively.

The initial hypothesis for this research is that the existence of a regulatory foundation for student government reflects the State's de facto recognition of children and adolescents as rights holders and guarantees their exercise of these rights in the very social environment that occupies much of their daily lives. Student government is understood as an organization created by representatives of the student community in each school, elected democratically, whose purposes include listening to, debating and voicing student opinions and proposals to the school administration and taking part in decisions on matters of school life that affect them. Thus students have access to a participatory forum for representation, deliberation and decision-making within the educational institution.

The challenge was to examine the development of HRE laws and regulations. Researchers asked whether the States had progressed over the past two decades in two areas. (i) Does the regulatory framework explicitly recognize some form of student organization featuring a degree of participation, representation and decision making? (ii) Are school resources available to make student government a reality?

In order to collect and share documentary information on these questions, the Sixth Report focused on three historical milestones: 1990, 2000 and 2007. The first year, 1990, stands as a constant in all the HRE reports, the starting point of the reference period during which changes in educational systems were observed. The third, 2007, reflects another constant in the reports: the endpoint to the given *reference period* in the same year each study takes place, so that the analysis of educational developments in the region is always current. As the life span of the report has lengthened, the reference period also extended, so the decision was made to add a third intermediate milestone, 2000, marking the midpoint between decades and providing a means to examine changes and identify trends more precisely and in greater detail.

The matrix for the Sixth Report was enriched with lessons learned in the first cycle. To begin with, the new study used a larger number of indicators to produce a more in-depth examination of the subject. In the second place, the new table offered as many opportunities as possible to elicit differentiated responses reflecting the perspectives of gender, ethnic diversity and State-society interaction. Finally, researchers in each country were given detailed guidelines on using the matrix and a glossary of key concepts.

Following the same lines as the First Report (2002), researchers considered certain minimum indicators on the general right to education, which is considered a basic condition for receiving rights education. Two new indicators were added: one on discrimination-free access to educational systems, and the other on efforts to adapt these services to meet the needs of children unable to attend school. The matrix was as follows:

Variables	Indicators
Domain 1: Right to education (as context)	
Adoption of legal provisions on the right to education	Constitutional provisions.
	Percent of the national budget allocated in the Constitution to education.
	Compulsory nature of education.
Adoption of public policies	Provisions favoring access to compulsory education for all children under the jurisdiction of the State, without discrimination.
	Provisions favoring the adaptation of compulsory education for all children unable to attend school.

Variables	Indicators
Domain 2: Right to human rights education (2000-2007)	
Adoption of norms on HRE	Ratification of international instruments.
	Reference to HRE in the national Constitution.
	Reference to HRE in the General Education Act.
	Reference to HRE in other provisions of the national legal system.
Adoption of public policies	Reference to HRE in executive orders, rulings and other government instruments.
	Incorporation of HRE into educational course plans and documents.
Institutional development	Existence of government departments specialized in HRE or including HRE.
	Government programs specialized in HRE.
Domain 3: Student government programs (1990-2000-2007)	
Adoption of legal provisions on student government	Existence of a student government program –regular or experimental– in regulations on education.
	Presence of HRE principles and content in the rationale underlying student government programs.
Institutional development	Existence of a department in the Ministry of Education responsible for implementing student government at the macro level (national or provincial).
	Assignment of responsibility for implementing student elections in the schools (micro level).
	Existence of a budget for implementing student government in the schools.

The Seventh Report

Development of specific human rights concepts in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age

This Seventh Report hews to the sequence of topics examined during the first research cycle. It reconsiders the general theme discussed in the Second Report (2003), but with a more narrow focus. It concentrates on only one of the domains covered at that time –school curriculum–, taking a second measurement to determine progress made in this decade.¹⁸

This report also takes a closer look at the subtopic of student government first introduced in the Sixth Report (2006). The idea is to develop a specific indicator on whether the experience of student organization and participation is approached as explicit material in the curriculum, associated with the exercise and learning of human rights. This is because the central hypothesis underlying this study, as was true for the Second HRE Report, is that progress in HRE depends on whether human rights material has in fact become an integral part of the curriculum in the formal educational system. This stands as evidence of the State's political will and a technical guarantee that such knowledge will be part of the teaching and learning process. One of the innovations introduced in this report is the means of measuring such things.

¹⁸ The second domain in the Second Report (2003), school textbooks, will not be covered here but instead will be the focus of the Eighth HRE Report, scheduled for 2009. The study of the curriculum was separated from the analysis of textbooks in the interest of allowing for a more in-depth study, with an entire annual report devoted to each one.

As was already noted, the Seventh Report, unlike its predecessor in the first cycle, limited its focus exclusively to the curriculum. Moreover, it changed the definition of the sample and selected a different set of variables and indicators for the analysis.

The sample no longer consists of alternating grades in the school system, but instead focuses on a block of successive grades pertaining to a specific age group: 10 to 14 years. For reasons discussed above, this group currently holds top priority within the IIHR education strategy. As a result of this methodological decision, the universe of study became more cohesive. The analysis can now cover a much more extensive curriculum sequence (five consecutive grades), associated with an age that is critical for the student's cognitive, emotional and social development. An added advantage is that the study addresses two different phases in the school system –both primary and secondary school– because, in most cases, it begins with the final three years of elementary school and continues into the first two years of secondary school.

The selection of variables and indicators this time was much more detailed and finely tuned to provide specific information on human rights knowledge. The variables and indicators in the Second HRE Report (2003) were based on the general precepts found in article 13.2 of the Protocol of San Salvador. They provided a broad overview of curricular approaches associated with the themes of human rights, democracy and values. These constructs go farther in the new report because they identify specific human rights knowledge, albeit of a basic, nonspecialized nature, in consideration of the age of the target population. The selection was based on the very detailed table of curricular content suggested in the *Curricular and Methodological Proposal for Incorporating Human Rights Education into Formal Schooling for Children from 10 to 14 Years of Age*, a pioneering initiative of the IIHR as described above.

In order to facilitate a better understanding of the thematic focus and methodological instruments used in this Report, the discussion will begin with a few thoughts about the school curriculum in general and, more particularly, HRE content.

*Human rights, schools and curriculum*¹⁹

The points of consensus set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequent international instruments, including the Protocol of San Salvador for the countries of the Americas, assert the importance of schools as the ideal setting to practice human rights. It is a two-way relationship: *education is a right that the States must guarantee, and at the same time, one objective of education is full development of the human personality and strengthening respect for human rights.*

Education and rights are closely intertwined and help define one another. Human rights, by giving education its very purpose, lend greater substance to its goals and content (the knowledge, values and practices that society hopes to instill in new generations), distinguishing education from other endeavors that may resemble it (mere socialization, simple transmission of information, or strict social control). Furthermore, education, as the place where meaning is built and legitimacy is reconstructed, contextualizes and defines human rights, distinguishing them from abstract discourse or empty proclamations divorced from reality.

HRE is present throughout the school, clearly evident in the *explicit curriculum*, the *null curriculum* and the *hidden curriculum*. The explicit curriculum presents human rights as part of the curricular objectives and content. The null curriculum consists of content that, for one reason or another, has been squelched or sidelined from the official curriculum. The hidden curriculum holds messages that derive from the school culture and the daily institutional and interpersonal interactions among all members of the school environment, including relationships between the educational institution and the surrounding community

¹⁹ Concepts developed here and in the following sections are based on guidelines given in the IIHR Curricular and Methodological Proposal.

of which it is a part, with its families and neighborhoods. Instead of referring to a school curriculum, it would therefore be more accurate to speak of the *diverse manifestations of the curriculum*.

If HRE penetrates the entire universe of the school, the task of keeping the message consistent is complex indeed and must cover all institutional levels. One of its most essential challenges is to incorporate human rights content into the explicit curriculum. The explicit school curriculum is always the political expression of a consensus about the knowledge that should legitimately be available to everyone. The inclusion of any subject in the curriculum therefore presupposes that it has been given value as part of the educational aspirations of society.

Over the past 15 years, HRE has begun to take its place in the region's school systems, slowly but increasingly.²⁰ It has gained ground in the explicit curriculum, especially in social sciences and civics courses, or in other cases, as a crosscutting objective or theme used in the analysis of problems such as gender perspectives, ethnic and multicultural diversity, environment, health and education for democracy.²¹ A still unfinished task is to lend the topic a clearer identity, setting out its essential content, its basic categories and how they fit together, in order to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of human rights that will lead to changes in the way students live, behave and coexist with one another.

HRE content categories:

knowledge, values and attitudes, and skills or abilities for action

All human rights education, whether formal or non-formal and regardless of recipient, needs to cover different types of content, all of which is necessary to foster the desired comprehensive development. This content must be of different kinds (cognitive, affective and procedural) in response to the integrated and multidimensional nature of both the object of knowledge (human rights and life in democracy) and the purposes being pursued (ethical, critical and political).

Therefore, in the most general and all-encompassing sense, HRE content must include three types or categories of components of three very different kinds, all of them equally important and mutually reinforcing:

1. *Information and knowledge* on human rights and democracy.
2. *Values* that uphold the principles and standards of human rights and democracy, as well as *attitudes* that are consistent with these values (or *predispositions*, as they are known in the HRE literature), and
3. *Skills or abilities* for effectively putting the principles of human rights and democracy into practice in daily life.

This is a *holistic* approach to HRE, systematically incorporating the different dimensions of a complex object –*human rights*– that mirror the dimensions of the person who is the *subject of these rights*.

Any HRE program must design and carry out processes that will facilitate the teaching and learning of all three categories of content, using methodologies tailored to the specific nature of each one. The following table shows what each component entails.

20 The scope –and limits– of this process of incorporation in the 19 countries signatory to the Protocol of San Salvador are reflected in the different editions of the *Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education*, especially the Second and Fifth Reports.

21 See: *Second Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education. Development of school curricula and textbooks*, IHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003.

Components or categories of HRE content		
Information and knowledge	Values and attitudes	Skills or abilities for action
<p>Teaching comprehensive mastery of:</p> <p>Concepts: categories of analysis, principles, standards, logic of argumentation, confrontation of ideological positions, etc.</p> <p>History: origin, evolution and landmarks in the recognition and effectiveness –or breach– of human rights, democracy and Rule of Law in the world, the region and the country: content, background, influences, protagonists, results, effects, consequences, etc.</p> <p>Legal provisions: human rights instruments, international and regional documents of different kinds and varying legal effect, national legislation, etc.</p> <p>Institutions: forums for protection of national, regional and universal rights; structure, function, procedures, etc.</p>	<p>Instilling an appreciation and willingness to act in accordance with the universal principles that underpin the dignity and rights of persons.</p> <p>The central core of values is set forth in human rights instruments developed and upheld by the international community:</p> <p><i>Life and personal safety</i> <i>Human dignity</i> <i>Identity</i> <i>Freedom and responsibility</i> <i>Equality and freedom from discrimination</i> <i>Justice and equality</i> <i>Solidarity and cooperation</i> <i>Participation</i> <i>Pluralism</i> <i>Human development</i> <i>Peace</i> <i>Security</i></p>	<p>Development of skills necessary for the full exercise of human rights and the practice of democracy:</p> <p><i>For critical thinking.</i></p> <p><i>For communication and effective argumentation.</i></p> <p><i>For participation and cooperative work.</i></p>

Subject and age-group research targets: scope and implications

Admittedly, most HRE content is one of three different but complementary types, as just described. Nonetheless, the Seventh Report focuses on only one of these categories: specific information or material directly relevant to knowledge of human rights. In no sense does this suggest that the other dimensions (values and attitudes, or skills and abilities for action) are considered unnecessary or less important. It was simply a methodological decision to focus on a single segment of the thematic spectrum for a more detailed analysis. The designers of the study faced a trade-off between length and depth, and opted for the latter.

One factor in this decision was to ensure comparability of the different educational practices in the region. The explicit curriculum is generally expressed as plans and programs of study for specific courses imparted to students in particular grades. These programs tend to focus on developing the knowledge dimension of the particular academic disciplines being taught, much more than instilling desired values or cultivating important skills (indeed, in some cases only isolated items of information or knowledge are developed). This is why the starting assumption was that the knowledge component would be easy to identify in the curriculum of all the countries and would be relatively comparable. This could not be assumed *a priori* for the other dimensions.

The identification of specific human rights knowledge itself focused on a narrower target. As was explained above, the study examined the curriculum for grade levels attended by students from 10 to 14 years of age, a range that represents two different stages in the school system. From the age of 10 to 12, children are still attending elementary school (assuming they began their schooling at the usual age of seven and proceeded without repetition or delay). By 13, they are entering secondary school (in countries whose school system consists of three divisions, this is called mid-level or middle school). The names of these stages of education vary by country, but in all cases, the nature of State-provided educational services undergoes a significant transition for students between the ages of 12 and 13. This change occurs in both the type of institution students attend, and the way these services are organized.

Both stages of education are represented in the sample of school grades examined for the Seventh Report. Although neither stage is covered in its entirety, parts of both come under the lens. Of course the findings reported herein do not cover the full cycle of schooling that children complete from the time they begin first grade until they receive their diploma upon graduation from secondary school. These findings certainly cannot be interpreted as absolute. It is quite possible that specific human rights knowledge appears in other portions of the school cycle that are not covered by this study.

Even so, the selected age range provides sufficient coverage to draw valid inferences on how much human rights knowledge appears in the overall school curriculum and how it is imparted. It is unlikely that any material has been overlooked in the elementary school because concepts covered with the smallest children in the early grades generally need to be reiterated and deepened in later grades. Thus, the curriculum for the final three grades offers the best possible indication of how of these topics are handled in elementary school as a whole. If they are not here, it is quite unlikely that they were introduced earlier.

Secondary school is a slightly different case. The study sample takes in the curriculum for the first two years only and may be omitting information that a country's educational system introduces in later grades. Nevertheless, the selected indicators single out the basic, essential information that is necessary and appropriate for children in the age group of interest; even if further coverage is introduced later, it would not be suitable for this age. Material accessible to this age group, if introduced later, would be out of sequence and overly simplistic, which is to say, untimely and insufficient.

Appropriate, comprehensive internalization of human rights by children should, at the very least, begin at this age and proceed in the following years, gradually deepening its focus. For these reasons, even though the research covers only five selected grades of the entire school program, it delves into two particularly significant segments of the child's education (the close of elementary school and the beginning of a secondary school). It thus can safely draw conclusions on how the overall educational system delivers human rights knowledge. Even though the results do not exhaust all angles of the research problem, they do provide a reasonable approximation as to how public schools in our countries address the issue today. They indicate whether or not the countries have progressed over the past decade and reveal areas of progress or setbacks.

Selection of variables and indicators

Three variables were selected to facilitate a detailed measurement of the presence of specific human rights knowledge in the school curriculum. They are recognized and amply grounded by extensive international and regional literature on the subject.²²

²² See above table and, for further background information, the IIHR Curricular and methodological proposal.

The first covers *concepts and conceptual developments*, constructs that have emerged in the ongoing evolution of human thought in order to capture the notion of human rights intellectually and argue it persuasively. In short, this is everything that unifies us and characterizes us as human beings—equal in dignity and rights—and the implications for social organization.

The second variable is *history*, which is extremely important. With a firm knowledge of history, we can understand the true significance of human rights conventions, or agreements developed jointly by the States to set limits on political power and prevent it from subjugating human individuals. We need a knowledge of history if we hope to understand that human rights are not designs of nature, or religious principles, or gracious concessions granted by the political power. Instead, they are true conquests laboriously wrested from the hands of power over long periods of time, often at great cost in human lives and suffering for their defenders. The history of human rights exhibits the process by which the essential dignity of the person was recognized and practical tools were forged to safeguard individuals from the arbitrary and excessive use of power.

The third, *legal provisions and institutions*, comprises the legal instruments and bodies that guarantee the protection of human rights. People who are ignorant of these things cannot exercise effective defense when their specific are breached. Legal provisions are established in formal international agreements. Institutions are responsible for enforcing these provisions by means of specialized procedures available to and understood by the general public.

These variables—concepts, history, legal provisions and institutional framework—are essential building blocks for the theory and practice of human rights. Together they will lead to an understanding of the meaning, nature, and origin of human rights, the legal foundations on which rights are enforced, and the institutions that safeguard them. This is the very minimum body of knowledge that should be taught systematically if rights are to be fully understood and truly exercised.

The study set out to measure how these variables are presented in the curriculum and how thoroughly they are covered, using indicators suggested in the IIHR Curricular and methodological proposal. The proposal, as a body of indicators for use in research, offers a standard curricular model for students at the intermediate level. It summarizes, develops and sets in motion the concepts and guidelines articulated in a variety of important international documents, including: the Declaration and Programme of Action of the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights (1993); the declaration and guidelines of the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995); the report *Learning: The Treasure Within*, produced for UNESCO by the Jacques Delors commission (1996), and the United Nations World Programme for Human Rights Education (2005-2007). It is truly based on the state of the art in the field of HRE.

The number of indicators used (44), although far from covering the entire field of human rights, was extensive enough to map out an overview of the curriculum. These indicators painted an impressively accurate picture of human rights instruction, reflecting areas of emphasis as well as gaps. This in turn was useful for gauging quantitative coverage as well as the relevance and appropriateness of the educational approach used, pinpointing its strengths and weaknesses (see the complete matrix in the attached table).

To complete the general hypothesis outlined above, we believe that as the school curriculum increases the amount of human rights material imparted, and as it deepens and integrates human rights concepts, students will be in a much better position for comprehensive learning. Together with Paulo Freyre, we believe that information is a necessary phase in the process of knowledge, because we will never need to reinvent what we already know. In the end, knowledge is a tool for action.

In synthesis, the field of study covered by this report corresponds to school curricula and educational programs in effect in 2000 and in 2008 for students from 10 to 14 years of age. For each program, researchers examined the degree to which three primary variables had been incorporated: *concepts and basic conceptual development of human rights*, *history of human rights* and *legal provisions and basic institutions of human rights*. These variables, in turn, were broken down into a series of indicators to be used for comparing the two different periods and identifying trends, whether progress or setbacks, in handling this subject.

The final matrix used for preparing this Report is as follows:

Domain 1: Curriculum programs for 10- to 12-year-olds – Primary school	
Variables	Indicators
1. Inclusion of concepts and basic conceptual development on human rights	1.1 Concept of “human rights” or “rights of persons.”
	1.2 Definition of human rights (rooted in the dignity of the person and developed as both ethical principles and legal standards).
	1.3 Characteristics of human rights.
	1.4 Human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration.
	1.5 Concept of children’s rights.
	1.6 Children’s rights enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
	1.7 Equality and freedom from discrimination.
	1.8 Gender equality – or equity.
	1.9 Prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination.
	1.10 Different types of discrimination: by sex, age, race, ethnic origin or nationality, religion or ideology, economic status, special abilities and sexual orientation.
	1.11 Poverty, hunger, inequality – in the world, the region and each country.
2. Inclusion of the history of human rights	2.1 Historical background of human rights in antiquity and the Middle Ages.
	2.2 Modern construction of human rights: American and French Revolutions.
	2.3 The United Nations.
	2.4 The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
	2.5 The Convention on the Rights of the Child.
	2.6 Individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights in the world, the region and each country.
	2.7 History and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in each country.
3. Inclusion of basic human rights standards and institutions	3.1 Democracy.
	3.2 The State or Rule of Law.
	3.3 Law. Equal protection of the law.
	3.4 Due process.
	3.5 Human rights in the national Constitution.
	3.6 Institutions that protect human rights at the national level.
	3.7 International organizations for human rights cooperation and promotion (UN, UNESCO and UNICEF).
	3.8 Organizations for student participation in the school (such as student government).

Domain 2: Curriculum programs for 13- to 14-year-olds – Secondary school ^(*)	
Variables	Indicators
1. Inclusion of concepts and basic conceptual development on human rights	1.1 Concept of “human rights” or “rights of persons.”
	1.2 Definition of human rights (rooted in the dignity of the person and developed as both ethical principles and legal standards).
	1.3 Characteristics of human rights.
	1.4.1 Classification of human rights as civil and political rights, economic, social and cultural rights, and collective rights.
	1.4.2 Civil and political rights
	1.4.3 Economic, social and cultural rights.
	1.4.4 Collective rights.
	1.5 Concept of children’s rights.
	1.6 Children’s rights enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
	1.7 Equality and freedom from discrimination.
	1.8 Gender equality – or equity.
	1.9 Prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination.
	1.10 Different types of discrimination: by sex, age, race, ethnic origin or nationality, religion or ideology, economic status, special abilities and sexual orientation.
	1.11 Poverty, hunger, inequality – in the world, the region and each country.
2. Inclusion of the history of human rights	1.12 Citizenship.
	1.13 Global citizenship.
	1.14 Economic and social development. Sustainable development.
	2.1 Historical background of human rights in antiquity and the Middle Ages.
	2.2 Modern construction of human rights: American and French Revolutions.
	2.2.1 Development of human rights in the 20th and 21st centuries.
	2.3 The United Nations.
	2.4 The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
	2.4.1 The two International Covenants: Civil and Political Rights, and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
	2.5 The Convention on the Rights of the Child.
	2.5.1 CEDAW Convention.
	2.5.2 Other human rights instruments for specific populations (indigenous, refugees, disabled).
	2.6 Individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights in the world, the region and each country.
	2.7 History and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in each country.
	2.8 Cases of massive human rights violations in recent history in the world, Latin America and this country, if applicable.

(*) Shaded sections list indicators used only for students in the 13-14 year-old range.

Domain 2: Curriculum programs for 13- to 14-year-olds – Secondary school ^(*)	
Variables	Indicators
3. Inclusion of basic human rights standards and institutions	3.1 Democracy.
	3.1.1 Historical development of the concept of democracy.
	3.2 The State or Rule of Law.
	3.2.1 Elections and suffrage.
	3.3 Law. Equal protection of the law.
	3.4 Due process.
	3.4.1 Transparency and accountability (or in negative terms, the fight against corruption and impunity).
	3.5 Human rights in the national Constitution.
	3.6 Institutions that protect human rights at the national level.
	3.7 International organizations for human rights cooperation and promotion (UN, UNESCO and UNICEF).
	3.7.1 Regional human rights protection system. OAS, Inter-American Commission and Court of Human Rights.
	3.7.2 International human rights protection system.
	3.8 Organizations for student participation in the school (such as student government).

Two basic *means of verification* were used:

- The *official text of the curriculum* for grade levels attended by students from 10 to 14 years of age in the educational systems of the signatory countries to the Protocol of San Salvador. Researchers used the official curriculum in effect in 2000 and in 2008.

These program texts were identified and supplied to the IIHR by local consultants from the ministries and secretariats of public education who had been designated in advance to cooperate with the Inter-American HRE Report project. In addition to obtaining these curriculum programs, consultants from the ministries also supplied any background information that could contribute to a better understanding of the programs (such as date of approval and implementation, current status, any reform processes underway, etc.).²³

- A *checklist of specific items of human rights knowledge* drawn from the IIHR curricular proposal.

The independent local consultant was responsible for applying the checklist to official programs and also combined efforts with the consultant from the ministry to compile data for the report. Results were sent to the Institute, where the IIHR research team reviewed application of the checklist, completed it when necessary and compiled results from all the countries.

Sources of information

The report was based exclusively on official course curricula in each country. The study evaluated a sample of courses from the school system, selected as being most relevant to items listed in the data

²³ The questionnaire designed by the IIHR to collect information on background conditions can be seen in the Appendix.

(*) Shaded sections list indicators used only for students in the 13-14 year-old range.

collection matrix. The national consultants from the ministries of education identified those courses (generally two) that seemed most likely to contain information on human rights.

The curriculum programs generally contain several sections, such as objectives, content (usually limited to knowledge or information), activities and evaluation strategies. This research was based exclusively on material in the knowledge or content section of the program. In some cases it was necessary to seek information from other sections of the program or other supporting documents. This was particularly true in countries where education is not based on a detailed nationwide program, but on general curricular guidelines or crosscutting topics that each province, institution and, in some cases, each teacher, can use for developing their own lesson plans.²⁴

Finally, it should be noted that researchers succeeded in collecting information from nearly all the signatory countries of the Protocol of San Salvador. The only exception was Haiti, where consultants ran into difficulty obtaining curriculum documents as raw material for the study.

24 The countries using guidelines of this type are: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay and Chile.

Section III

Research findings

Courses and curricula analyzed

National researchers from the ministries of education collected the sources for this Report in accordance with a very specific, limited request: to identify two courses in their country's official curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age (that is, the final three grades of elementary school and the first two years of secondary school) that best and most extensively impart instruction on specific human rights knowledge. They were asked to consider both the curriculum as it stood in 2000, and the current curriculum. The results of their search were recorded on the following table.²⁵

Courses and curricula analyzed			
Country	10-11-12 years of age	13-14 years of age	Other courses with HR content
Argentina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences – Ethics and Education for Citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences – Ethics and Education for Citizenship 	All the courses as a whole contain content, attitudes and values associated with HR.
Bolivia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Curriculum and programs for the upper elementary grades. – Social Studies, Mid-level grades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies – Philosophy and Psychology – Religion, Ethics and Morality 	
Brazil ^(a)	National Curriculum Guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – History – Geography – Ethics – Environment – Health – Cultural Diversity – Sex Education 	National Curriculum Guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – History – Geography – Ethics – Environment – Health – Cultural Diversity – Sex Education – Art – Natural Sciences – Physical Education – Foreign Languages – Portuguese (Language Arts) 	
Colombia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences – Ethics and Human Values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences – Ethics and Human Values 	Specialized subjects such as Afro-Colombian Studies, or cross-cutting themes such as Sex Education or Building Citizenship or Environmental Education. The goal is to incorporate the cross-cutting perspective in all areas.

²⁵ In the great majority of cases, consultants named the same courses for both periods, regardless of whether the curriculum had been changed from 2000 to 2008. Therefore the same subjects were analyzed for both years.

Courses and curricula analyzed			
Country	10-11-12 years of age	13-14 years of age	Other courses with HR content
Costa Rica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies – Civics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies – Civics 	
Chile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Language and Communication – Studying and Understanding Society – Guidance – Spanish (Language Arts) – History, Geography and Social Sciences – Developing Good Habits and Social Attitudes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Spanish Language and Communication – History and Social Sciences 	
Dominican Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences – Integrated Humanistic and Religious Education – Civics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences – Integrated Humanistic and Religious Education – Civics 	All subjects contain some form of HR, although it is not always emphasized explicitly.
Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Language and Communication – Mathematics – Natural Sciences – Social Studies – Esthetic Appreciation – Physical Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Language and Communication – Mathematics – Natural Sciences – Social Studies – Esthetic Appreciation – Physical Education – Foreign Languages 	
El Salvador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies 	
Guatemala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Spanish (Language Arts) – Social Studies – Education for Citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Spanish (Language Arts) – Social Studies – Education for Citizenship – Social Sciences 	All courses address the topic indirectly but do not emphasize it.
Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Civics – History – Civics and Ethics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Civics and Ethics – History 	As a cross-cutting theme, HR has pervaded all secondary school courses since 2006.
Nicaragua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Civics – Morality, Civics and Life in Society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Civics 	As a cross-cutting theme, HR pervades all basic and mid-level courses.
Panama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Sciences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Civics – Social Sciences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Religion, Morality and Values
Paraguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies – Ethics and Education for Citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Social Studies – Ethics and Education for Citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community Project – History and Geography

Courses and curricula analyzed			
Country	10-11-12 years of age	13-14 years of age	Other courses with HR content
Peru	– Personal/Social Development	– Social Sciences – Civics	None
Suriname	– Basic Life Skills Program	– Basic Life Skills Program	None
Uruguay	– Moral Development and Civics – History – Geography – Language Arts	– Social Sciences (History and Geography) – Nature (Biology) – Teen Life	None
Venezuela	– Social Sciences – Family and Citizen Education	– Universal History – Venezuelan History – Curricular Proposal on Education for Citizenship in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	
(a) No curricula have been approved for national use; instead, individual institutions and teachers have autonomy to design them. A document containing National Curriculum Guidelines for Basic Education was introduced in 1998, along with National Curricular Parameters for grades 1- 4 (1997) and 5 - 8 (1998).			

A quick look at the selected courses confirms what was already found in earlier HRE reports (II and V). The study identified no courses that focus exclusively on human rights, but instead, human rights concepts and issues tend to be concentrated primarily in two curriculum courses offered throughout the progression of the school program: *Social Sciences* or *Social Studies*, and *Civics*, *Ethics* or *Education for Citizenship*. Human rights concepts and issues commonly appear in any of these.

Although these courses may be the curricular slot most often used as a setting for human rights, they are not the only ones. Other courses reported, although less frequently, are *Language Arts* and *Communication* (Chile, Guatemala and Uruguay), and *Natural Sciences* or *Biology* (Brazil and Uruguay).

The school subjects identified generally bear titles that suggest secular disciplinary approaches. Indeed, only two references were found to religion or religious training. Even these course titles cannot be interpreted to mean that the classes offer an exclusively confessional approach, but rather they impart the religious viewpoint in combination with other perspectives. This is the case of *Religion, Morality and Values* (Panama) and *Integrated Humanistic and Religious Education* (Dominican Republic).

The purpose of this report was narrow: to analyze the curriculum for courses that have the greatest content of human rights material. Significantly, though, several countries currently offer human rights content either as an explicit topic or as a common thread in a number of other courses, or as a component of special projects or lessons. This reflects a decision to handle human rights as a crosscutting theme (examples include Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic).

Information gathered to date suggests several trends in the curriculum map for elementary and secondary schools in the region. In general, the curriculum offers more consideration of human rights topics, values and attitudes than was found in research for the Second Report (2003).

Moreover, as the following table shows, most of the curricular programs in effect in both 2000 and 2008 were and are quite new.²⁶ In 2000, at least 25 of the 36 programs had been approved in the previous decade, the 1990s. Six programs date back to the second half of the 1980s (secondary school programs in Guatemala, secondary and some elementary programs in Venezuela, some elementary and some secondary programs in Chile and the elementary school program in Uruguay). Only two claim earlier origins: Suriname, with a curriculum dating back to 1965 but presently engaged in a reform process; and Bolivia, with a curriculum approved in 1975 and still in use today.

The 2008 study found that at least 17 (of 39) new curricula had been approved during the eight years of this present decade, that is, from 2000 through 2008. Of the remaining countries, 17 were approved during the 1990s, predated only by those of Suriname and Bolivia, although as already noted, Suriname is currently engaged in a reform process.

Approval dates of programs examined				
Country	In effect in 2000		In effect in 2008	
	10-11-12	13-14	10-11-12	13-14
Argentina	n/a	n/a	2004 a 2008	2004 a 2008
Bolivia	1975/1999-2001	1998/1999	1975/1999-2001	1998/1999
Brazil	1997	1998	1997	1998
Colombia ^(a)	--	--	--	--
Costa Rica	2001	1996	2001	2008
Chile	1980 ^(b) 1998-1999 ^(c)	1980 ^(d) 1998 ^(e)	1999-2000	1998 ^(e) 2001 ^(d)
Dominican Republic	1993	1993	2000 ^(d)	2000 ^(d)
Ecuador	1997	1997	1997	1997
El Salvador	1993	1993	1993	1993
Guatemala	1997	1987	2007	2007
Mexico	1993	1999	2008	2006
Nicaragua ^(b)	1999	1993	1999	1993
Panama	n/a	n/a	2001	2001
Paraguay	1997 y 1998	1989 y 1999	1997 y 1998	2000 ^(c)
Peru	1999	2000	2006	2006
Suriname	1965	1965	1965	1965
Uruguay	1986	1996	1996	1996
Venezuela	1997-1998 ^(c) 1987 ^(b)	1987	1997-1998 ^(c) 1987 ^(b)	1987 ^(f) 2000 ^(g)

n/a No data available.
 (a) No programs with official dates of approval and adoption are in effect.
 (b) Programs intended for 12-year-olds.
 (c) Programs intended for 10- and 11-year-olds.
 (d) Programs intended for 13-year-olds.
 (e) Programs intended for 14-year-olds.
 (f) The programs examined were in effect in both years (2000 and 2008).
 (g) Of the subjects examined, only one had been changed by 2008 – *Civics and Ethical Development* (14 years).

26 For the purposes of this analysis, the significant date is the official program approval date, not the date of implementation in the classroom. There are several reasons for this. First, from the perspective of the HRE Report, the date of approval is more meaningful because it marks the time when a political decision was made to introduce curricular changes or adjustments, while date of implementation is basically an organizational accident. Another reason is that, while reformed programs generally go into effect the year after they are approved, they are rarely implemented simultaneously at all grade levels. They are often adopted gradually, one grade at a time, so that new classroom materials can be prepared and published with reformed content, and in-service teachers will have time to retrain. As a result, full implementation may occur well after the date of approval.

This shows that, at least in the areas of civics and social studies where most of the key programs are found, a very dynamic process of curricular change has been taking place, at the rate of nearly one per decade. Regardless of the magnitude or scope of each change in each national setting, the unremitting process of adjustments in and of itself reveals that education authorities are concerned about renovating school content and there is political will to keep it up to date. This is somewhat unusual in the history of Latin American education, where curriculum reform processes have been few, far between and laborious. The facts seem to show that the pace of change in school systems has been gathering speed to keep up with other fast-moving social changes in the region and the world.

Ministry documents outlining the rationale behind recent changes in curricular programs reflect their concern for keeping education up to date, making sure it is in tune with the demands of the times (see below table with information on the institutional setting of programs analyzed (a)). They also cite challenges and demands that the schools must meet, involving organizational concerns (consistency and effectiveness of the educational system), academic concerns (access to knowledge and high-quality education), and above all, very clear sociopolitical concerns (for equality, justice, peace, and pluralistic, respectful coexistence).

The great majority feel that curriculum programs have become “obsolete” or “out of date” in terms of both content and as a pedagogical proposition. This means they are no longer appropriate for providing students with the minimum knowledge and skills necessary to understand and solve the problems that arise in a constantly changing environment marked by high uncertainty. It is undeniable that such an environment also holds out new opportunities for personal and collective growth (such as new information and communication technologies); however, it also poses new challenges for the individuals and social groups that need to manage it effectively, as well as new threats to equality and social justice. In short, there is a growing conviction that the educational process is embedded in a macro-social context that inevitably colors all its dimensions.

In this complex setting, the States are carrying out more and more efforts, not only to guarantee the right to education for the people in their jurisdictions, but also to provide access to a high-quality education that furthermore includes human rights training. Current documents by education authorities express this with growing frequency.

One clear sign in this direction can be found in the statements of rationale to justify curricular change. Researchers found many explanations clearly rooted in human rights values and principles, for example, *to provide equal access to knowledge* (Argentina, Brazil and Chile), *develop citizens who understand their rights and responsibilities* (Costa Rica), *educate against violence and for peace and human rights* (Mexico), *support the transition to democracy and the need to incorporate Paraguayan bilingualism* (Paraguay), and the like.

Significantly, among reasons for the most recent curricular changes, several specific references were made to national and international agreements, conventions and instruments associated with human rights. These instruments are binding on the States and therefore prompted the introduction of these educational reforms. For example, interviewees cited *the end of the domestic armed conflict, the Peace Agreements and Convention No. 169 of the International Labour Organization, ILO* (Guatemala); *the Law to Promote Human Rights and Education in the National Constitution and regional and world agreements on education such as the Vienna, Jomtien and Beijing conferences*, (Nicaragua); *the Law on Educational Policy for Human Rights, calling for a National Plan for dissemination and instruction* (Peru); *the World Conference on Education for All, Jomtien and the Convention for the Nation and the Future of Education* (Dominican Republic) and *the General Education Act and the Chapultepec Agreements* (El Salvador).

The institutional setting of programs studied (a)		
Country	Rationale for the most recent curricular change	Scope of programs
Argentina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To promote a more integrated and uniform National Education System. – To provide equal access to knowledge. 	National, with regional/jurisdictional specifications. Implementation will vary, depending on the particular features of each province.
Bolivia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To correct deficiencies in the 1995 reforms and respond to concerns expressed by the schools and by the technical team responsible for curriculum design. – To incorporate features that will reflect the country's social, cultural and linguistic diversity. – The Jomtien World Declaration on Education for All. – The Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (1996). 	National.
Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To provide an education that responds to the new needs of the modern world. – To provide equal access to knowledge. 	The program has a common core to be used nationwide, but each school has autonomy to develop its own teaching program.
Colombia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To develop curricular guidelines on basic required content. 	National, but each territorial entity and its schools may design autonomous programs consistent with the required guidelines.
Costa Rica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To provide an education that responds to the new needs of the modern world. – To equip students to understand and solve today's problems. – To facilitate the development of citizens who understand their rights and responsibilities. 	National, with contextual adaptation by teachers.
Chile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To modernize education in accordance with the country's new needs. – To make the educational system more effective and equitable. 	Of national scope, but optional; primary and secondary schools may develop their own programs consistent with the required curricular framework.
Dominican Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National Education Plan out of date, with obsolete educational theories; fails to encourage meaningful, reality-based learning. – To shape national society more effectively. – Increasing inequality between the schooled and the unschooled. – Rural flight. – Rising rates of functional illiteracy. – End of nondemocratic models. – World Conference on Education for All, Jomtien (1990). – Socioeconomic conditions in the country. – Broad-based congressional declarations on the 10-year Education Plan 91-92. – Second Convention for the Nation and the Future of Education, 1994. 	National.

The institutional setting of programs studied (b)		
Country	Development process	Final approval
Argentina	Developed by technical teams from the National Ministry and political representatives, technical specialists, supervisors and teachers from jurisdictions throughout the country.	Federal Council of Culture and Education.
Bolivia	Process by a team of specialists who attended workshops for study and analysis, reviewed bibliography and educational research, conducted direct observation in the classroom, documented concerns by teachers and students, and compiled views of educational advisors and suggestions from the community.	Ministry of Education.
Brazil	Developed by the Secretariat of Fundamental Education (now known as the Secretariat of Basic Education).	n/a
Colombia	The development process depends on each school.	Schools themselves.
Costa Rica	Designed by technical and curriculum specialists from the Ministry with the support of teacher groups and university faculty.	Higher Council of Education.
Chile	2000: prepared by the Ministry of Education without consulting teachers or other groups of society. Produced under the Augusto Pinochet military dictatorship.	2000: approved through executive order signed by the Minister of Education.
	2008: developed by professional teams from the Curriculum and Evaluation Unit of the Ministry of Education, made up of curriculum specialists and subject specialists. Consultations were held with education communities, and media-based discussion was elicited from the general public and various organized sectors of society.	2008: approved by the Higher Council of Education, an autonomous body made up of various authorities representing different sectors and organizations of society.
Dominican Republic	Developed and modified by the person responsible for each area of the curriculum at the central level. A participatory methodology was used for designing a new curriculum based on three types of consultations: open (communication with the public through community-level advisory teams that provided input and feedback), national and internal (education specialists and professionals and experts on different areas of the curriculum, workshops to publicize the information and obtain validation from teachers, specialists and academics) and regional (representatives of the different regions of the country).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National Council of Education. – Executive Council. – Daily work team. – Regional coordinator.

The institutional setting of programs studied (a)		
Country	Rationale for the most recent curricular change	Scope of programs
Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Education guidelines and agreements produced by the National Board of Education, especially on curricular reform. – Agreements from the First and Second National Consultations “Education in the 21st Century.” 	National.
El Salvador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Basic guidelines for education found in legal and political documents such as the Constitution, the Education Law and the Agreements of Chapultepec. – Institutional changes in the interest of greater democracy, consolidation of new socioeconomic initiatives and a general desire for reconciliation and consensus building. 	National.
Guatemala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – End of the domestic armed conflict and signing of peace agreements containing provisions for educational reform and curricular change. – Peace Agreements and ILO Convention No. 169. – Interest in improving the quality of education and the incorporation of theoretical and practical lessons for informed, aware, sensitive living. 	2000: National.
		2008: National, with the possibility of contextualization in the meso-curriculum at the regional level and the micro-curriculum at the local level.
Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To introduce new skills and crosscutting issues such as peace education, environmental education, gender education, education against violence and for peace, human rights. 	National, but many state entities develop or contract out their own supplementary materials for statewide circulation.
Nicaragua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implementation of Law N°. 201: Law to Promote Human Rights and to Foster Teaching on the Constitution of the Republic of Nicaragua. – Regional and world agreements on education (Jomtien, Vienna, Spain, Beijing, Rome, Mexico, Colombia, etc.). 	National.
Panama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Curricular content (from the 1960s and 1970s) had become outdated and irrelevant to new constructivist currents. 	National, with contextual adaptation by teachers.

The institutional setting of programs studied (b)		
Country	Development process	Final approval
Ecuador	n/a	n/a
El Salvador	Developed by education specialists from the Curriculum Department of the Ministry. A prior assessment of needs and interests was performed with children, teachers, parents and people from the community.	Education authorities.
Guatemala	2000: Developed by curriculum experts from the Ministry, specialists from teacher colleges and participants in seminars led by SIMAC.	Authorities from the executive office of the Ministry of Education.
	2008: Developed with the participation of various sectors of Guatemalan society, curriculum specialists from the Ministry of Education and external consultants. Classroom observations were made, and interviews were held with teachers, principals and supervisors and with representatives of NGOs, universities and other organizations.	
Mexico	2000: Curriculum specialists from the Ministry and union representatives.	The executive branch, by presidential agreement published in the Federal Gazette.
	2008: An inter-institutional council was created (of the Federal Electoral Institute, Secretariat of Internal Affairs, National Human Rights Commission, etc.) to review the various curriculum proposals.	
Nicaragua	Developed by curriculum analysts from the Curriculum Department of the Ministry of Education as part of a contract between the Ministry and Save the Children. A tripartite agreement was signed by the Ministry, Save the Children and the Human Rights Ombudsman, and students and teachers were consulted regarding human rights studies.	A curriculum commission made up of authorities from the Ministry and prestigious individuals from the field of education, with expertise in the subject.
Panama	Developed by international consultants, national consultants and teachers. Forums were organized for consultation with educators, the business community, etc.	First by the National Curriculum Department of the Ministry of Education, and subsequently by executive order of the President and the Minister of Education.

The institutional setting of programs studied (a)		
Country	Rationale for the most recent curricular change	Scope of programs
Paraguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – New government system (as of 1989). – New 1992 Constitution as transition to democracy. – Education Reform begun in 1993. – Educational paradigms out of date. – Need to incorporate Paraguayan bilingualism. 	National, but each teacher adapts the material to the local province, community and school. Department-level Boards of Education also develop the Departmental Development Plan, which serves as a basis for programs in each school.
Peru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Law N°. 27741 on human rights education policy, creating a National Plan for dissemination and instruction. 	National. The DCN has been nationwide since 2006, but 30% is open for adaptation to regional and local levels so that the curriculum can be fitted to National, Regional and Institutional Education Programs.
Suriname	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Basic Life Skills Programs have not been changed since they were created in 1965, but reforms are currently underway. 	This project has not been incorporated into the national curriculum, but is implemented as an extracurricular activity for teens.
Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Programs out of date. – 1986 Montevideo Resolution, stating that the 1957 program should be updated. – In secondary schools, an additional factor was that teacher organizations were dissatisfied with inter-disciplinary course integration; the decision was therefore made to resume teaching by subject matter instead of combined areas, such as Social Sciences. 	National. The program has also been extended to the private sector and the Military Academy.
Venezuela	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A new sociopolitical structure triggered by the election of the National Constitutional Assembly with a popular mandate to draft the current Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. – Signing of various international instruments. 	National.

The institutional setting of programs studied (b)		
Country	Development process	Final approval
Paraguay	Developed by technical teams from each section of the Curriculum Department in the Ministry of Education and Culture. The proposals then underwent technical validation with in-house Ministry representatives and external consultants (specialized educators invited by the Ministry: school principals, education supervisors, academics, representatives of international organizations, universities, civil society, government ministries, municipalities and funding agencies).	National Council of Education and Culture, technical team from the cabinet of the Minister, and General Board of Directors of the Ministry.
Peru	Developed by curriculum specialists from the Ministry of Education (primary, 1999; secondary, 2000). Specialists and teachers from the different regions of Peru (diversified curricular design).	Minister of Education.
Suriname	n/a	n/a
Uruguay	Primary: commission made up of the Ministry, Central Board of Directors (CODICEN), Elementary Education Council (CEP), technical specialists responsible for each area and nationwide surveys. The proposal was then submitted to the consideration of inspectors, teachers and principals. Secondary: commission made up of highly recommended teachers, delegates of the Technical Teaching Assemblies (technical advisory body chosen by ballot in obligatory elections by all teachers in the country) and consultation with experts.	Decentralized Councils.
Venezuela	Developed by the Ministry of Education.	n/a

In large measure, these rationales are innovative for curricular programs in the educational system of Latin America and are certainly remarkable in comparison with the hemisphere's recent past. Admittedly, they were not found in all the States; but the fact that so many do cite concerns of this nature points toward a growing trend to recognize and apply international commitments directly associated with human rights and, in particular, mass instruction of human rights through formal education.

The design of school programs: scope and development

The school programs examined for this Report are part of the official national curriculum in each case, but their features vary by country.

One of the major differences to help understand this Seventh Report involves scope: What is the geographic coverage of the program? Does it apply to all educational establishments in the country? Do they all use it in identical fashion, or can they introduce certain variations? If variations are allowed, what they are and who decides? For the most part, the countries covered by this study tend to adopt a curriculum of nationwide coverage. However, they do recognize varying degrees of flexibility for adapting the curriculum to the peculiarities of different provinces or departments, communities, and even individual schools (see above table (a) with information on the institutional setting of programs).

The more decentralized national educational systems tend to grant greater leeway to the intermediate and lower levels of the system to adapt content proposed at the central level or to add their own content. Over time, the relationship between centralization and decentralization has shifted toward the latter. More and more, States are introducing the principle of regional and institutional diversification into their education systems. Examples of highly decentralized curriculum programs that began well before 2000 can be found in Colombia, Argentina, Brazil and Chile. By contrast, Peru, Paraguay and Guatemala have only recently begun to adopt standards of regional and local curriculum adaptation.

This tendency points to significant efforts by the States to adapt their education systems to the unique characteristics and needs of specific target populations in different regions, to groups who are in special situations, and to populations that include high degrees of ethnic and cultural diversity. Such policies reflect the principle of adaptability, an important quality for implementing the right to education.²⁷ They are valid policies so long as the State guarantees that all children, regardless of their situation or place of residence within the country, receive educational services of equal relevance, currency, quality and pedagogical effectiveness.

Programs also vary in terms of their underlying curricular approach or model. Some adopt a formula built around school subjects to be learned, while others focus on skills for action. Some organize content into traditional discipline-based programs, while others use an interdisciplinary structure. Some adopt across-the-board objectives or cross-cutting themes that apply to all subjects, while others do not.

This means that programs in all the different countries do not necessarily match and cannot be quickly or easily compared to one another. It is important to remember this precautionary note in

²⁷ This is based on the theory of the four “A’s” –Affordable, Accessible, Acceptable and Adaptable– proposed by the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Cfr. General Comment No.13, Session 21, 1999) by former Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education Katarina Tomasevski (Cfr., among other texts by this author, *Contenido y vigencia del derecho a la educación*, Cuadernos Pedagógicos, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003).

order to conduct a weighted study of the programs and avoid the temptation of drawing invalid extrapolations.

The actual process of developing the curriculum also varies. The great majority of the countries have created centralized national technical teams from the ministry or secretariat of education, consisting mainly of curriculum specialists and subject matter specialists. An unusual case is Uruguay, where the process is carried out by multisectoral commissions on which the ministry of education sits as one of many members. Another is Colombia, where curriculum development takes place in each different school.²⁸

This general trend was predictable, not only because the ministries of education are the countries' lead institutions, but because this has historically been the pattern in the region. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that nowadays the experts from the ministry generally play a role that, while significant, is no longer exclusive. Most of the countries over the past two decades have been creating more opportunities and roles in the preparation of school curriculum for representatives of other sectors, from both the government and civil society.

Many of the countries reported that their 2008 programs for the selected subjects had been developed through processes of assessment, consultation, development and/or validation with the participation of a variety of stakeholders. They had brought in teachers, parents, students, university professors, teacher unions, ombudsman offices (known as human rights defenders, prosecutors or commissions in the different countries), community and civil society organizations (such as human rights groups), private businesses and representatives of international organizations. This was the case in 10 of the 18 countries studied: Argentina, Costa Rica, Chile, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and Paraguay (see table (b) above with information on the institutional structure of the programs).

Certainly, there are many variations among the different processes each country follows, the characteristics and coverage of which are beyond the scope of this Report. What does emerge clearly as a significant trend is that the institutions that oversee national formal education are increasingly willing to invite other sectors and social stakeholders to take part in discussions on education policy, including curriculum.

Specific components of human rights knowledge in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age

The curriculum analysis covered two different domains of study (elementary school and secondary school); the results of both domains will be presented together. The purpose of combining the two is to give a more complete picture of human rights knowledge that the region's school systems have chosen to impart to their students from 10 to 14 years of age. The other alternative would be to present the two levels separately. The disadvantage of this approach is that it would sever the curricular continuum, so that readers would have more difficulty following the sequence of instruction under each topic.

The presentation follows the same order of variables and indicators as given in the matrix, grouping into sections those that share the greatest conceptual affinity or tend to display similar tendencies,

²⁸ For a more detailed description of the different levels or expressions of the curriculum and processes of curriculum design in Latin America, see the analytical discussion in the Fifth Inter-American HRE Report, IIHR, 2006.

in order to facilitate reading. The text does not include tables with specific results on all indicators because they are too many in number (44 including both domains). Instead it offers only a few that are particularly striking; the rest are available for consultation in the Appendix.

The tables of findings can be read in two directions, providing two different types of comparative information. A vertical reading contrasts countries, identifying whether or not a particular indicator is present in the curriculum for the different grades and, if so, how explicitly, thus illustrating the regional trend. A horizontal reading facilitates comparisons within the curriculum of each country. In other words, the curriculum for all five grades (the final three years of elementary school and the first two of secondary) can be viewed together at the two different reference points in this study (2000 and 2008).

Inclusion of concepts and basic conceptual developments on human rights

Concept of human rights, definition and characteristics

The first indicator used was the most elementary: whether or not the *concept of human rights* is present in the curriculum for the classroom subjects examined. The following table summarizes the findings of the analysis.

Indicator 1.1 Concept of human rights or rights of persons										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓	--	--	✓	--	✓	--	--	✓
Venezuela	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.

✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.

-- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

An overview of the curriculum in the two reference years (2000 and 2008) shows that the concept of human rights is present to a high degree, extended over several grade levels and generally of an explicit nature. Furthermore, the presence of such content has increased significantly in at least seven of the 18 countries studied (Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Panama and Venezuela), or nearly 40% of the total. By 2008, the concept of human rights either appeared in

more school grades of the system, or was expressed more directly and explicitly than in 2000. In one of these seven countries, the concept was entirely absent from the 2000 program but today has been added to all three of the elementary grades that were examined.

For the most part, the national school systems that recorded no significant change over the course of the study had already adopted the concept of human rights to a high or considerable degree (seven in total, including Brazil, Nicaragua and Panama). Only three countries continue to report a negligible or very low presence of human rights content, having posted no progress at all.

One particular trend became evident with the very first indicator and appeared repeatedly throughout the matrix. When a human rights indicator is present in the curriculum, it generally appears in more than one school grade. It may be found in two, three or even the full range of grades examined (5th through 9th). Naturally, the situation varies from one indicator to the next or from one country to the next, as can be seen in the tables; but the repeated presence of a particular indicator over the course of several grades suggests the beginnings of a cross-cutting approach in which specific human rights knowledge underlies the entire curriculum.²⁹

Evidence of the second indicator, as to whether or not the curriculum contains a *definition of human rights*, was less widespread than for the previous indicator in both years covered by the study (see table on Indicator 1.2 in the Appendix). Even so, considerable change did take place during the intervening years. Eight countries showed a significant increase by 2008, including the same countries that posted progress under the previous indicator. Two of the countries that in 2000 offered no definition of human rights whatsoever have now added it to the curriculum in several school grades.

It seems reasonable that increased visibility for the concept of human rights in the school program (Indicator 1.1) should be associated with a higher frequency in the definition (Indicator 1.2). This very clear correlation, however, was not found in all cases. The distribution of the two indicators by country and by grade is not fully consistent. The second is less frequent than the first, which suggests certain logical and pedagogical inconsistency in the curriculum of several countries. How well can students understand an abstract notion if they are given no definition? It is quite possible, in practice, that an occasional textbook offers a definition of the concept, or that a particular teacher provides it, but there is no guarantee. Nor is there a guarantee that human rights are being defined accurately under these conditions, grounded in the idea of human dignity and faithfully reflecting the nature of these rights both as ethical principles and as legal standards.

A similar although less critical mismatch can be found in the analysis of the next indicator: *inclusion of the characteristics of human rights* in the curriculum.

If this indicator is separated from the last two and examined in isolation, program content appears to be clearly minimal in both years, despite certain progress over time. In 2008, it appeared on the curriculum of nine of the 18 countries, three more than in 2000 (Colombia, Dominican Republic and Guatemala), and was strengthened as a crosscutting theme in more grades in at least one country (Nicaragua). However, placing this indicator side by side with the previous two is especially revealing. In many countries, this indicator is absent from the very grades that include the concept of human rights (see table on Indicator 1.1 above) and the definition of human rights (see table on Indicator 1.2 in the Appendix).

²⁹ Imparting human rights as a crosscutting pedagogical theme throughout the curriculum is a very complex process; if certain ideas come up repeatedly in a variety of consecutive lesson plans, it may not be a fully cross-cutting presentation, but it is nonetheless a worthwhile starting point. If the concepts are not explicitly named in the program, there is no guarantee that school textbooks will develop them consistently or that teachers will discuss them in the classroom.

In other words, curricula that feature high coverage of the concept of human rights afford much less space to the definition of human rights and only negligible attention to the different characteristics of human rights. If students are to truly understand human rights, they should be able to explain what they are and appreciate their characteristics – that they are inherent, universal, integrated and inviolable. It is a bit alarming, upon examining the first three indicators in sequence, to find that human rights may be present in some curricular programs as a superficial token, without receiving substantive coverage.

Indicator 1.3 Characteristics of human rights										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	--	--	--
Bolivia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Brazil	✓	--	--	--	--	✓	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chile	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	✓	✓	--	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓	--
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓ (a)	✓(a)
Panama	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--
✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly. ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly. -- The material does not appear in the curriculum. (a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.										

Rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration

Several different studies were performed on the curriculum for elementary school and secondary school in order to ascertain how the rights granted in the Universal Declaration are incorporated into the programs. For this particular area, the initial assumption was that the curriculum would be differentiated, with more detailed and complete coverage in the higher grades.

A single indicator was examined for the elementary grades, that is, whether or not the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration taken as a whole were mentioned (see table on Indicator 1.4 in the Appendix). The results show that inclusion of the topic had achieved quite acceptable levels in both years and has increased over time: while in 2000 it appeared in 14 of the 18 national curricula (77%), in 2008 it appeared in 16 (88%).

For secondary school, the indicator was subdivided into four detailed topics: mention of the classic classification of human rights as civil and political rights, economic, social and cultural rights and collective rights (Indicator 1.4.1); inclusion of civil and political rights (Indicator 1.4.2), inclusion of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCRs) (Indicator 1.4.3), and inclusion of collective rights (Indicator 1.4.4).

The topics defined in the sub-indicators were not so common in the national curricula, but unquestionably they did increase over the course of this decade. Of the 18 curricula studied, in 2000, the classification of human rights appeared explicitly in five, civil and political rights in 10, ESCRs in 10 and collective rights in six. By 2008, the classification of rights had spread to eight curricula, civil and political rights were present in 11, ESCRs in 14 and collective rights in nine (see tables in the Appendix). Perhaps significantly, of all the human rights, it is the ESCRs whose explicit coverage is most widespread at present. This could be interpreted to mean that today's school systems in the countries of the region are increasingly willing to grapple with real-life human rights problems in the hemisphere. One of the most burning issues today is the extreme inequality that prevents large population groups from exercising their right to a decent living, condemning them to subsist in conditions of poverty and exclusion.

Children's rights: concept and rights enshrined in the International Convention on the Rights of the Child

The concept of *children's rights* is found to a high degree in both 2000 and 2008, although much more visible in the latter year (see table on Indicator 1.5 in the Appendix). In 2000, it was present in 14 of the 18 national curricula (77% of the universe of study), and by 2008, it had risen to 17 of the 18 (94%).

The inclusion of this concept, as well as its spread through the curricula over time, can be seen more forcefully in elementary school than in the secondary grades. In 2000, these rights were covered by the education program for elementary school in 13 of the 18 countries, while in secondary school programs it appeared in only eight of the 18. In 2008, it was in the elementary school curriculum of 17 countries, and in the secondary curriculum of only 10 countries.

The disparity between the two stages of the school system is unsurprising. Admittedly, the Convention defines children as people up to 18 years of age. The schools begin to teach children about their rights from an early age, when they can easily understand concepts so relevant to their own lives and needs. Children's rights are particularly meaningful to this age group and provide a useful introduction to later lessons on general human rights knowledge, which is covered in more depth in secondary school.

Curriculum coverage of *specific rights enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child* (Indicator 1.6) follows a pattern similar to that of the previous indicator. It appears somewhat less frequently in both years and exhibits little change from 2000 to 2008, but consistently predominates in elementary school for the reasons described above.

The Convention ought to have been present in more programs, as the material it covers is extremely relevant to these students and because this instrument was more widely and quickly ratified than any other in the history of human rights treaties. Oddly enough, even some ratifying countries have not yet included it as material for study in the official curriculum for these grades (for example, Dominican Republic, Suriname and Uruguay).

Indicator 1.6 Rights enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓				✓✓	✓✓			
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	✓	✓	✓	--	--	✓	✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓ ^(a)
Panama	--	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓
Paraguay	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.
 (a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Equality and freedom from discrimination. Concepts and types of discrimination

The research table set up four indicators (1.7 to 1.10) to gauge how the curriculum covers the ideas of equality and discrimination, both in general terms and with regard to specific cases. Because this topic occupies such a central position, both in human rights doctrine and in real-life problems affecting the countries of the Americas, the study was designed to cover it extensively and with a certain degree of redundancy to provide control information.

The findings under these four indicators are compelling and consistent: of all topics examined, this is the one that has received the most widespread, explicit coverage in the countries and grades studied, at both endpoints of the reference period. Notwithstanding the fact that it was already very much present in the curriculum in 2000, it increased even further in 2008.

The following table displays the results of the study on Indicator 1.4. It clearly shows the overall situation in the region, as well as the clear upward trend.

Indicator 1.7 Equality and freedom from discrimination										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Guatemala	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Suriname	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Uruguay	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly. ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly. -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.										

As can be seen, coverage of this indicator in 2008 increased in at least seven countries (Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Panama, Peru and Venezuela). In general, instruction on concepts of equality and freedom from discrimination spread into additional school grades of the curriculum and also expanded in those grades where it was already present. In other words, the topic was already present in several school programs in 2000; changes in 2008 mostly involved adding it to the curriculum for other consecutive grades where it was not yet covered explicitly.

The addition of this topic to new grade levels can follow several different paths; it may move upward (as in Guatemala, which added it to secondary school); downward (Peru, where it was added to elementary school), or sideways, by adding it to intervening grades in either stage where it was not previously found (Panama and Dominican Republic). In practical terms, it is taking shape as a crosscutting theme in the curriculum for these selected courses in formal education at the national level.³⁰

The same pattern was found for two other indicators discussed in this section: *prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination* (Indicator 1.9) and *different types of discrimination* – by sex, race, ethnic origin or nationality, religion, etc. (Indicator 1.10). In 17 of the 18 countries studied, both indicators were already quite common in 2000, and significant new increases had been introduced by 2008 (see tables in the Appendix).

³⁰ This should not be understood to mean that the school systems are actually practicing a full-fledged crosscutting strategy. Such a conclusion cannot be drawn without first examining other features of the curriculum (for example, lesson plans for other courses) and teaching methodologies; both are beyond the scope of this research. Based on our actual findings, the most that can be said is that certain content appears to be cutting across the curriculum for the specific courses examined, over the course of several consecutive grade levels in the school system.

The cases of Brazil and Colombia both stand out for their curriculum content addressing the subject of discrimination based on sexual preference.

Brazil (National Curriculum Standards. Sex Education. 2000-2008):

- “In the first place, this topic is very strongly associated with preconceived notions and unique taboos, beliefs and values. In order for Sex Education classes to uphold consistently the pluralistic view of sexuality proposed herein, it is necessary to encourage free expression of different beliefs and values, together with questions and concerns about various aspects of sexuality. This is to be accomplished through dialogue, analysis and the possibility of reconstructing information, always based on respect for one’s self and for others. Students will thus be able to transform and/or reaffirm concepts and principles, building their own code of values in a meaningful fashion.”
- “Honor the existing diversity of values, beliefs and behaviors regarding sexuality, respecting the dignity of the human being.”

Colombia (Basic Standards of Citizen Competencies 8th-9th. 2008):

- “I understand and respect the rights of groups whose rights have historically been abridged (women, minority ethnic groups, homosexuals, etc.).”
- “I understand that sexual orientation is part of the free development of the personality, and I reject any discrimination on this basis.”

A similar pattern appears for the *inclusion of gender equality or equity* (Indicator 1.8), although this indicator is found somewhat less frequently than the other three, as can be seen in the following table.

Indicator 1.8 Gender equality or equity										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓	✓✓	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	--
Suriname	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	✓	--	--	--	--	✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

An overview shows that gender equality is addressed as specific course material in both 2000 and 2008 in 16 of the 18 countries. There was, however an undeniable increase over the course of the current decade: seven countries introduced the subject into their curriculum for more grade levels than they had covered in 2000. Once again, it is clear that these seven countries are interested in more robust crosscutting instruction in this field, at least over the course of multiple consecutive grades of the school system, in the courses covered by this report. Nevertheless, gaps continue to exist in full cycles of the 2008 curriculum in some countries, whether in elementary school or secondary. It could be that gender discrimination is given less space in the curriculum because it has been subsumed under the overall phenomenon of discrimination, analyzed above. Ultimately, there could be a risk that gender discrimination is not covered in enough depth unless it is introduced explicitly as a separate subject.

To summarize the findings of this section, it can be clearly stated that all the school curricula studied for this report are currently seeking ways to promote a society that values and respects diversity, free of discrimination. Indeed, most assert these beliefs with considerable emphasis. Significantly, this suggests that the signatory States of the Protocol of San Salvador are increasingly willing to honor the commitment they acquired under article 13.2, specifically, that “(...) education ought to (...) foster understanding, tolerance and friendship among all (...) racial, ethnic or religious groups (...).”

Examples of content on gender equality or equity

Colombia (Basic Standards of Citizen Competencies 8th-9th. 2008):

- “I recognize that all boys and girls are people of equal value and with the same rights.”

Guatemala (National Base Curriculum for primary school, 2008):

- “Demonstration of respect for human rights and of complementary and equal opportunities and possibilities for men and women in their different activities.”
- “Description of populations that experience disadvantages in different social setting in terms of gender and social inequity and inequality.”
- “Strengthening the participation of girls and women in the education system in the framework of equitable relationships between the sexes.”

El Salvador (Social Studies, 5th, 2000- 2008):

- “Recognize equal rights between men and women to achieve greater individual, family and social well-being.”

Poverty, hunger and inequality

A look at curricular programs overall shows considerable coverage of issues involving the persistent, acute problems of *poverty, hunger and inequality* that affect large population groups in our region. Because such situations run utterly counter to human dignity, they represent a negation of the full exercise of all individual human rights. These topics are not so widely covered as issues involving discrimination, but by 2000, they were already addressed explicitly in more than two-thirds of the national curricula (see table on Indicator 1.11).

Indicator 1.11 Poverty, hunger and inequality										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	✓	✓	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓	--	--	✓✓	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓ ^(a)	✓ ^(a)
Panama	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
Paraguay	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.
 (a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

In 2000, 13 of the 18 countries (72%) included this subject in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age. In 2008, the percentage rose slightly with the addition of Nicaragua (78%).³¹ During the same period, five countries added the topic to more grade levels or made it more explicit, especially in secondary school (Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Chile and Panama). Education on issues of poverty and social inequality is of course far from universal. In some countries it still remains entirely absent from the curriculum for this age group, and not because these countries lack such problems.

Even with these precautionary notes, observed findings seem to reveal an incipient progressive trend. They suggest that certain curriculum changes are being made to provide more accurate information on real-life conditions in the countries and the hemisphere, something that was still unheard-of 20 years ago. In the not-so-distant past, school systems invariably offered oversimplified, sugarcoated versions of reality, ignoring or shielding childish eyes from the crude reality of poverty and marginalization, even though many of these same children experienced it in their own lives every day. The school knowingly remained at the margins of the real world.

It should be understood, however, that a brief synthesis of the school program is not enough to determine whether curricular changes occurring so often today actually provide a more reliable social analysis. The fuller, more comprehensive explanations of the subject, such as presentations found in school textbooks, need to be considered as well. Such an expanded study will show, among other things, how much progress is actually being made in adopting a human rights perspective to explain the causes and consequences of poverty, inequality and exclusion that have become endemic to our societies and to explore possible alternatives for overcoming them.

31 Nicaragua's new curriculum is still being tested in a limited number of schools.

Examples of content on poverty, hunger and inequality

Argentina (Social Sciences, 5th grade, 2008):

- “Realizing and developing a critical attitude toward the fact that groups of people live side-by-side in Argentina with unequal access to material and symbolic goods.”

Chile (Studying and Understanding Society. 8th Grade / Basic Level 6, 2008):

- Manifestations of economic and social inequality in the world.
- Overview of the world's problems and their complexity.
- Analysis and investigation of a special-interest topic, poverty.
- Manifestations of poverty locally, nationally and worldwide.
- The inability to meet basic needs as the distinguishing feature of poverty.
- World poverty map and quantitative dimensions of poverty.
- Hunger as an expression of extreme poverty.
- Various initiatives committed to overcoming poverty.

Mexico (History, 8th, 2008):

- Inequality and social problems. Daily life is transformed. Education and culture.

Citizenship and development (secondary school)

The next three indicators applied only to programs in the early grades of secondary school, based on suggestions from specialized studies and the IIHR Curricular Proposal. These indicators cover concepts and conceptual developments that are more abstract and complex, thus better suited to the cognitive development of preadolescents between 13 and 14 years old. The study of curricula showed that, indeed, this is the stage of the school program where such topics are commonly found.

Indicators 1.12 and 1.13 both focus on the concept of *citizenship*, albeit using two historically and conceptually differentiated viewpoints. Indicator 1.12 targets the classic notion of citizenship, understood as the “universe of physical or natural persons who comprise the population of a nation-state and possess legal qualities that equip individuals to exercise their rights, fulfill their obligations and participate in the public life of their country (...) citizenship is the *sine qua non* for the effective exercise of all rights recognized by international conventions and national constitutions.”³² Indicator 1.13 takes in a contemporary and much more holistic view known as “global citizenship,” understood as more than simply knowing that everyone is a citizen of the globe. Instead it goes much farther, leading students to understand and assume our responsibilities both to each other and to the Earth, our common habitat.³³

The results are eye-opening, especially if the two concepts are examined side-by-side, as in the following table. The programs give a clearly predominant position to the classic or traditional concept of *citizenship*. In 2000, it appeared in 83% of the national curricula (15 countries), and by 2008, the percentage had risen to 89% (16 countries). In 2008, the study found certain new developments in some of the national curricula that already included the concept. In some cases, the coverage had become more explicit (as in Nicaragua) and in others, it had spread to an additional grade level (as in Panama).

³² Valencia, H., *Diccionario Derechos Humanos*, Espasa, Madrid, 2003.

³³ Oxfam, *Global Citizenship: The Handbook for Primary Teaching*, Mary Young, Eilish Commings, GB, Oxfam, 2002.

Country	Indicator 1.12 Citizenship				Indicator 1.13 Global citizenship			
	2000		2008		2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary		Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓	✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Republic	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓
Nicaragua	✓	✓	✓✓ ^(a)	✓✓ ^(a)	--	--	✓ ^(a)	--
Panama	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	--	✓	--
Peru	✓✓ ^(b)		✓✓ ^(b)	✓✓	--		--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓	--	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(a) Developed in greater depth in the Curricular Transformation program now undergoing pilot studies and validation in 84 schools. (b) The indicator appears in the curriculum for 12-year-olds (elementary school).					(a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.			
✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly. ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly. -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.								

In sharp contrast, the more contemporary concept of global citizenship is hardly present in the programs, although there was some growth during the reference period. In 2000, it was found in only 40% of the national curricula (seven countries), in most cases in a single grade level and presented almost tangentially. Only three countries cover the concept in both grades and explicitly (Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador), in all cases alongside the classic notion of citizenship. By 2008, it had spread to 55.5% of the national curricula (10 countries), but in many cases, the presentation was less than explicit and contained many gaps.

Naturally, these figures do not paint an exhaustive picture of citizenship education being offered today in the region's school systems. However, they do suggest that a restrictive understanding of citizenship persists and even predominates. The concept continues to be strongly associated with nationality and membership in a closed, territorially bound community with a homogeneous culture. It emphasizes majority rule and focuses mostly on the exercise of civil and political rights in which citizens are defined in terms of civics and their role in the public life of their nation-state. With few exceptions, little progress has been made toward opening the schools' eyes to a more broad, universal and diversified understanding of citizenship that, while respecting the national or civic dimension, extends much farther.

It is true that there is no universally accepted definition of the new "global" concept of citizenship. However, there is consensus that it crosses national and cultural barriers to foster a systemic view of the planet and its development. It values all forms of human and natural diversity, defending the

environmental balance and seeking the inclusion of all individuals in society on a footing of equal rights. It promotes dialogue and negotiation for resolving conflicts as an alternative to the use of force, whether between nations, social groups or individuals. Findings obtained so far suggest that our school systems still have a long way to go if they are to meet these objectives.

However, according to the figures, such ideas as *economic and social development and sustainable development* are widely accepted in the curriculum and have been for some time (see the table on Indicator 1.14 in the Appendix). In 2000, 16 of the 18 countries (89%) had already incorporated such ideas, generally in the two grade levels of secondary school, and by 2008, one more country had joined the ranks (94%), also in these two grades (Panama). This seems to suggest that, although the concept of global citizenship per se is mostly absent from the curricula, at least one of its components (sustainable development and care for the environment) has been generally adopted.

Inclusion of the history of human rights

Background and landmarks in world history

A first group of indicators (2.1 through 2.5) considers whether the schools have introduced programs to impart specific knowledge on concrete events in human history that stood out as landmarks in the struggles to gain recognition of human rights, or key moments in the development of the primary international human rights instruments and modern human rights doctrine. Some of these indicators were applied to both elementary grades and secondary school because such material may appear in either or both. Others were applied only to secondary school, on the understanding that they cover more specialized or complex knowledge best suited to preadolescent students (13 and 14 years old).

When surveyors for this report tracked lessons on *historical background of human rights in antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Indicator 2.1), they were surprised to find that the programs contained hardly any information in either year studied and showed very little progress between 2000 and 2008. The figures even seemed to reveal certain regression, since in 2000, the indicator was found in 13 of 18 countries (72%), but by 2008, it appeared in only 12 (67%). Two more countries de-emphasized its position in the curricular sequence (see table in the Appendix).

The same pattern emerged in the case of *modern construction of human rights* with lessons emphasizing the American Revolution in 1773 and the French Revolution in 1789 (Indicator 2.2). In 2000, 15 national curricula contained material on this subject; by 2008, it had vanished from two (Mexico and Uruguay) and had been weakened in two others (Argentina and Paraguay). The table is revealing.

Shrinkage of space in the curriculum is even more striking in the case of material about the *United Nations* (Indicator 2.3); from 2000 to 2008, this indicator disappeared altogether from three countries, although one new country did add it. As a whole, material on the United Nations remained sparse during the entire period, as can be seen in the table.

Indicators on the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (2.4) and the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (2.5), applied to all the curricula covered in the study, proved more encouraging, with more explicit mention of these concepts in both years studied and some progress during the overall period. At present, the Universal Declaration is taught to children from 10 to 14 in 89% of the countries in the study (16 countries), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, in 72% (13 countries, see the tables on Indicators 2.4 and 2.5 in the Appendix).

Indicator 2.2 Modern construction of human rights: American and French Revolutions

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	--
Bolivia	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Panama	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Paraguay	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--

- ✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

Indicator 2.3 The United Nations

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Brazil	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	✓✓	✓	--	--	--	--	--
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chile	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓ ^(a)	✓ ^(a)
Panama	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Paraguay	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- ✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.
 (a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

More background and landmarks in world history (secondary school)

As noted earlier, this research was based on suggestions given in the IIHR Curricular Proposal, which recognizes the stages of cognitive, affective and social development in children. Accordingly, the analysis of instructional programs on precedents and landmark events in the history of human rights applied four indicators developed exclusively for 13- and 14-year-olds (secondary school). Unfortunately, these indicators yielded results that are not encouraging.

The examination of material on the *development of human rights in the 20th and 21st centuries* looked for explicit discussion of such historical issues as the Cold War, the feminist movement, the drive for indigenous rights and other social movements to assert rights, especially those most relevant to each national context (Indicator 2.2.1). In 2000, such material was found in 11 countries (61%). By 2008, one more country had added it and two removed it, producing no overall increase but rather a net loss (see table in the Appendix).

The results are even more meager when the lens focuses in on references to narrower bodies of rights. This includes material on historical events to demand both general rights (civil and political rights and ESCRs) and the rights of specific collectives (women, indigenous groups, migrants, people with disabilities, etc.). For example, information about the two international covenants (Indicator 2.4.1) was found in only seven countries in 2000, increasing by a single country in 2008. Material on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, CEDAW (Indicator 2.5.1), appeared in the curriculum of only one country in 2000, increasing to five countries in 2008. Other human rights instruments for specific populations (Indicator 2.5.2) were covered in four countries in 2000, rising to seven in 2008. (All the tables can be found in the Appendix.)

From another angle, it would be fair to say that the indicators do reveal some progress over time, although it is minimal. At this rate of change, it is impossible not to ask how many more decades will need to go by before the States of this region begin to comply fully with their international obligations for human rights education.

Champions for human rights

In general, the indicator on *individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights in the world, the region and each country* (Indicator 2.6) is sparse in the national curricula. According to figures for the year 2000, only seven of the 18 countries had incorporated it, although inconsistently and mostly in the elementary school. The lessons contain references to certain individuals who have led movements in defense of human rights during the history of the particular country, but there is very little mention of modern-day figures or others who are closer to the daily life of students. By 2008, the situation had progressed very little, as only two of the countries still missing from the list in 2000 had added this subject in at least some way in a few elementary school grades.

This item of instruction is not insignificant, nor is its only value that of enlivening history lessons with anecdotal material. Knowledge about people who fought –and particularly, those who are still fighting today– to defend and further human rights in their communities, countries or the region goes beyond just personal or institutional recognition, which they unquestionably deserve. It is also an educational tool for teaching that these fighters were and are common ordinary people, essentially the same as everyone around them, but they stood out because they reacted to a wrong in their society and to the pain of those who suffered from it. Refusing to resign themselves to injustice, instead they organized to change it.

They did not possess the qualities of a superhero, nor were they saints or chosen ones. Instead they were individuals sensitive to the plight of others, aware of the value of equality and justice, and resolved

to fight for them. They come from different places, races, cultures, economic status, background and experiences. The best lesson we can draw from their lives is that we all hold the potential to take action on behalf of others, to make a difference in people's lives, and that there are different ways of doing so. It is also important to understand that they did not act alone. They learned to organize, file complaints and initiate joint action in the face of arbitrary acts. They demonstrated skill at critical analysis, argumentation, cooperation and leadership. All these attitudes and skills can be learned.

According to the findings of this study, knowledge about human rights champions is covered primarily in the elementary grades. However it would be useful not to limit it in this way, but to extend it into secondary schools. Considering the stage of socio-emotional development of these students, it would be especially appropriate for preadolescents and adolescents to experience the stories of those who can serve as valuable models for their own lives.

Indicator 2.6 Individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Costa Rica	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Chile	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓	--	✓	--	--
Nicaragua	✓	✓	✓	--	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓✓
Panama	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	--
Paraguay	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

Examples of content on individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights

Costa Rica (Social Studies, 5th grade, 2000):

- Indigenous resistance (Kamakiri, Cocorí, Garabito, Juan Serrabá, Pablo Presbere).

Mexico (History, 6th grade, 2000-2008):

- Bolívar, San Martín, Sucre, O'Higgins, Benito Juárez, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla.

Paraguay (Social Studies, 5th, 2000-2008):

- We understand and value actions by Paraguayans to defend our nation.

Uruguay (Moral Development and Civics, 4th and 5th, 2000-2008):

- Tribute to our nation and her heroes.
- Human conquests. In the area of morality: sense of solidarity and humanitarianism.
- Florence Nightingale, Henry Dunant, Luis Morquio.

National cultural history

An encouraging contrast to the shaky results reported so far regarding the presence of history lessons in the curriculum was the abundance of material on *history and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in each country* (Indicator 2.7).

Indicator 2.7 History and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in the country ^(a)										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	*	**	--
Bolivia	**	**	--	--	*	**	**	--	--	*
Brazil	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Colombia	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Costa Rica	--	**	**	**	**	--	**	**	**	**
Chile	**	**	--	--	--	**	**	**	**	--
Dominican Republic	**	**	--	**	--	**	**	--	**	--
Ecuador	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
El Salvador	**	*	*	**	--	**	*	*	**	--
Guatemala	*	*	*	*	*	**	**	**	*	--
Mexico	**	*	*	*	--	**	**	*	**	**
Nicaragua	**	**	--	--	--	**	**	** (b)	** (b)	** (b)
Panama	--	--	--	--	--	**	**	--	**	--
Paraguay	**	**	**	--	**	**	**	**	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Uruguay	*	**	--	**	--	*	**	--	--	**
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

(a) In this case, a double asterisk (**) marks programs that distinguish between the two populations, while a single asterisk (*) indicates that only one of the two is mentioned.

(b) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

-- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

Clearly, the curricular programs in both reference years contain considerable information. Most of them cover indigenous peoples as well as Afro-descendants, which are the two most numerous (although not the only) population groups in the region, aside from European-descended mestizos. Moreover, progress has been made over time, as can be seen by comparing the 2008 programs to the 2000 programs. First, the proportion of national curricula covering this topic rose from 83% (15 countries) to 89% (16), with the addition of Panama. In the second place, the national curricula tended to adopt a two-faceted historical/cultural approach, including separate lessons on indigenous peoples and Afro-descendant populations. In 2008, the separate, two-faceted approach had been added to one national curriculum that had not done so explicitly in 2005 (Guatemala). Two other curricula that formerly contained very little material had added content to more grade levels (Chile and Mexico).

This is consistent with findings in the earlier section on equality and freedom from discrimination. Both indicators have been highly visible in the curricula since the early part of this decade.³⁴ Indeed, coverage continues to grow stronger, evidence that the region's school systems are increasingly concerned with providing more and better instruction on the topic of diversity, at least ethnic and

34 Even so, these topics are more visible now than they were a decade ago, in 1990, according to findings of the 2002 *Second Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education*.

cultural diversity. This is encouraging, because from the standpoint of human rights, the theoretical/conceptual coverage of this issue cannot be dissociated from consideration of real diversity within the national community. Nevertheless, other gaps may still remain in the curricula. There is not yet any sign of equally substantive coverage of specific human rights instruments for indigenous populations or for fighting racism, nor is there any particular consideration of those who have stood up to fight for the rights of these populations.

Massive human rights violations in recent history (secondary school)

The final indicator under this variable is *curriculum coverage of massive human rights violations in the recent history of the world, Latin America and this country, if applicable* (see the table on Indicator 2.8 in the Appendix). The findings are few and reveal no real progress in the region over the past decade, but quite the contrary. In 2000, 10 countries included this topic (55.5%), but by 2008, the number had fallen to eight (44%).

It could be that the elementary school curriculum in some country contains references not detected in this survey of secondary school programs. Such material would probably refer to the exploitation of indigenous and Afro-descendant people during the colonial period (physical extermination, indentured servitude or the “encomienda” and hacienda systems and slavery). It would be framed as part of a critical discussion of national and regional history, as generally occurs in the secondary school curriculum in a number of countries. However, if cases of rights violations do not even appear in the curriculum for secondary school, where they are more appropriate to the age level of students, it is unlikely that they are taught to younger children in the primary schools. This is particularly true for rights violations that are closer to home, as opposed to discussion of more remote instances in universal or national history (the Holocaust, apartheid, ethnic cleansing, forced disappearance, etc.).

In synthesis, the variable on *history of human rights* appears to receive very little coverage in the programs examined, and even displays setbacks during the reference period. The only exception is reference to the history and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in the particular country (Indicator 2.7), which is present to a high degree, as discussed above.

The absence of historical content in the curricula is cause for concern. No one can understand human rights in their entirety without some knowledge of the conventions. These agreements have been forged by human society over the course of many years. Their gradual incorporation into the social consciousness and the legislation of States became possible only after many intense struggles of resistance to absolutist political powers. They were not bestowed by nature or born of a particular religious confession, nor are they generous concessions by a gracious State. Instead, they are conquests that human society has won over the course of history. How can we expect our children to understand and value their rights if we do not give them at least a minimum glance at the origin, evolution and historic defense of these rights? How can our children argue their case when others try to ignore their rights? How can they defend their rights rationally to those who would deny them?

Another cause of particular concern is the paucity of information on the United Nations. We live in a profoundly complex and interconnected world, where no country’s problems—whether environmental, trade, financial, military or anything else—are likely to arise or remain within its own borders. This is why it is more important than ever for the nations to pursue on-going dialogue and sustained cooperation. This is their hope for keeping peace and working for equitable, sustainable development of the planet. How can our children understand this commitment if they are ignorant of efforts

made through history to achieve international cooperation? What if they are ignorant about the very organization that represents them, or about its objectives, standards and procedures? It is not a matter of encyclopedic knowledge, but an eminently realistic and working familiarity that will equip them to live effectively in contemporary society.³⁵ Note that this lacking is even more critical in view of the also very limited coverage of the concept of global citizenship (Indicator 1.13).

As mentioned before, a teaching and learning process that takes the historical perspective of human rights will recognize and value these rights as conquests gained over the course of human history. Martínez-Shaw (2004) once warned, “universal history is a necessity in a world trembling with pulses and currents that operate on the entire planet, whether in the economy, politics or cultural life. Total history is a necessity in a society that is attempting to understand its past in order to intervene in its present, and transform the present in order to play a part in building the future. History is a necessity and an indispensable requirement for the daily exercise of citizenship and freedom.”³⁶

States must remember and give life to the urgent message of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states in article 26.2, among other powerful ideas, that “Education (...) shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations (...) and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.” This same message is reiterated in similar terms in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Art. 13.1) and, in our own region, in the Protocol of San Salvador (Art. 13.2), and therefore stands as a binding commitment on all its signatories before the community of their peers.

Inclusion of basic human rights standards and institutions

Standards and institutions of democracy

The first two items under this variable –instruction on *democracy and the State or Rule of Law*– appear with very high frequency at both endpoints of the survey and have followed quite similar trends.

Democracy (see table on Indicator 3.1) is taught repeatedly in several or all of grade levels covered by the study, in 89% of the countries (16), both in 2000 and in 2008. By 2008, a marked increase had occurred because some of the national curricula, especially Costa Rica, Guatemala, Peru and Dominican Republic, had increased the frequency with which these lessons were reiterated. This very strong presence of the concept was to be expected, as it had already been found in the school curriculum study conducted for the Second HRE Report (2003).

Curriculum content on the nature, structure and functioning of the State almost exactly matches that of democracy in terms of frequency and distribution, in both 2000 and 2008 (see table on Indicator 3.2 in the Appendix). The “Rule of Law” is not presented explicitly in all cases; but discussion of the State in general always emphasizes the separation of powers and the existence of a legal order that defines the extent and conditions of State functions in a democratic system. The Second HRE Report had foreshadowed not only the high volume of material on these subjects, but also the way in which notions of democracy and rule of law are presented simultaneously and in conjunction with one another.

35 This study did not look into the history of the United Nations, such as the earlier (although not distant) League of Nations. Nevertheless, survey findings hint that if programs include so few references to today’s UN, they are certainly not likely to go into its predecessors.

36 Martínez-Shaw, Carlos, “La historia total y sus enemigos en la enseñanza actual,” in: Mario Carretero and James F. Voss (editors), *Aprender y pensar la historia*. Amorrortu Editores, Buenos Aires-Madrid, 2004.

Indicator 3.1 Concept of democracy										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓
El Salvador	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly. ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly. -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.										

By contrast, the next few indicators show that the coverage of more specific components of democratic rule gradually loses force. First, *equal protection of the law* (or equality under the law) was found in the national curriculum of only 13 countries in 2000, growing slightly to 14 in 2008 (see table on Indicator 3.3). Second, *due process* was nearly non-existent; in 2000 it was taught in a small number of grade levels in six countries, some of them not even explicitly. Growth by 2008 was negligible and even contradictory. The topic was added in two more countries but eliminated from one, so its presence in the region today totals seven countries. The same weaknesses found for the last concept appeared here as well: presentation is sporadic, disperse and sometimes only implicit (see table on Indicator 3.4).

It is an interesting exercise to place the three tables of results summarized in this section side by side. The resulting pattern is similar to the one found under the first variable, which brought together indicators on the concept of human rights (1.1), the definition of human rights (1.2) and the characteristics of human rights (1.3). The pattern shows nearly all grade levels offering strong, recurring instruction on very elementary general concepts (human rights and democracy). Meanwhile, related, more specific knowledge necessary for understanding the general concept in more detail and giving it greater density becomes more and more watered down. This is not specialized knowledge, but information that is in fact part and parcel of the general concept, making it more specific and fleshing it out so that students can understand it more easily. Indeed, this material falls within the standard category of knowledge suggested for school populations from 10 to 14 years of age.

In one case under the earlier indicators, the high frequency of the concept of human rights stood in clear contrast to the much lesser presence of its definition and nearly insignificant reference to its characteristics. In the parallel case covered by this chapter, the concepts of democracy and rule of law are abundant, in contrast with minimal references to equal protection of the law and near absence of instruction on due process. The critical question is self-evident: what is happening with other, equally basic and important components of democracy that were examined in this study?

Indicator 3.3 Equal protection of the law										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	✓	✓	--	--	--	✓	✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	✓	--	--	--	--	✓	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓(a)	--
Panama	--	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓	✓	✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator 3.4 Due process										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--
Chile	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mexico	✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓
Nicaragua	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓(a)	--
Panama	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	✓	--	--	--	--	✓	--	--	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.

✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.

-- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

(a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 3.4.1 Transparency and accountability				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	✓	✓
Costa Rica	✓ ⁽²⁾	--	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	--	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	--	--	--
Panama	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	✓	--	✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
 ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
 -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.
 (1) Mentioned as curriculum content for students from nine to 11 years old.
 (2) Accountability by student representatives is discussed in the fourth grade program for 10-year-olds.

Standards and institutions of democracy for preadolescents (13 and 14 years old)

The indicators examined above on the standards and institutions of democracy were supplemented with others, applied to the curriculum for 13- and 14-year-old students only. These are: *historical development of the concept of democracy* (Indicator 3.1.1), *elections and suffrage* (Indicator 3.2.1) and *transparency and accountability* (Indicator 3.7.1), which can also be expressed in negative terms as *the fight against corruption and impunity*.

While this type of material is somewhat more profound than the previous items, it is fully appropriate to the development of preadolescents. In general it appears in the curriculum only occasionally.

The *historical development of the concept of democracy* is mentioned considerably less than the nearly omnipresent concept of democracy itself as described in the discussion of Indicator 3.1. It did grow somewhat over time, rising from nine countries in 2000 to 12 in 2008. Surprisingly, in six countries this content is still absent altogether from the curriculum imparted in the early years of secondary school (see table on Indicator 3.1.1 in the Appendix). This finding is consistent with the near invisibility of the historic dimension of human rights found in the analysis of Variable Two. Again, it is most unfortunate to find so little understanding of the process view in this field. Not only is knowledge of democracy impoverished, but there is a real risk that it will be distorted when the transformations and developments of democracy over the course of human history are rendered invisible.

It is also surprising to find very little material on *elections and suffrage*, which in 2000 appeared in 11 of the 18 national curricula, growing to barely 13 by 2008. Note too that this content was recorded because it showed up in the program for 10- to 12-year-olds, which was not the target group of the indicator (see table on Indicator 3.2.1 in the Appendix). It would be reasonable to assume that the

program for children under the age of 10 also contains material on this subject, or that the information is imparted through extracurricular activities. It could conceivably be part of practical experiences with student government or exercises of “children’s elections” held in some countries of the region. However, if this were the case, a very compelling argument could be made that the electoral dimension of democracy cannot be understood wholly when expressed only in the simple language accessible to small children, or as part of action experiences that provide no guarantee of follow-up instruction or reflection.

As for information on *transparency and accountability* (or *the fight against corruption and impunity*), the volume of material found was miniscule but growing. As the table on Indicator 3.7.1 shows, it appeared in only four countries in 2000, in each case, in one of four specific grades. By 2008, it was in five countries, three of which presented it in two different grade levels. So the outlook is poor, but was to be expected based on the findings of the Second HRE Report (2003). Even so, the increase over time merits applause and special recognition because this is a sensitive “taboo” subject. Although the phenomenon has a long history in our societies, it has always hushed by official history and ignored in the classroom. Only recently has it begun to appear in the curriculum, so any increase at all, regardless of its magnitude, is an encouraging sign of real and impending progress.

National legal provisions and institutions

This section was applied to the full range of five grade levels. As a whole, the curricula contain voluminous material on legal provisions and institutions in the home country for students from 10 to 14 years of age (see tables on Indicators 3.5 and 3.6 in the Appendix).

First, 16 of the 18 national programs examined in 2000 contain material on *human rights in the national Constitution*, most of them in more than one grade level. In 2008, coverage increased in two ways. One additional country introduced the subject into its curriculum, and the countries that already had it strengthened coverage by adding it to more grade levels (see table on Indicator 3.5 in the Appendix). Instruction on *institutions that protect human rights at the national level* is also quite significant, although less than in the case of legal provisions. Institutions are addressed in fewer national curricula (15 of 18 countries in both years), and the material is spread more thinly among grade levels. A slight increase was recorded by 2008 in countries that already had material (Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua and Uruguay), in the sense that it was added to new grade levels, especially in the secondary schools.

If the two are compared in the overall curricula, the study of legal provisions for human rights clearly receives greater emphasis than material on human rights institutions. In real life, the two are inseparable, as neither can function without the other. The effective exercise of legal guarantees presupposes the existence of institutions and procedures that safeguard respect for these provisions or, if necessary, order justice for breaches. If students do not learn how these institutions function, their understanding of legal provisions remains highly abstract, which at the very least, casts doubt on whether they are truly building the skills they need to assert their rights and the rights of others. Ultimately, this is one of the most critical objectives of HRE.

Supranational legal provisions and institutions

Information on *international organizations for human rights cooperation and promotion*—specifically the UN, UNESCO and UNICEF— is moderate at best. Two-thirds of the countries (12) contained references in 2000, with only slight improvement by 2008. One additional country, Colombia, joined the ranks, and coverage in four others was reinforced (see table on Indicator 3.7 in the Appendix).

Researchers expected to find more coverage of this subject, since it is the minimum information necessary to understand those arenas where the nations of the world come together to build agreements and cooperate with one another. Such information appears in the media every day and is relevant to the ages and interests of children and young people alike. In short, this is information they require, and they need to know how to handle it as currency for understanding the world in which they live.

For the older subjects in our age group, 13- and 14-year-olds, two additional indicators were applied. Instruction on *supranational systems for human rights protection* covers both the *regional system*, made up of the Inter-American Commission and Court of Human Rights (Indicator 3.7.1), and the *universal system*, or the United Nations specialized agencies (Indicator 3.7.2). Overall, coverage of this fundamental subject in the nation's curricular programs is truly distressing, as can be seen in the tables. Material is meager and disperse, especially on the inter-American regional system (Indicator 3.7.1).

Despite this discouraging picture, it cannot be denied that positive signs were found. First, the material is not absent altogether, and second and most important, growth has occurred over time. Information on supranational systems appeared in only four national curricula in 2000. By 2008, two more countries had introduced lessons on the inter-American system (Colombia and Costa Rica) and three, on the international system (Colombia, Costa Rica and Nicaragua; in Nicaragua, the new pilot curriculum not yet applied to all schools provides implicit coverage). Because this subject is so very important, present levels of coverage are far too low, but the incipient progress is encouraging.

Country	Indicator 3.7.1 Regional human rights protection system				Indicator 3.7.2 Universal human rights protection system			
	2000		2008		2000		2008	
	13	14	13	14	13	14	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓	--	--	--	✓✓	--
Chile	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Dominican Rep.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	✓	--	✓✓	--	✓
Nicaragua	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓ ^(a)	✓ ^(a)
Panama	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓ ^(a)	--	✓✓ ^(a)	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(a) Included as content in the fifth grade curriculum (11 years of age).				(a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.			
	✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly. ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly. -- The material does not appear in the curriculum.							

Student government

The purpose of this indicator is to provide follow-up on the new domain introduced in the Sixth Inter-American HRE Report (2007). For the purposes of the HRE Report, *student government* is understood as an organization made up of representatives of the student body in each school, elected

democratically, whose purposes include listening to, debating and voicing student opinions and proposals to the school administration and taking part in decisions on matters of school life that affect them. Regardless of organizational details, it normally provides the student body with access to a forum for participation, representation, deliberation and decision-making within the school.³⁷

Last year's report examined whether school systems in the countries of the region had provisions, explicit policies and institutional structures oriented toward recognizing and implementing experiences with student government. This report takes a different angle in its exploration of student government, focusing on the curriculum. Researchers asked if student government was included as an explicit subject for analysis and discussion in the classroom, regardless of whether legal provisions authorized its practice as an extracurricular activity in the schools. The working hypothesis was that if information on student government institutions were presented in the curriculum, and if teachers and students discussed it together as part of classroom dynamics, there was a greater likelihood of its being adopted as a real practice in the school. It would grow naturally through the interplay between knowledge and action, one of the pillars of HRE.

The findings were reasonably encouraging (see table on Indicator 3.8 in the text). At present, more than two-thirds of the curricula (13 of 18) address the subject, and in all cases, they do so in several different grade levels. Four countries call for discussion of student government in every grade (Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela and Nicaragua in the pilot program). These figures show significant growth since 2000, when only 10 countries covered the subject in the curriculum, with low density at the different grade levels. Today, not only has it been introduced by countries that did not have it before, but student government is taught more intensely –in more grade levels– by countries that already had it in 2000.

Indicator 3.8 Organizations for student participation in the school										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Chile	✓	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓	--
Dominican Republic	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	--	--	--	✓	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓(a)	✓✓(a)
Panama	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.

✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.

-- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

(a) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

37 See *Sixth Inter-American HRE Report*, Section II, pp 30-32.

Section IV

Conclusions

Courses that cover human rights

This report, like two earlier HRE studies (Two and Five), found no courses devoted exclusively to human rights. These concepts and themes tend to be concentrated in two subjects offered in consecutive grade levels of the system: *Social Sciences* or *Social Studies and Civics*, *Ethics* or *Education for Citizenship*. Surveyors also found, although with less frequency, that certain human rights concepts sometimes appear in courses on *Language Arts and Communication* (Chile, Guatemala and Uruguay) and *Natural Sciences* or *Biology* (Brazil and Uruguay).

Several countries also report that certain human rights content has now filtered into other courses as well, or is introduced through special projects and activities as a result of the decision to introduce human rights as a crosscutting theme (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico and Nicaragua).

In general, the region's curricular map for grades attended by students from 10 to 14 years of age seems to provide more instruction on human rights topics, values and attitudes than was found in research for the Second Report (2003).

Curricular programs

The first important discovery was that the curricula in 2000 and 2008 are quite new. In both years, most of the programs had been in use for less than a decade. Even the oldest (Suriname, 1965) is currently undergoing reform.

This shows that, at least in the areas of civics and social studies where most of the key programs are found, a very dynamic process of curricular change has been taking place, at the rate of nearly one per decade. Regardless of the magnitude or scope of each change in each country, the unremitting process of adjustment in and of itself reveals that education authorities are concerned about renovating school content and that there is political will to keep it up to date. This is somewhat unusual in the history of Latin American education, where curriculum reform processes have been few, far between and laborious. The facts seem to show that the pace of change in school systems has been gathering speed to keep up with other fast-moving social changes in the region and the world.

When defending recent changes in the curriculum, Ministry documents emphasize their concern for keeping education up to date and in tune with the needs of the times. They cite demands that the schools must meet, involving organizational concerns (consistency and effectiveness of the educational system), academic concerns (access to knowledge and high-quality education), and above all, very clear sociopolitical concerns (for equality, justice, peace, and pluralistic, respectful coexistence).

The States seem more and more determined, not only to guarantee the right to education for the people in their jurisdictions, but also to provide access to a high-quality education that includes human rights training. Current documents by education authorities express this with growing frequency. In a clear sign of such concerns, they offer explanations and defense of curricular changes, especially the most recent reforms, drawing heavily on human rights values and principles (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico and Paraguay). Another encouraging sign is their frequent, concrete reference to national and international human rights agreements, conventions and other instruments that embody State commitments and by virtue of which the education reforms are justified (such as Guatemala, Nicaragua, El Salvador and Dominican Republic).

Compared to past practices in the region's school systems, such justifications in curricular texts are new and unprecedented. The fact that so many States wield these arguments today suggests that real progress is being made toward recognition and application of international commitments to respect human rights and make them a part of formal education.

The scope and development of programs

Curricula vary from one country to the next. They do not line up neatly and, as a result, cannot be quickly or easily compared to one another. At least two main differences are significant.

The first is scope, that is, whether the same curriculum is used in all the schools of the country and whether it is applied in identical fashion or certain variations are permitted; and if variations are allowed, who makes them. Most of the countries studied adopt a single national curriculum. However, they also recognize differing degrees of flexibility so the curriculum can be adapted to the particular needs of each province, community or even individual school.

Over time, curriculum development has been shifting away from centralization and toward greater decentralization. More and more States are introducing the principle of regional and institutional diversification into their education systems. This tendency points to a significant effort by the States to adapt their education systems to the unique needs of specific target populations in different regions, to groups who are in special situations, and to populations that include high degrees of ethnic and cultural diversity. These policies reflect the principle of *adaptability*, one of the essential traits of the right to education.

A second difference is that programs vary in terms of their underlying curricular approach or model. Some adopt a formula built around school subjects to be learned, while others focus on skills for action. Some organize content into traditional discipline-based programs, while others use an interdisciplinary structure. Some adopt across-the-board objectives or cross-cutting themes that apply to all subjects, while others do not.

The process of curriculum development tends to be centralized in the hands of technical teams from the ministry of education, made up of both curriculum specialists and subject matter specialists. The exceptions are Uruguay, where the process is carried out by multisectoral commissions, and Colombia, where it is done by each different school. In general, technical specialists have been losing their exclusive dominion over the last two decades. For the 2008 programs, 10 of 18 countries report that they conducted processes of prior assessment, consultation, development and/or validation with the participation of a variety of stakeholders: teachers, parents, students, university professors, teachers' unions, ombudsman offices, community and civil society organizations (such as human rights groups), private businesses and international organizations (Argentina, Costa Rica, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Dominican Republic).

Above and beyond differences among countries in their curriculum development processes, a clear trend is that national institutions in charge of formal education are increasingly open to the participation of other sectors and social stakeholders in discussions about education policy, including these and other decisions.

Specific components of human rights knowledge

In the educational programs studied for this report, coverage of the great majority of indicators grew very clearly from 2000 to 2008. Indeed, findings on at least 90% of the 44 indicators were positive.

The growth takes various forms:

- The indicator appears in more national curricula (more countries) than in 2000.
- Within a single national curriculum, the indicator is found in more grade levels than in 2000.
- Within a single national curriculum, and even at the same grade level, the indicator is more explicit than in 2000.

In other words, in quantitative terms the trend is consistently upward, with the exception of the subset of indicators on the history of human rights.

However, the magnitude of growth varies by country. Some show more growth, others less, and others remain stable. Changes need to be interpreted and assessed on a case-by-case basis, considering the situation of each national curriculum at the beginning of the reference period, that is, 2000. Thus for example, some curricula remain unchanged or report low growth because in 2000, the indicator was already strongly present (as in Brazil). Other countries grew more because the indicator was negligible or nonexistent in 2000. Indeed, the countries posting the greatest growth during the reference period are those whose curricula were changed very recently (such as Guatemala), or those that are currently implementing very new programs, still in the testing stage (Nicaragua).

In more qualitative terms, and comparing the results of the different indicators to one another, certain interesting trends emerge—strong and weak points, gaps and lags—that shed light on how human rights issues are being addressed today. These emerging trends provide a compass for thinking ahead and for reviewing teaching approaches. At times they reveal healthy directions that should be reinforced, while on other occasions they may alert us to a faulty approach that needs correction. Because of their implications for the early education of children, the following deserve special mention.

Basic concepts and conceptual developments in human rights

1. When a human rights indicator is present in the curriculum, it generally appears in more than one school grade. It may be found in two, three or even in the five grades examined. Even though the situation varies from one indicator to the next or from one country to the next, the repeated presence of a particular indicator over the course of several grades suggests the beginnings of a cross-cutting approach in which specific human rights knowledge underlies the entire curriculum of the subjects studied.

Imparting human rights as a crosscutting pedagogical theme throughout the curriculum is a very complex process; if certain ideas come up in a variety of consecutive lesson plans, it may not be a fully cross-cutting presentation, but it is nonetheless a worthwhile starting point. If the concepts are not explicitly named in the program, there is no guarantee that school textbooks will develop them consistently or that teachers will discuss them in the classroom.

2. The *concept of human rights* appears to a high degree in both 2000 and 2008, but this strong showing stands in contrast to the slight curricular attention on the *definition of human rights* and even less, indeed negligible coverage, on the *characteristics of human rights*. Human rights cannot be fully understood without a grasp of what they are and what traits they possess. It is a bit alarming, upon comparing the three indicators in sequence, to find that human rights can be present in some curricular programs as a superficial token, without receiving dense, substantive coverage.

3. Among the many *human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration*, it was found that ESCRs are currently receiving the most widespread, explicit attention. This could be interpreted to mean that today's school systems in the countries of the region are increasingly willing to grapple with real-life human rights problems in the hemisphere. One of the most burning issues today is the extreme inequality that prevents large population groups from exercising their right to a decent living, condemning them to subsist in conditions of poverty and exclusion.
4. Instruction on the *concepts and rights afforded in the Convention on the Rights of the Child*, as well as growth in curriculum coverage of this point over time, can be seen with greater force in primary school than in secondary school. This disparity between the two stages of the school system is understandable. The schools start teaching about rights from an early age, and children easily understand concepts that are so relevant to their own lives and needs. Children's rights are particularly meaningful to this age group and provide a useful introduction to later lessons on general human rights knowledge, which gain momentum in secondary school.

Nevertheless, it is surprising more countries do not teach their students about the Convention itself at either level.

5. Of all the specific human rights concepts examined, those receiving the most extensive and explicit coverage in the curriculum in 2000 and 2008 are the *rights to equality and freedom from discrimination*.

At present, all the curricula studied seek to build a society that respects and values diversity without discrimination. Most do so with considerable emphasis. Significantly, this suggests that the signatory States of the Protocol of San Salvador are increasingly willing to honor the commitment they acquired under article 13.2, specifically, that "(...) education ought to (...) foster understanding, tolerance and friendship among all (...) racial, ethnic or religious groups (...)." The findings suggest that this principle is taking a strong position as basic educational policy.

6. The curricula also offer considerable room to learn about problems of *poverty, hunger and inequality* that affect large populations in our region and stand as a case of clear, persistent violation of their human rights. In 2000, this issue appeared explicitly in more than two-thirds of the countries' curricula, and the proportion grew slightly by 2008.

These dramatic realities of our societies are not yet covered in the school program of all countries; indeed, in some cases they are entirely absent from all the grade levels studied. Even with this precautionary note, a clear tendency has been in effect since the end of the 1990s to introduce more accurate discussion of real-life conditions in each country and in the hemisphere, something that was still unheard-of only 20 years ago. In the not-so-distant past, school systems in the region mostly offered oversimplified, sugarcoated versions of reality, ignoring or shielding childish eyes from the crude reality of poverty and marginalization, even though many of these same children experienced it in their own lives every day. It is encouraging to find that the schools are making honest efforts to portray the real world as it is, with all its inadequacies and constraints on the enjoyment of rights, because problems can never be solved unless people are aware of them.

7. The classic or traditional *concept of citizenship* continues to hold sway in the curricula, understood as the universe of physical or natural persons who comprise the population of a nation-state and possess legal qualities that equip individuals to exercise their rights, fulfill their obligations and participate in the public life of their country. By contrast, the contemporary, holistic *concept of global citizenship* states that we are citizens of the globe and we must understand and assume our

responsibilities both to each other and to the Earth, our common home. This new vision achieved a degree of growth during the reference period (it was present in 7 curricula in 2000 and 10 in 2008), although it often remains non-explicit and ridden with gaps.

These indications suggest that a restrictive understanding of citizenship persists and even predominates. The concept continues to be strongly associated with nationality and membership in a closed, territorially bound community with a homogeneous culture. It emphasizes majority rule and focuses mostly on the exercise of civil and political rights in which citizens are defined in terms of civics and their role in the public life of their nation-state. Little progress has been made toward opening the schools' eyes to a more broad, universal and diversified understanding of citizenship that, while respecting the national or civic dimension, extends much farther. Global citizenship crosses national and cultural barriers to foster a systemic view of the planet and its development. It values all forms of human and natural diversity, defending the environmental balance and seeking the inclusion of all individuals in society on a footing of equal rights. It promotes dialogue and negotiation for resolving conflicts as an alternative to the use of force, whether between nations, social groups or individuals. Our school systems still have a long way to go if they are to meet these objectives.

Inclusion of the history of human rights

8. An overview of all the indicators shows that historical material is among the most sparse during both years of measurement and the only area that shows some regression from 2000 to 2008. This became evident when tracing the *background of human rights in antiquity and the Middle Ages*, the *modern construction of human rights* (American Revolution in 1773 and French Revolution in 1789) and the United Nations.

The same pattern emerges with the indicator of secondary-school instruction on *development of human rights in the 20th and 21st centuries*, based on explicit discussion of such historical issues as the Cold War, the feminist movement, the drive for indigenous rights and other social movements to assert rights, especially those most relevant to each national context. Overall there is no increase, but rather a decline.

9. The results are even more meager when the lens focuses in on references to *narrower bodies of rights*. This is true for material on historical landmarks in the demand for both general rights (civil and political rights and ESCRs) and the rights of specific collectives (women, indigenous groups, migrants, people with disabilities, etc.). This point does show an increase over time; it is so small that, at this rate, the school systems would need decades to begin teaching students how the human race has progressed in recognizing the rights of individuals and collectives in situations of vulnerability.
10. School programs offer only minimal lessons on *individuals who stand out for their defense of human rights in the world, the region and each country*. In 2000, only seven of 18 countries made any mention at all, mostly inconsistent and limited to elementary school. Very little progress had been made by 2008. The lessons contain references to individuals who led movements in defense of human rights during the distant past of the particular country, but there is very little mention of modern-day figures or others who are closer to the daily life of students.

This item of instruction is not insignificant, nor is its only value that of enlivening history lessons with anecdotal material. Knowledge about people who fought –and particularly, those who are still

fighting today—to further human rights in their communities, countries or the region goes beyond just personal recognition, which they unquestionably deserve. It is also an educational tool for teaching that these fighters were and are common ordinary people, the same as everyone around them, but they stood out because they reacted to a wrong in their society and to the pain of those who suffered from it. Refusing to resign themselves to injustice, instead they organized to change it.

Although lessons on human rights champions are mostly limited to the elementary grades, they should also be offered in secondary school. Considering the stage of socio-emotional development of these students, it would be especially appropriate for preadolescents and adolescents to experience the stories of those who can serve as valuable models for their own lives. This gap definitely needs to be filled.

11. An encouraging contrast to the shaky results regarding the presence of history lessons in the curriculum was the abundance of material on *history and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations living in each country*. It was found in the curriculum for both years examined by the study, most of it covering indigenous peoples as well as Afro-descendants, which are the two most numerous (although not the only) population groups in the region, aside from European-descended mestizos.

This is consistent with findings on equality and freedom from discrimination. Both indicators have been highly visible in the curricula since the early part of this decade.³⁸ Indeed, coverage continues to grow stronger, evidence that the school systems are increasingly concerned with providing instruction on the topic of diversity, at least ethnic and cultural diversity. This is encouraging, because from the standpoint of human rights, theoretical/conceptual lessons cannot be dissociated from consideration of real diversity within the national community. Nevertheless, other gaps may still remain in the curricula. There is not yet any sign of equally substantive coverage of specific human rights instruments for indigenous populations or for fighting racism, nor is there any particular consideration of those who have stood up to fight for the rights of these populations.

12. Material on *massive human rights violations in recent history in the world, Latin America and each country* is very meager and shows little progress from 2000 to 2008, sometimes even the contrary. Because this indicator was applied only to secondary school, it is possible that the elementary curriculum in a particular country contains references that the study did not detect. Such material would probably refer to the exploitation of indigenous and Afro-descendant people during the colonial period (extermination, indentured servitude and slavery). It would be introduced as part of the lessons on national and regional history, as generally occurs in the secondary school curriculum in a number of countries. It seems unlikely that primary schools would teach about more recent violations (the Holocaust, apartheid, ethnic cleansing, forced disappearance, etc.) if these subjects are not even broached in the secondary school where they are more age-appropriate.

In short, the variable on the *history of human rights* is very underrepresented in the programs analyzed and even experienced setbacks during the reference period, with the single exception of the history and culture of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations in the particular countries. The poverty of curricular coverage on history is worrisome. No one can understand human rights in their entirety without some knowledge of the conventions. These agreements have been forged by human society over the course of many years. Their gradual incorporation into the social consciousness and the

³⁸ Even so, these topics are more visible now than they were in 1990, according to findings of the 2002 *Second Inter-American Report on Human Rights education*

legislation of States became possible only after many intense struggles of resistance to absolutist political powers. They were not bestowed by nature, they did not emerge from a religious mandate, nor are they generous concessions by a gracious State. Instead, they are conquests that human society has won over the course of history. At this rate, our children will lack even a minimal understanding of where these rights came from, how they developed and how they were defended historically; such students cannot be expected to understand and value rights for their real merits or to argue their case and defend them.

Another cause of particular concern is the paucity of information on the United Nations. We live in a profoundly complex and interconnected world, where no country's problems—whether environmental, trade, financial, military or anything else—are likely to arise or remain within its own borders. Today it is more important than ever for the nations to pursue on-going dialogue and sustained cooperation. This is their hope for keeping peace and working for equitable, sustainable development. New generations will not shoulder this commitment if they are unaware of how difficult it was to achieve current forms of international organization or how important it is to keep them in operation. Students do not need encyclopedic knowledge, but an eminently realistic and working familiarity that will equip them to live effectively in contemporary society. This lacking is even more critical in view of the also very limited coverage of the concept of global citizenship.

Inclusion of basic human rights standards and institutions

13. *Democracy*, as well as the *nature, structure and operations of the Rule of Law* are taught repeatedly in several or all of the grade levels covered by the study in 89% of the countries, both in 2000 and in 2008. The Second HRE Report (2003) had already foreshadowed not only the high volume of material on these subjects, but also the way in which notions of democracy and rule of law are presented simultaneously and in conjunction with one another.

This general topic follows the same pattern as that described in paragraph 2 above, when the concept of human rights was contrasted with the definition and characteristics of human rights. The pattern shows nearly all grade levels offering intensive instruction on very elementary general concepts (human rights and democracy). Meanwhile, related knowledge necessary for fleshing out the general concept in more detail becomes more and more watered down. In this case, the generous amount of material on concepts of democracy and rule of law stands in contrast to the meager coverage of equal protection of the law and the nearly nonexistent references to due process. It is impossible not to ask whether the programs address other equally important aspects of democracy that were not included in this survey.

14. Similarly, the *historical development of the concept of democracy* is taught markedly less than the concept of democracy itself. This result is consistent with the extremely meager and diminishing presence of the historical dimension of human rights, as described above. Again, it is most unfortunate to find so little understanding of the process view in this field. Not only is knowledge of democracy impoverished, but there is a real risk that it may become distorted if the transformations and developments of democracy over the course of human history are rendered invisible.
15. The amount of material found on *transparency and accountability (or the fight against corruption and impunity)* was miniscule but growing. Even so, the increase over time merits applause and special recognition because this is a sensitive “taboo” subject. Although the phenomenon has a long history in our societies, it has always been hushed by official history and ignored in

the classroom. Only recently has it begun to appear in the curriculum, so any increase at all, regardless of its magnitude, is an encouraging sign of real and impending progress.

16. Large amounts of material were found on *national legal provisions for human rights* (especially in the Constitution); lessons on *institutions that protect human rights at the national level* are quite visible as well, although less widespread than those on legal provisions. If the two are compared in the overall curricula, the study of legal provisions for human rights clearly receives greater emphasis than material on human rights institutions. In real life the two are inseparable, as neither can function without the other. In the face of such a clear imbalance, one wonders what the schools are doing to help students understand this necessary interconnection. If students do not learn how these institutions function, their understanding of legal provisions remains highly abstract, which casts doubt on whether they are truly building the skills they need to assert their rights. Ultimately, this is one of the most critical objectives of HRE.
17. Instruction about supranational resources in the curricula of the region is far from satisfactory. For example, information on *international organizations for human rights cooperation and promotion*—specifically the UN, UNESCO and UNICEF—is moderate at best. Coverage is far too little given the importance of this material is for understanding those arenas where the nations of the world come together to build agreements and cooperate with one another. Such information appears in the media every day and is relevant to the ages and interests of children and young people alike.

Similarly, the outlook for instruction on *supranational systems for human rights protection*, both the *regional system* and the *universal system*, is truly distressing. Material is meager and disperse, especially on the inter-American regional system. Notwithstanding all this, it cannot be denied that positive signs were found. First, the material is not absent altogether, and second and most important, growth has occurred over time. While information on supranational systems appeared in only four national curricula in 2000, by 2008, it had been added to others for the first time: two concerning the inter-American system, and three more on the international system. Because this subject is so very important, present levels of coverage are far too low, but the incipient progress is encouraging.

18. Another area of interest was whether *student government* is part of the explicit knowledge base covered in the classroom, regardless of whether it has been recognized legally as an extracurricular activity in the schools. Findings are reasonably encouraging.

At present, more than two-thirds of the curricula (13 of 18) address the subject, and in all cases, they do so in several different grade levels. These figures mark significant growth since 2000, when only 10 countries covered the subject in the curriculum, with low density at the different grade levels. Today, not only has it been introduced by countries that did not have it before, but student government is taught more consistently and intensely—in more grade levels—by countries that already had it in 2000.

This observation is important because if information on this type of student organization is presented in the curriculum, if teachers and students discuss it together in the classroom and if it is introduced into school textbooks, there is a greater likelihood that it will be adopted as a real practice in the school. It will grow naturally through the interplay between knowledge and action, one of the pillars of human rights education.

Section V

Recommendations

This report represents a second exercise in measuring curriculum development of specific human rights material in the grade levels attended by students from 10 to 14 years of age. Its findings confirm signs of progress among the signatory countries of the Protocol of San Salvador.

The conclusions summarized above clearly highlight noteworthy progress in the curriculum, much of it quite widespread among the school systems of the region in terms of both number of countries and grade levels. The results also underscore clear gaps, constraints and imbalances that must be addressed in order to consolidate the study of human rights in the schools both academically and pedagogically.

Based on its systematic observation of progress in human rights education, and drawing from the findings of this study, the IIHR is pleased to offer the States parties to the Protocol of San Salvador the following curricular recommendations for the public school system.

- The curricula currently in use –particularly for courses on *Social Studies* or *Social Sciences* and *Civics* (or *Ethics* or *Education for Citizenship*)– ought to undergo thorough academic review, both disciplinary and interdisciplinary, to determine accurately the amount and depth of specific human rights knowledge they contain and how well they are interconnected and internally consistent.

The IIHR Curricular and Methodological Proposal (2006) may prove helpful to curricular specialists and subject matter experts in this work. It provides them with a minimum platform of relevant content on human rights education applicable to the great problems and needs of this hemisphere in the field and particularly, although not exclusively, relevant for students from 10 to 14 years of age.

- The following recommendations apply to specific human rights material already included, or scheduled for inclusion, in the curricula:
 - o Provide comprehensive, balanced instruction on the different dimensions of disciplinary knowledge and pedagogy in the field of human rights.
 - o Develop appropriate “density” of specialized human rights concepts to provide true theoretical and doctrinal depth above and beyond mere lip service.
 - o Introduce variety and diversity so that human rights concepts recurring in the program over the course of consecutive grade levels or in the different stages of the school system (such as elementary school and secondary school) are not mere identical, mechanical repetition. Instead, offer approaches that reframe the material every time, using an educational strategy based on progressive expansion and deepening over the course of the entire school program.
 - o Reinforce the *historical dimension of human rights knowledge*, including lessons on how the concept grew and developed and recognition of legal provisions for defending and enforcing human rights in various different contexts, including world history, history of the Americas, and national history.
 - o Offer more complete coverage of massive human rights violations – in the world, the region and, if relevant, the country. Such a measure is critically important for keeping historical

- memory alive and guaranteeing by every possible means, in this case through education, that acts of human rights violation are not repeated.
- o Include more lessons on *specific individuals, people who stood out and continue to stand out in defense of human rights* in several different spheres: the world, the region and the country.
- o Enrich the curriculum by selecting the life stories and accomplishments of people who worked and struggled for human rights, making sure the material is not limited only to people who lived in the distant past or were famous notables in political life. Lessons should also cover people from everyday life who inhabit the same world and live the same experiences as the common people and grass-roots communities. It is also important to represent many facets of human diversity: race, creed, ideology, sex, social class, and a variety of collective groups that tend to be vulnerable or marginalized (indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, people in poverty, migrants, refugees, the disabled, etc.).
- o Reinforce the notion of *global citizenship* to expand on territorial or politically-based citizenship.
- o Review material to determine whether lessons on *equality* and the *fight against discrimination* in the curricula in fact cover all forms of discrimination present in the life of today's society. Discrimination is not a static concept that remains immutable over time. It has many manifestations and reappears as a thousand-headed Hydra if it is not identified, exposed and counteracted regularly. School programs to fight discrimination need to be rethought frequently and always with the participation of diverse social sectors, especially those that suffer discrimination personally.
- o Reinforce an emphasis on the institutional framework of human rights, especially knowledge of the history, structure and operations of the international cooperation organizations that bring together many nations, and the supranational agencies for human rights protection in both the inter-American and the universal protection systems.

Section VI

Appendices

Context information for the two years in the comparison: 2000 and 2008-09

Domain	Useful contextual information on the means of verification applied	Comments
Curriculum programs for 10- to 12-year-olds Primary (5th, 6th and 7th grades)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the course and why was it chosen? • Is this the only course likely to contain HR material, or is there some other course that may as well? (If so, the curricula for both courses should be examined.) • Date these curricula were approved. • Date they went into effect. • What were the reasons for the curricular change, as given in official statements or documents? 	<p>This information should be requested from the consultant named by the Ministry of Education.</p>
Curriculum programs for 13- to 14-year-olds Secondary (8th and 9th grades)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these curricula in use nationwide? Do they vary by province or by individual school? If so, how do they vary and who makes the decision? • Who develops these programs and how is it done? (Among other things, it would be useful to know whether programs are developed exclusively by curriculum specialists from the ministry, or with participation or consultation involving other sectors, such as teachers or parents.) • Who gave final approval to the programs? • Does the program include some other type of explanatory document from the ministry? Methodological guides for teachers? • Do you know whether reforms to these curricula are being developed or considered? If so, why? <p>Please add any other information that may be helpful for understanding the origin, objectives and development process of selected curricula.</p>	<p>Along with the curricula, consultants should also send the IIHR any other supplementary documents that provide justification or explanations for the curriculum or contain methodological suggestions.</p>

Tables on each indicator for the two periods examined (2000-2008)

Legend

- ✓ Implicit inclusion: the curriculum makes reference to the concepts without naming the indicator explicitly.
- ✓✓ Explicit inclusion: the curriculum names the indicator directly and explicitly.
- The material does not appear in the curriculum.

Indicator 1.2 Definition of human rights										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓	✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓	✓	✓	--	--	✓	✓	✓	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
Paraguay	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓	✓✓
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--

Indicator 1.4 Human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration						
Country	2000			2008		
	Primary			Primary		
	10	11	12	10	11	12
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓✓	✓	--	✓✓	✓	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--
Guatemala	--	--	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓
Nicaragua	✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓
Venezuela	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 1.4.1 Classification of human rights				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓	--
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Chile	--	--	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓	--
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓ ⁽²⁾
Panama	--	--	✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓ ⁽³⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽³⁾	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Included as content in the curriculum and course programs for elementary schools.

(2) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

(3) The indicator appears in the curriculum for 12-year-olds.

Indicator 1.4.2 Civil and political rights				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓
Bolivia	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	✓✓	--	--	✓✓
Paraguay ⁽²⁾	--	✓✓	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1)

(2)

Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.
The indicator also appears in the curriculum for 12-year-olds.

Indicator 1.4.3 Economic, social and cultural rights				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	✓	--	✓	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓ ⁽²⁾
Panama	✓✓	--	--	✓✓
Paraguay ⁽³⁾	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	✓	✓	✓	✓
Uruguay	--	--	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1)

(2)

(3)

Included as content in the curriculum and course programs for elementary schools.

Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

The indicator also appears in the curriculum for 12-year-olds.

Indicator 1.4.4 Collective rights				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Bolivia	--	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	--
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	--	--	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	✓	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	--
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	--	--	--	✓✓
Paraguay	✓ ⁽²⁾	--	✓ ⁽²⁾	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.
(2) The indicator appears in the curriculum for 12-year-olds.

Indicator 1.5 Concept of children's rights										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	✓✓	--	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 1.9 Prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Suriname	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Uruguay	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator 1.10 Different types of discrimination										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	✓	✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓✓
Guatemala	✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓
Panama	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Suriname	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Uruguay	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 1.14 Economic and social development. Sustainable development

Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Rep.	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓
Panama	--	--	✓✓	✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Uruguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Venezuela	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	--

- (1) Developed in greater depth in the Curricular Transformation program now undergoing pilot studies and validation in 84 schools.
 (2) Included as content in programs for 12-year-olds.

Indicator 2.1 Historical background of human rights in antiquity and the Middle Ages

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--
Bolivia	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓
Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Costa Rica	--	✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chile	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--
Dominican Rep.	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Ecuador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
El Salvador	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓	--	--
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓	✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓	--
Panama	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Paraguay	--	✓	✓	--	--	--	✓	✓	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator 2.2.1 Development of human rights in the 20th and 21st centuries

Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	--
Costa Rica	✓✓	--	--	--
Chile	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Rep.	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Ecuador	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
El Salvador	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Guatemala	✓✓	--	--	--
Mexico	--	--	✓✓	--
Nicaragua	--	--	--	--
Panama	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	✓	--	✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Venezuela	✓✓	--	✓✓	--

- (1) Included as content in the curriculum and course programs for elementary schools.

Indicator 2.4 Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Rep.	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	✓	✓
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓
Panama	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 2.4.1 International covenants

Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓	✓	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colombia	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓	✓	✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Dominicana Rep.	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	✓	✓	--
Mexico	--	--	--	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	--	✓ ⁽²⁾	✓ ⁽²⁾
Panama	--	--	--	--
Paraguay	--	--	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Included as content in the curriculum and course programs for elementary schools.

(2) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 2.5 The Convention on the Rights of the Child

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	✓✓	--	✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓	✓
Chile	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Dominicana Rep.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	✓	✓	✓	--	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓
Paraguay	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 2.5.1 CEDAW Convention

Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
Chile	--	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	--
Panama	--	--	✓✓	--
Paraguay	--	--	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Included as content in the curriculum and course programs for elementary schools.

(2) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 2.5.2 Other human rights instruments for specific populations

Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓ ¹	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓ ⁽²⁾
Panama	--	--	--	✓
Paraguay	--	--	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Elementary school programs identify several vulnerable groups that need protection (the elderly, disabled, unemployed, etc.).

(2) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 2.8 Cases of massive human rights violations

Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓	✓	--	--
Costa Rica	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓ ⁽²⁾
Chile	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Republic	✓	--	✓	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	--	--	--	--
Nicaragua	--	--	--	--
Panama	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Programs for 12-year-olds mention exploitation of indigenous peoples and Afro-descendants during the colonial era.

(2) The program mentions exploitation of indigenous peoples and Afro-descendants during the colonial era.

Indicator 3.1.1 Historical development of the concept of democracy				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	--	--	--	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	--
Chile	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Dominican Republic	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Ecuador	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
El Salvador	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	✓✓	--
Mexico	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Paraguay	--	--	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	✓✓	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--

(1) Included as content in the sixth grade curriculum (12 years of age).

Indicator 3.2 The State or Rule of Law										
Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Ecuador	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
El Salvador	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓
Guatemala	--	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Panama	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Paraguay	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	✓	✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicator 3.2.1 Elections and suffrage				
Country	2000		2008	
	Secondary		Secondary	
	13	14	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓
Bolivia	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	--	--	--	--
Colombia	--	--	✓	✓
Costa Rica	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Dominican Republic	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	--	✓✓	--	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	--	--	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	✓✓	--	--	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓ ⁽³⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽³⁾	--
Venezuela	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	--	✓✓ ⁽²⁾	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.
 (2) The indicator appears in the curriculum for 12-year-olds.
 (3) The indicator appears in the curriculum for 11-year-olds.

Indicator 3.5 Human rights in the national Constitution

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominicana Rep.	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓
Ecuador	--	--	✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓	✓✓	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	✓	--	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 3.6 Institutions that protect human rights at the national level

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓
Costa Rica	--	--	✓✓	✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Chile	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Dominicana Rep.	--	--	✓	--	--	--	--	✓	--	✓
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓
Guatemala	--	--	--	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓
Mexico	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓	✓✓	✓✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--
Peru	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓
Venezuela	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Indicator 3.7 International organizations for human rights cooperation and promotion

Country	2000					2008				
	Primary			Secondary		Primary			Secondary	
	10	11	12	13	14	10	11	12	13	14
Argentina	--	--	✓	✓	✓	--	--	--	✓	--
Bolivia	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	--
Brazil	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Colombia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓
Costa Rica	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chile	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Dominican Republic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ecuador	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
El Salvador	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	--
Guatemala	--	--	✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Mexico	--	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓
Nicaragua	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓ ⁽¹⁾	✓ ⁽¹⁾
Panama	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	✓✓	✓✓
Paraguay	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	--	--
Peru	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Suriname	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Uruguay	--	--	✓✓	--	--	--	--	✓✓	--	--
Venezuela	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--	--	✓✓	✓✓	--	--

(1) Content is included in the Curricular Transformation program currently undergoing pilot testing and validation in 84 schools.

Inter-American Institute of Human Rights

General Assembly
(2007 - 2009)

Thomas Buergenthal
Honorary President

Sonia Picado S.
President

Mónica Pinto
Vice President

Margareth E. Crahan
Vice President

Pedro Nikken
Permanent Advisor

Mayra Alarcón Alba
Line Bareiro

Lloyd G. Barnett

César Barros Leal

Allan Brewer-Carías

Marco Tulio Bruni-Celli

Antônio A. Cançado Trindade

Gisèle Côté-Harper

Mariano Fiallos Oyanguren

Héctor Fix-Zamudio

Robert K. Goldman

Claudio Grossman

María Elena Martínez

Juan E. Méndez

Sandra Morelli Rico

Elizabeth Odio Benito

Nina Pacari

Máximo Pacheco Gómez

Hernán Salgado Pesantes

Wendy Singh

Rodolfo Stavenhagen

The IIHR’s activities are made possible by the financial support it receives from governments, international cooperation agencies, foundations and donor organizations. This diverse group of sponsors strengthens the mission of the IIHR and ensures the pluralism of its actions.

Inter-American Commission of Human Rights

Paolo G. Carozza

Luz Patricia Mejía

Felipe González

Florentín Meléndez

Víctor E. Abramovich

Clare Kamau Roberts

Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro

Inter-American Court of Human Rights

Cecilia Medina-Quiroga

Diego García-Sayán

Manuel E. Ventura Robles

Sergio García-Ramírez

Leonardo Franco

Margarette May Macaulay

Rhadys Abreu Blondet

Roberto Cuéllar M.
Executive Director