

# X Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education

Development of policies  
for safety and peaceful coexistence  
in the schools with a focus on rights





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

**A study in 19 countries**

**Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence  
in the schools with a focus on rights**

341.481  
I59t

Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos

Tenth inter-American report on human rights education, a study in 19 countries : development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a focus on rights / Instituto Interamericano de derechos humanos. -- San José, C.R. : IIDH, 2012

100 p. : 22x28 cm.

ISBN 978-9968-611-84-8

1. Educación en derechos humanos 2. Derechos humanos 3. Desarrollo de políticas I. Título.

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, academic advisor and research coordinator

Byron Barillas, Program Officer, human rights education program, IIHR Special Services

Natasha Monestel, assistant research advisor

Marisol Molestina, editorial consultant

Marialyna Villafranca, Publications, IIHR Special Services, cover and final art

Printing: Segura Hermanos S.A.

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

Argentina, Coordinación de Ciudadanía en las Escuelas (Ministry); Bolivia, Silvana Gózales (Fe y Alegría); Brazil, Paula Facci (Fe y Alegría); Chile, Sebastián Correa (Fe y Alegría); Colombia (IIHR); Costa Rica, Natacha Monestel (IIHR); Dominican Republic, Luisa América Mateo; Ecuador, Lina González Ospina and Pilar Samaniego; El Salvador, Héctor Rosemberg (Fe y Alegría); Guatemala, Gabriela Vides; Mexico, Ricardo Castro; Nicaragua, Policía Nacional; Panama, José Antonio Grenard; Paraguay, Abel Irala (Fe y Alegría); Peru, Rossana Mendoza; Uruguay, Aníbal Aliandre Romano; Venezuela, Luisa Pernalet (Fe y Alegría).

Natasha Monestel was in charge of documenting and digitizing data. Ana María Rodino was responsible for data analysis and writing the report, with the support of Natacha Monestel. Content review, Byron Barillas. Editing and layout, Marisol Molestina.

**Publication coordinated by the Publications Program of IIHR Special Services**  
**Inter-American Institute of Human Rights**

Apartado Postal 10.081-1000 San José, Costa Rica

Tel: (506) 2234-0404 Fax: (506) 2234-0955

e-mail: s.especiales2@iidh.ed.cr

<http://www.iidh.ed.cr>

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Section I: The IIHR report on human rights education and the Institute strategy .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Institutional background.....	13
Nature and scope of the <i>Inter-American HRE Report</i> .....	14
Regulatory foundations: the right to human rights education .....	15
Conceptual and methodological foundations: studying progress.....	16
<i>Approaches to human rights research</i> .....	16
<i>Human rights reports and monitoring</i> .....	18
<i>New instruments for new scenarios</i> .....	18
The first cycle of HRE reports: 2002-2006 .....	19
<i>General structure of the research</i> .....	19
<i>Data collection, analysis and writing</i> .....	21
<i>Themes and working hypotheses</i> .....	23
Another initiative by the Inter-American Institute:	
The <i>Curricular and methodological proposal for HRE</i> .....	24
<i>Purpose and objectives of the Proposal</i> .....	24
<i>The IIHR Educational Proposal, the OAS and the ministries</i>	
<i>of education: progress and regional synergy</i> .....	25
<b>Section II: The Tenth Report and the second cycle</b>	
<b>of the Inter-American HRE Report .....</b>	<b>29</b>
The second cycle of the report: 2007 onward .....	29
<i>An exercise in permanence and innovation</i> .....	29
<i>Sixth Report (2007): Normative development of HRE</i>	
<i>and student government</i> .....	29
<i>Seventh Report (2008): Development of specific human rights</i>	
<i>concepts in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age</i> .....	30
<i>Eighth Report (2009): Development of specific human rights</i>	
<i>concepts in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age</i> .....	31
<i>Ninth Report (2010): Development of the methodology for human rights</i>	
<i>instruction in textbooks for students from 10 to 14 years of age</i> .....	32
The Tenth Report: Development of policies for safety and peaceful	
coexistence in the schools with a rights approach.....	33
<i>Background and justification of the selected theme</i> .....	33
<i>Theoretical framework: School and types of violence</i> .....	35
<i>Research domain and hypothesis</i> .....	38
<i>Context information and table of variables and indicators</i> .....	40

	<i>Research procedure and sources of information</i> .....	42
<b>Section III: Research findings</b> .....		53
Sources consulted .....		53
<i>Documentary sources</i> .....		53
<i>Contexts and perceptions</i> .....		54
Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a focus on rights .....		56
<i>Statistical information and situation assessments</i> .....		56
<i>Policies, plans and programs</i> .....		61
<i>Policy implementation</i> .....		69
<i>Policy monitoring and evaluation</i> .....		78
<b>Section IV: Conclusions</b> .....		83
Sources consulted: documentary sources .....		83
Contexts and perceptions .....		83
Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a focus on rights: statistical information and situation assessments .....		84
Policies, plans and programs .....		86
Policy implementation .....		87
Policy monitoring and evaluation .....		89
<b>Section V: Recommendations</b> .....		91
<b>Section VI: Appendices</b> .....		93
1. Tables used in the first cycle of HRE Reports .....		93
2. Tables used in the second cycle of HRE Reports .....		96

## List of tables

Table 1. Approaches to human rights research .....	17
Table 2. Structure of the first cycle of Inter-American HRE Reports.....	21
Table 3. Structure of a system of indicators.....	22
Table 4. Structure of the second cycle of Inter-American HRE Reports.....	33
Table 5. Preliminary classification of types of school violence.....	37
Table 6. What works and what doesn't work.....	39
Table 7. Field: Public policies for education. Domain: Policies on safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools .....	41
Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them.....	43-51
Table 9. Variable 1: Statistical information and situation assessments.....	57
Table 10. Variable 2: Policies, plans and programs .....	64
Table 11. Variable 3: Policy implementation .....	72
Table 12. Variable 4: Policy monitoring and evaluation.....	79

## List of sidebars

Good practices: Observatorio Argentino de Violencia en las Escuelas, Argentina.....	60
Good practices: Programa Nacional Escuela Segura-PNES, Mexico .....	62
Human rights perspective in educational policies on peaceful coexistence and violence prevention in the schools.....	66-68
Good practices: Plan de prevención de la violencia escolar, El Salvador .....	70
Good practices: Plan Colegio Seguro, Nicaragua.....	71
Good practices: El Cole en Nuestras Manos, Costa Rica .....	73
Good practices: Programa Escuelas Disfrutables, Uruguay .....	75
Participation by education stakeholders in carrying out plans and programs or projects.....	76-78
Good practices: Programa Escola Aberta, Brazil.....	81





## Introduction

Today's education community has grown discouraged as it faces a critical panorama of insecurity in Latin America and the Caribbean. The region therefore has a pressing need for this *Tenth Report on Human Rights Education* that presents progress made and gaps encountered in public policies to prevent violence in the schools. It builds on a pioneering initiative launched by the Minister of Education and Vice President of El Salvador, Salvador Sánchez Cerén, and the Minister of Education of Uruguay, Ricardo Erlich, two leaders who promoted the Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education in the Americas in June, 2010 in Lima Peru, with the backing of the inter-American human rights community. As Executive Director of the IIHR, I have repeatedly stressed that democracy is founded on education in general and human rights education in particular. Thus public policies for education are paramount for promoting the socialization of our young people in a safe setting that fosters peaceful coexistence with a focus on human rights, a culture of peace and democratic citizenship.

The Tenth Progress Report on HRE in the countries that signed and ratified the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Protocol of San Salvador (San Salvador, November, 1988) closes the first decade of a process that began in 2002 and has been showing the region and the world how the countries have been living out Article 13 of this inter-American instrument. The system of reports was based on the idea that public policies for education must focus on respecting, protecting and guaranteeing human rights. Therefore, we have insisted from the very beginning that the right to education is critical for human development and for political democracy. We need to build and shape full citizenship, which is the linchpin for human security and human rights, if we hope to prevent our democratic institutional structures from regressing. HRE is the critical tool for this cumulative construction.

In general terms, the Inter-American HRE Report has been monitoring the inclusion of human rights education in education legislation, curriculum, schoolbooks and teacher training. The IIHR has regularly examined these spheres with support from the ministries and professional assistance from individual experts, former scholarship-holders of our institution. The research covers 17 of the 19 signatory countries of the Protocol, and its stated purpose has been to examine the degree to which policies, initiatives and decisions are consistent with content on the right to HRE, and how much progress has been made in achieving it.

The Tenth Inter-American HRE Report, which is part of the process begun in 2002, presents the findings of research conducted using an instrument to monitor progress, whose value is tested and recognized, to assess how the States intervene in the alarming problems of violence in the schools. This first exercise to address such an issue reflects the Institute's ongoing interest in performing a substantive, evolutionary study of human rights education (HRE). It was designed to examine not only the content of policies for responding to this problem, but also the process by which they have arisen, developed and been applied, and compare them with earlier laws and regulations addressing the extreme conditions associated with violence that now threaten the right to education. This Tenth Report will be useful not only for evaluating policies to prevent and address the phenomenon of violence as it affects the school setting, but also for proposing practices that could be adopted to counteract and prevent the problem. It can thus offer a sound basis for amending such policies, if necessary, and improving them.

The Tenth Inter-American HRE Report is a response to a pressing need. Despite the restoration of democratic institutions in the wake of widespread authoritarianism in the Americas, we enter the second decade of the twenty-first century faced with a climate of danger that violates the basic human rights of many people and communities exposed to fear, terror and lurking threats. The schools, defenseless and unprotected, are not immune to such conditions, as the death trap undermines the entire educational community and its mission to educate and socialize.

Our conceptual and political perspective posits that if the people involved in education receive human rights training, more peaceful, democratic and safe interactions will ensue for everyone. This is because HRE fosters the development of values, attitudes and behaviors that facilitate relationships of this kind among rights bearers. There is a reciprocal influence between peaceful coexistence and safety in the school and HRE, such that learning to live together in a safe environment favors learning and promotes the development of self-esteem and the appreciation and respect that others deserve. In short, this report suggests that safe, peaceful coexistence in the schools is closely associated with and is dependent upon current public policies and rights-based strategies for intervention. This is why it is so important to examine how far the signatory countries of the Protocol of San Salvador have advanced in developing such policies.

We also believe that any act of violence, in and of itself, is a violation of human rights and must be prevented. This is a problem that worries education authorities at the very highest level, as acts of violence in the schools have reached alarming proportions. Thus the IIHR has taken on the challenge of examining it using the particular theoretical perspective and methodological framework of the Inter-American HRE Report.

### **Schools must be kept free of violence**

The Tenth Report synthesizes efforts that the countries of the region have made in the field of peaceful coexistence and prevention of all kinds of violence in the schools, revealing that this concern has been or is being addressed already by the States and that HRE has shaped their proposals. It gives us great satisfaction to know that the contributions and proposals of the IIHR have become the standard as a source of alternatives for responding to this phenomenon with a focus on human rights. Even so, our substantive analysis of the data reveals that most policies on the books today are still very general, disperse and in some cases, ambiguous.

Moreover, it is clear that the task of promoting the right to human rights education now faces a picture very different from that of the late twentieth century, and it needs to be tackled using tools that have evolved over all these years. Thus, despite the relentless breakdown of social conditions, a greater degree of awareness has emerged concerning the need to go beyond the school itself when making necessary decisions. A response to violence demands more than just rules and regulations handed down by the school administration; it also calls for joint, comprehensive actions that benefit and engage the entire education community. This situation became clear through the reactions of the different stakeholders, as published in the pages of this report. Interviewees expressed particular alarm for those communities that have been taken over by drugs or gangs, most commonly in poorer areas. Central America and the Dominican Republic are especially concerned. These frightening conditions also appear to have an impact on school dropout rates, further undermining the exercise of the right to education. The findings described in the Tenth Report suggest once again that exclusion and inequality are serious problems that need to be addressed from the perspective of human rights.

The social gap needs to be understood as a phenomenon that negates the right to a violence-free education.

Discontent and fear are a fact of life in the region, especially in Central America, faced with the very delicate problem of *maras* or youth gangs infiltrating the schools. Measures are needed to detect and contain their actions, along with procedures for seizing weapons and carrying out different types of law enforcement operations, in which cooperative, organized action with the police is paramount. We reaffirm that the police have a major role to play, not so much in active crime fighting as in prevention, serving as a collaborative institution for addressing the dangers of our society. We need to value their role in protection and prevention in scenarios where the greatest hostility and danger are being reported. At least two experiences are now on record involving coordination between law enforcement and education following specific, clearly defined rules and spheres of action: El Salvador and Nicaragua, the latter more structured based on its many years of experience.

We encourage the States to intervene actively in schools located in areas of social risk, where the effective exercise of the right to HRE is pressing. Likewise, we urge the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Central American Integration System (SICA) to adopt the top-priority objective of protecting children and youth from violence, safeguarding the right to education and preserving the schools. The States Party to these two organizations must not delay the task of containing social conflict and, as a mission of utmost urgency, must address the causes of the breakdown and corruption of political life, which engenders ever more violence, skepticism and frustration among citizens.

### **Human rights are crucial to educate for the future**

We need to instill an entrepreneurial spirit in our young people, built on strong innovativeness and sound technological competence. We also need them equipped to take action in changing situations and standing up to the complex web of social problems with the know-how and experience to settle conflicts. There is no avoiding the need to provide young people with training in human rights in order to prevent criminal violence and eradicate social inequality.

Education and human rights education are keys to developing individual character and a humanely democratic society of the future. Educating for the future is the message of this Tenth Inter-American HRE Report.

I want to stress the importance and value of public schools that are inclusive, equitable and high-quality, with good programs and better teachers, and with appropriate, safe infrastructure. This is the way for communities to feel a sense of ownership and commitment to their children's schools. I reiterate our commitment to continue fulfilling this mandate for HRE in the region as a strategy for responding to violence in the schools. I would also like to reaffirm our duty to build safer educational environments by upholding and respecting human rights in the educational community. In closing, I sincerely hope that this Tenth Report will serve as a meaningful contribution to promote systematic progress in educational strategies to address the problems of violence that prevent our men and women from gaining access to an education that seeks their comprehensive development and respects human rights, justice, safety and peace.

*Roberto Cuéllar M.  
Executive Director  
December 10, 2011*



## Section I

### The IIHR report on human rights education and the Institute strategy

#### Institutional background

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 incorporation of human rights instruction into the curriculum and administration of the schools. This work draws on its long-standing dedication to education. In the early years, the Institute worked mainly to train human rights workers attached to civil society entities whose main tasks at that time focused on urgent appeals for protection. From this starting point, it has gradually extended its coverage to reach people who work in public institutions and train them to safeguard and monitor human rights and democracy.

The Institute decided to emphasize formal educational systems, without overlooking action in other training spheres, for a variety of reasons. In the first place, it was convinced that knowledge of human rights must be imparted from an early age as an essential prerequisite for rights to be protected. Second, it hoped to seize the moment when democratic governments were being reinstated in the region, as an opportunity to promote human rights beyond simply responding to violations, and begin holding them out 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 variety of teaching materials developed at that time was widely replicated by national institutions and used by pioneering teachers to incorporate human rights education into the schools.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile, as the IIHR continued to assist several ministries of education, it discovered an urgent need to promote the systematic inclusion of human rights concepts as a permanent fixture of formal education. It also came to understand that such a task is complex, dependent on innumerable political, regulatory, institutional and educational factors.

As the 21st century dawned, the IIHR undertook an intense process of rethinking and strategic redesign under the new leadership introduced in 2000, and decided to modernize its working strategies in the face of changing circumstances on the regional stage in the field of human rights and democracy.<sup>2</sup> 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, pertaining to the most deeply felt problems in the region: the inclusion of human rights education (HRE) in formal educational processes, promotion of access to justice, and development of the right to political participation. Starting in 2005, a fourth set of rights was added as a focus of Institute work: economic, social and cultural rights (ESCRs). This decision coincided with the recent

<sup>1</sup> 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/Amnesty International, San Jose, Costa Rica, 1994; *Educación en derechos humanos. Niveles primario y secundario*. IIHR/UNESCO, San Jose, Costa Rica, 1999.

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

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 the main trends in the development of legal protection and to gauge political conditions compatible with the exercise of rights. It also embraced three crosscutting perspectives reflecting three types of relationships critical to building social justice and good government: gender equality, ethnic diversity and the dynamics between State and civil society.

From 2000 to 2001, it designed a methodology for measuring progress (or lack thereof) in the protection of these rights and in the conditions for exercising them. The methodology was built on three monitoring systems that combine working hypotheses, research domains and content variables for each right, as well as progress indicators. The Institute discussed the system with social stakeholders in the countries of the region during consultations convened for this specific purpose and in specialized courses and workshops on its regular calendar of activities. It applied the system on a trial basis in Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela and conducted a final validation in Bolivia. These early measurement exercises were published under the title *Mapas de progreso en derechos humanos*.<sup>3</sup>

Armed with the findings from this exercise, in 2002 the Institute deepened the system on the right most closely associated with its founding mandate—the right to HRE—and applied it more broadly in the region. It set the objective of producing an annual report on issues relevant to the primary purpose of promoting the practice of HRE in 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 governments and civil society organizations in the countries as input for public policies on education and used as a discussion paper in outreach and training activities.

The project fully met its goals. Every year beginning in 2002, studies took place in the 19 countries that had signed and ratified the Protocol of San Salvador: *Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela*. 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 academic events.

### Nature and scope of the *Inter-American HRE Report*

The *Inter-American HRE Report* is the result of a set of studies conducted every year simultaneously in 19 countries of the region, following a single design. 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 indicators gauge the performance of variables that reflect changes in the exercise of some critical aspect of the right to HRE over a given period, usually the decade prior to measurement.

<sup>3</sup> Available in digital format on the Institute website (<http://www.iidh.ed.cr>).



The report reveals regional and national trends—whether progress, setbacks or stagnation—in legal protection and in political, institutional and operational conditions on the exercise of the right to HRE. It does not measure the status of this right at a single moment, nor does it report violations that may have infringed this right.

It is not a report on the right to education. It avoids the objectives pursued by other reports that examine whether the right to receive educational services has been respected without discrimination, and instead targets one of the particular qualities that educational services should possess—inclusion of human rights content. This quality is understood as an essential element of the right to education 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 or “*acceptable*” education, based on the theory of the four “A’s” (Affordable, Accessible, Acceptable and Adaptable) developed by the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCR) in its General Comment No. 13 (1999).

The goal of the 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 obligation. The IIHR creates this report with no claim to judge the responsibilities of the States, something it is not empowered to do. 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.

The overall system and its indicators emphasize qualitative aspects of the relations being studied. It makes no claim to produce numerical findings or to build an equation that will sort the countries by position or rank-order the different aspects of a right. The report does not establish a regional HRE performance index or create a ranking. It does, however, determine whether or not progress has been made and identifies examples of good practices that may be replicated or considered for developing solutions to problem issues.

The IIHR has taken on this task in fulfillment of its mission to teach, study and promote human rights. While it fully respects the universal protection system, it particularly focuses on standards derived from the instruments of the Inter-American system, taking an interdisciplinary approach and considering problems specific to the Americas. The IIHR intends for these reports to provide input to the Inter-American organizations that monitor, promote and protect 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 facilitating the effective exercise of the right to rights education, and to civil society entities active in this field.

### **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. As the Protocol states in article 13, subparagraphs 1 and 2:



1. Everyone has the right to education.
2. [...] 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 19 countries that have signed and/or ratified the Protocol of San Salvador are committed to design a legal and logistic platform for promoting and protecting 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 incorporate international human rights provisions into their domestic legislation, design public policies and implement activities to comply with these precepts. States that have ratified the Protocol hold the additional obligation to submit regular reports to the OAS Secretary General, who will transmit them for review to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Council for Education, Science and Culture (article 19.2). An additional copy of these reports is sent to the Commission.

From 2004 to 2007, after the Protocol had received its 12th ratification and entered into effect, the OAS General Assembly resolved to design and implement a procedure whereby the States should submit reports, emulating the system of progress indicators adopted by the IIHR for analysis of HRE. In this framework, it entrusted the Permanent Council, and by extension the Commission, to develop a proposal with support from the Institute.<sup>4</sup>

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 Belém 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*

Today's human rights research endeavors tend to adopt variations on three major approaches:

1. One approach could be considered 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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](http://www.cidh.org/pdf_files/guidelines_progress_indicators_desc.july.2008.doc)> and General Assembly Resolution OEA AG/RES. 2506 (XXXIX-O/09).

2. A second approach focuses on the *status of human rights*; it examines the effective exercise of rights at a given moment and 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 human rights without discrimination.
3. 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.

The violation-based approach uses an essentially case-by-case methodology that 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 shed light on the facts, punish perpetrators and provide justice and reparation to victims, at the same time alerting to the possibility of future violations. In Latin America, this approach has been enriched in recent decades by ever-wider access to public information associated with the restoration of democracy and by active monitoring in the hands of a growing number of civil organizations.

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

Finally, the progress measurement approach takes a long-term view by examining relatively lengthy periods to assess whether real progress is being made in the effective exercise of rights; progress is measured according to minimum standards set forth in international law and adopted by the countries upon ratification of conventions. It does not replace the approach of monitoring and reporting 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 focusing in on particular cases of violations or merely taking a photograph of the status quo at a given moment. It 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.

Table 1 summarizes the main aspects of these approaches.

Table 1. Approaches to human rights research			
Approach	Methodology	Results	Uses
Violation	Descriptive	Identify frequency	Denounce and defend
Status	Comparative	Assess	Identify problems and set goals
Progress	Comparative and forward-looking	Identify trends	Monitor compliance and stimulate dialogue

The IIHR started developing the progress approach in 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 reports that serve as the preferred monitoring mechanism for the international and inter-American protection systems. Several international instruments call for the States to submit compliance reports. Others allow protection bodies to develop documentation, including reports by rapporteurs or 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. These 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.<sup>5</sup>

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.

By contrast, with very few exceptions, no systematic mechanisms have been developed for monitoring compliance with the recommendations of international oversight institutions or the judgments of judicial bodies. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts on-going analysis of progress in meeting the Millennium Development Goals, and UNESCO releases regular monitoring reports on the Education for All agreements. These are part of a systematic effort to monitor compliance with commitments, taking the rights perspective.

### *New instruments for new scenarios<sup>6</sup>*

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.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> See *The current outlook for human rights and democracy*, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003.

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 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, that is, 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 that target the progressive development of human rights.<sup>7</sup> 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 of relying on interpretations or 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**

#### *General structure of the research*

The research behind the first five reports was 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 advancement 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:

<sup>7</sup> For more extensive discussion of the institutional basis for this work, see: *Framework for development of institutional strategy*, IIHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2003.

- 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.
- Whether textbooks reflect this content, teach it using appropriate methodologies and are free of references contrary to human rights values and principles.
- Whether this content and acceptable 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 into all types of educational programs at all levels.
- Whether curriculum slots and extracurricular activities addressing this type of education are acceptable and are increasing over time.

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:<sup>8</sup>

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

Work in each field covers several component domains:

- 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 domain, the research team identified a set of variables that would reveal (i) the most significant changes occurring over a 10- to 15-year period beginning in 1990 and ending the year immediately prior to the study; and (ii) whether all the relevant legal provisions, policies and practices were developing at a consistent rate.

To assess the performance of the variables over time, a set of *progress 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.

<sup>8</sup> Each of these is understood as a complex web of relationships among many domains: regulatory or legal, political or institutional and pedagogical, all of which combine to yield a particular level of performance.

The system of indicators does not contain opinions, nor does it claim to reflect the perceptions 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 for interpreting the results of data collection by giving a sense of context.

Table 2 summarizes the structure of research in the first cycle of the report:

Table 2. Structure of the first cycle of Inter-American HRE Reports					
Report N°	Year	Subject fields	Domains	Variables	Indicators
I	2002	Normative and institutional development	1	4	10
II	2003	Development of school curricula and textbooks	3	6	28
III	2004	Development of teacher education	4	11	38
IV	2005	Developments in educational planning at the national level	3	8	26
V	2006	Development of curricular slots and content: 10-14 years of age	3	9	28
Total			14	38	130

### *Data collection, analysis and writing*

Part of the information for the First Report was supplied by participants in the *20th Interdisciplinary Course on Human Rights: Human Rights Education*, 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 undertook to disseminate the report in their countries, and some 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, especially the Protocol of San Salvador. The final outcome will consist of deepened and sustained changes in the countries' educational programs by building a system of indicators and developing regular reports on the subject. The Institute thus makes a substantive contribution to efforts for giving expression to the right to education and to human rights education.

Starting with the Second Report, research has taken place in the following order:

1. The Institute team develops a working hypothesis and designs a system of variables and indicators.
2. In-country researchers collect information based on the system of indicators.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> This could include both individual researchers and collectives organized through human rights NGOs. Most of the cooperating researchers have been alumni of IIHR courses.



3. The Institute team reviews, screens and sorts the information received from the countries.
4. Results are analyzed and a comparative synthesis of findings is developed (patterns and specificities).
5. Conclusions and recommendations are discussed.
6. The IIHR team writes and publishes the reports.
7. The reports are unveiled publicly in several countries of the region.
8. The reports are uploaded onto the IIHR website.
9. A bilingual Spanish-English publication is produced.

The system of indicators used in the reports is synthesized in Table 3.<sup>10</sup>

Associates in the countries collect data, applying a matrix developed by the IIHR and following a protocol of instructions to ensure that replies are as comparable as possible.

The central Institute team then processes data submitted by researchers. They begin with a preliminary screening of the quantity and quality of responses received. Any missing information can be completed and, in case of doubt, information is verified with the use of secondary sources. Finally, they develop specific documents showing the data by country. The country results, presented as text or tables, are recorded on a compact disc, complete with a search system, to be included as appendices to the report.

Table 3. 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).	A magnitude that may take different values. For example: the factor's relative proximity to a given standard.	"Key" signs of the performance of each variable over time. For example: legislation in effect at two different times.	Sources of information that back up the proposed indicators. For example: laws, official documents, school textbooks.

To facilitate comparative analysis, the staff develop tables containing syntheses of the response to each variable in all countries (sometimes, but not always, expressed as values or percentages). This makes it easier to identify patterns, repeated occurrences and specificities useful for inferring general and specific trends that reflect progress under each domain in the system.

The final report is 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 is submitted to the Permanent Council and the OAS Committee on Juridical and Political Affairs and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in Washington, DC.

<sup>10</sup> These terms in Spanish were taken from the dictionary M.Moliner, *Diccionario de uso del español*, Editorial Gredos, Madrid, 2001.

## Themes and working hypotheses<sup>11</sup>

The *First Report* (2002) examined the *normative development of HRE*. It was based on the hypothesis 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 against the more general status of the overall right to education. This is why two domains were created: the right to education, to provide additional information on surrounding conditions, and the right to HRE as the focus of the study.

The *Second Report* (2003) focused on the *development of HRE in 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 system and whether school textbooks reflect this content and are free of references that run counter to the fundamental values and principles of human rights.

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 of educational content concerning the State, rule of law, justice, democracy and values in general. For practical reasons, school curriculum and textbooks were analyzed in a sample taken from three grades of the educational system (5th, 8th and 11th).

The *Third Report* (2004) discussed the *development of HRE in teacher education*. The working hypothesis was that, if HRE is to be implemented effectively, the training programs for teachers and other deliverers of education should include content on the knowledge, values, attitudes and skills for teaching human rights.

The study therefore explored changes that had occurred since 1990 in the training given to teachers, whether for aspiring new professionals being readied to enter the classroom for the first time, or for in-service teachers receiving continuing education. 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 the instruction they needed to understand and impart human rights. 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 continuing education programs for active teachers had done so.

The *Fourth Report* (2005) discussed the *development of HRE in national education planning*. This study inquired into the development of national plans for human rights education, national human rights plans, or equivalent policy documents. Presumably, such plans serve as significant indicators that public policies have been developed for including HRE in educational processes at all levels, and setting their basic direction.

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

<sup>11</sup> The complete matrices (domains, variables and indicators) used for collecting data and analyzing results in all the reports of the first cycle can be examined below in Section VI, Appendix 1.



table of domains, variables and indicators was based on guidelines proposed by the United Nations for developing national HRE plans in the framework of the *Decade for Human Rights Education* (1995-2004).<sup>12</sup>

The *Fifth Report* (2006) explored the *development of HRE in curriculum contents and courses* for students between 10 and 14 years of age.

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 school curriculum design. 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 IIHR educational proposal as discussed in the following section. Following the same structure as the educational proposal, the Fifth Report trained its view on students between 10 and 14 years of age.

### **Another initiative by the Inter-American Institute: 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.<sup>13</sup>

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 taken from the earlier Inter-American HRE reports and IIHR participation in a variety of educational initiatives. Finally, it built on interactions with education 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 to introduce or strengthen 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 across the board into school education for their children and adolescents.

The educational proposal was directed at authorities and technical experts in the countries' ministries of education and other academic institutions and should serve as a contribution to the development

<sup>12</sup> Report of the Secretary General, A/52/469/Add.1, November 20, 1997.

<sup>13</sup> See *Curricular and methodological proposal for incorporating human rights education into formal schooling for children from 10 to 14 years of age*; in several languages, on the IIHR website ([http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/PaginaExterna.aspx?url=/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD\\_119984550/Propuesta%20curricular%20ingles.pdf](http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/PaginaExterna.aspx?url=/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD_119984550/Propuesta%20curricular%20ingles.pdf)).

of education 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 *World Programme for Human Rights Education* (2005-2007) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.<sup>14</sup> Clearly, the inter-American reports had revealed significant progress; they also identified limitations and gaps, as well as unequal degrees of development from one country to another. This initiative was therefore intended to help the countries overcome shortcomings and lags and provide a broad, all-encompassing, rigorous vision for incorporating human rights into formal education.

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.<sup>15</sup>

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 that 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 responsibilities 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. Therefore the education of this specific segment of the population remains under the responsibility of public policy, including curriculum design, supervision of text materials and continuing education for teachers.

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

### *The IIHR Educational Proposal, the OAS and the ministries of education: progress and regional synergy*

The last five years have seen growth in both the scope and impact of the Institute's landmark contributions to formal education in the region. As was noted, the OAS General Assembly extended resounding political support for the Institute to promote HRE in the school systems and repeatedly urged the member countries to adopt IIHR recommendations and proposals. At the same time, the Institute strengthened its ties of cooperation with the institutions that govern education in the countries and

<sup>14</sup> The first phase of the World Programme for HRE, carried out from 2005 through 2009, targeted elementary and secondary education. Phase Two will cover the period from 2010 through 2014 with a focus on higher and specialized education for certain specific professions, including security forces and court workers.

<sup>15</sup> See: *World Programme for Human Rights Education* (<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/483/04/PDF/N0448304.pdf?OpenElement>) and plan of action (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001478/147853e.pdf>).

intensified its specialized projects for research, pedagogical development, production of materials and teacher training. High-level political and technical meetings and discussions, agreements, academic initiatives and joint activities have continued to take place every year.

In 2007, the 37th session of the OAS General Assembly (Panama, June 3-5) was preceded from May 31 to June 2 by the *Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education on Human Rights Education*, organized in Panama 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. Participants analyzed the state of HRE in the region, identified progress made and pending challenges and strengthened inter-institutional linkages for complying with international commitments on this subject.

The delegations attending the event had the opportunity to examine the IIHR *Curricular and methodological proposal*; they shared their comments and used it as a basis for working out a common horizon within which to step up the inclusion of human rights material in formal education. The activity closed with the signing of the *Panama Declaration on Human Rights Education*. Upon completion of the meeting, the 37th General Assembly of the OAS adopted a 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.<sup>16</sup>

In 2008, in the framework of the 38th session of the General Assembly of the OAS (Medellín, June 1-3), the IIHR organized the *Dialogue of Ministers on Human Rights Education* from May 29-30, with support from the Colombian Ministry of Education. This dialogue followed up on the 2007 meeting of ministers by providing the countries with an opportunity to share their experiences with HRE. It was attended by delegations from Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica and Panama. Once again, the General Assembly adopted a resolution recognizing the efforts of the IIHR and the ministries of education to incorporate human rights into the education system, reiterating its support of the *Curricular and methodological proposal* and the inter-American reports on HRE.<sup>17</sup>

Shortly thereafter, 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 representatives from the ministries of education who held leadership positions in the area of curriculum and HRE; 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 university programs in the schools of education. With this intersectoral makeup, the course was geared toward building synergy among different institutions that are associated with HRE in the formal education system: the ministries, as decision-makers on national education policy, universities as trainers of future teachers, and *ombudsman* offices that monitor the work of public institutions and promote human rights.

<sup>16</sup> The *Panama Declaration on Human Rights Education* can be seen in Spanish in the IIHR Newsletter, issue 99 ([http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/PaginaExterna.aspx?url=/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD\\_541409364/99\\_mar-jun\\_2007.pdf](http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/PaginaExterna.aspx?url=/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD_541409364/99_mar-jun_2007.pdf)); see Resolution AG/RES. 2321 (XXXVII– O/07) by selecting “Thirty-seventh Regular Session at: <http://www.oas.org/consejo/GENERAL%20ASSEMBLY/Resoluciones-Declaraciones.asp>.”

<sup>17</sup> Resolution AG/RES. 2404 (XXXVIII– O/08) can be seen at: [http://www.oas.org/dil/AGRES\\_2404.doc](http://www.oas.org/dil/AGRES_2404.doc).

In 2009, a new encounter took place at the 39th General Assembly of the OAS. Called the *Dialogue of ministers: human rights education and the prevention of violence*, it was convened by the Honduran Secretariat of Education, the IIHR and the OAS General Secretariat. It was the third such event in the advocacy process by which the Institute is supporting the efforts of the States to fulfill their HRE obligations, and it was attended by delegations from Bolivia, Colombia, Guatemala and Honduras. The General Assembly again emphasized the work of the Institute and the ministries of education in the progress of HRE in formal education in the Americas.<sup>18</sup>

In 2010, the 40th OAS General Assembly, held in Lima, Peru, reiterated its support for HRE development in the region and the Institute's outreach work by adopting a resolution that cites another IIHR strategic initiative: the *Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education*. The Covenant was put forward by the Institute, the Ministry of Education of El Salvador and the Ministry of Education of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay. It proposes a plan of action to deepen the progress both countries have made in the field of HRE and aspires to serve as a paradigm that will drive greater progress in this field in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Inter-American Covenant was publicly released by its signatories during the commemoration of the Thirtieth Anniversary of the IIHR on July 30, 2010.<sup>19</sup>

Finally, in 2011, the 41st General Assembly of the OAS, meeting in San Salvador, El Salvador, from June 5 to 7, adopted another strongly worded resolution recognizing and supporting the Institute's various initiatives in the field of HRE in the region and encouraging the Member States to do likewise. The operative part of the resolution says:<sup>20</sup>

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.
2. To suggest to member states that they 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 to incorporate human rights education at different levels in their formal education systems, bearing in mind the educational policies and guidelines of each member state.
3. To suggest to member states that they analyze the contributions of the Curricular and Methodological Proposal of the IIHR to incorporate human rights education into the official curriculum for children aged 10 to 14, 3. and evaluate its applicability, bearing in mind the national contexts and education systems of member states, in accordance with Article 13.2 of the Protocol of San Salvador Additional to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, "Protocol of San Salvador," and, in that regard, to recommend to those member states that have not already done so that they adopt, sign, and ratify the latter instrument.
4. To underscore the work and achievements of the Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education on Human Rights Education in the signatory states to the Protocol of San Salvador, in which participants shared

<sup>18</sup> Resolution AG/RES. 2466 (XXXIX-O/09) has been reprinted on the IIHR website at: [http://www.iidh.ed.cr:80/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD\\_395509089/Res2466OEA.doc](http://www.iidh.ed.cr:80/BibliotecaWeb/Varios/Documentos/BD_395509089/Res2466OEA.doc).

<sup>19</sup> Resolution AG/RES. 2604 (XL-O/10), along with the text of the *Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education*, have been reprinted (in Spanish) on the IIHR website ([http://iidh-webserver.iidh.ed.cr/multic/UserFiles/Biblioteca/IIDH/8\\_2010/6082.pdf](http://iidh-webserver.iidh.ed.cr/multic/UserFiles/Biblioteca/IIDH/8_2010/6082.pdf)). The resolution can be found in English at the OAS (<http://www.oas.org/dil/AG05138E06.doc>, page 391).

<sup>20</sup> Resolution AG/RES. 2673 (XXXIX-O/11) can be found at <http://www.oas.org/consejo/sp/AG/Documentos/AG05485E05.doc> (page 225).

their experiences and discussed the curricular and methodological developments needed to introduce or strengthen human rights education in each state party's educational system.

5. To encourage member states to continue supporting the IIHR in educational activities and projects conducted at the national and regional levels under this mandate, especially through an initiative entitled the Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education, the initial implementation of which enjoys firm support from the Ministry of Education of El Salvador and the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay, and which comprises the promotion of inclusive education, the provision of infrastructure to ensure quality education, teacher training, curriculum development, the preparation and distribution of teaching materials, and the implementation of proposals for preventing, addressing, and overcoming manifestations of violence affecting the school environment.

6. To congratulate the signatory states of the Protocol of San Salvador that have made substantial progress in including in textbooks exercises related explicitly to human rights, as well as instructional designs for their implementation, as indicated in section IV of the IX Inter-American Report on Human Rights Education, entitled "*Development of the Human Rights Education Methodology in School Textbooks: 10 to 14 Years of Age.*"

(AG/RES. 2673 (XLI-O/11) "Human rights education in formal education in the Americas")

Based on the meetings of ministers and the series of resolutions by the OAS General Assembly, the IIHR has continued to strengthen its ties with the ministries of education by renewing agreements for inter-institutional cooperation and through a variety of teacher training activities (both face-to-face and online), specialized technical assistance and the production and distribution of print, audiovisual and electronic materials. Meanwhile, the Inter-American HRE Reports continue to provide the best possible assessment of the region's strengths, weaknesses and shortcomings in the field of rights education.



## Section II

### The Tenth Report and the second cycle of the Inter-American HRE Report

#### The second cycle of the report: 2007 onward

##### *An exercise in permanence and innovation*

The 2007 meeting of ministers in Panama and the encouraging support of the Inter-American HRE Reports by the OAS General Assembly year after year, as well as expressions by the ministries of education of continued interest in working with the Institute in this field, clearly reveal that the decision to implement a new cycle of the report was the wisest course of action. The new cycle would follow the same sequence of fields of inquiry as the previous cycle and perform a second measurement of progress. New regulatory standards have been appearing in the international arena, along with local developments in each country, and the second cycle would study the most recent changes these have brought to education.

Every year, new components would be introduced into the measurement system, whether to expand the arsenal of indicators or to add new domains or research variables that had not been considered in the first cycle. Thus the IIHR strategic approach combines and balances *permanence* (or the continuation of practices that have proved necessary or valuable for HRE work in the past) with *innovation*, introducing new practices demanded by evolving challenges for human rights in the region.

The 2007 meeting in Panama also marked the beginning of direct participation by ministry of education officials in the second research cycle. Accordingly, the group of researchers for the sixth and subsequent reports was larger and more varied than before. Now the team combined 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* revisited the topic discussed in the First Report (2002) and applied a second progress measurement. It also introduced a new domain: *developments with student government in educational systems*. This new research domain was selected on the premise that 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 hypothesis for this research was 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 whether the States had progressed over the past two decades in two areas: (i) does the regulatory framework recognize some form of student organization featuring participation, representation and decision making? (ii) are school resources provided to make student government a reality? Three historical milestones were defined for collecting and sharing documentary information: 1990, 2000 and 2007. The first year, 1990, stands as a constant in all the HRE reports, the starting point of the *reference period* over which progress in educational systems is observed. The third, 2007, became another constant, placing the endpoint of the reference period in the same year the study took place, so that the analysis of educational developments in the region is always current. As the lifespan of the report lengthened, the *reference period* also grew, so it became necessary to add an intermediate milestone, 2000, marking the midpoint between decades and providing a means to examine changes and trends 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, it elicited differentiated responses reflecting the perspectives of gender, ethnic diversity and State-civil society interaction. Moreover, researchers in the countries were given detailed guidelines for applying the matrix.

Following the same lines as the First Report (2002), certain minimum indicators were included 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 whether systems can adapt to meet the needs of children unable to attend school.<sup>1</sup>

### *Seventh Report (2008): Development of specific human rights concepts in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age*

The *Seventh Report* continued with the sequence of topics examined in the first cycle, revisiting the theme of the Second Report (2003). It introduced a significant change: the study focused on only one of the domains covered by the earlier exercise – *curriculum* – and applied a second measurement to determine how this field had advanced during the 2000s.<sup>2</sup> This new study of the curriculum added an indicator on student government to identify whether experiences with student-body participation were being addressed in the curriculum itself as explicit knowledge associated with the exercise of human rights.

The hypothesis underlying the research for the Seventh Report was 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. The report introduced a new way of measuring the presence or absence of such curriculum content.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The complete tables (domains, variables and indicators) used for collecting and analyzing data for the sixth, seventh and eighth reports can be seen in below in Section VI, Appendix 2.

<sup>2</sup> The Second Report (2003) also included the domain of school textbooks; in the second cycle, this domain was excluded from the Seventh Report and instead left for specific analysis the following year. The two ideas were handled separately to allow for more in-depth study, devoting a full annual research exercise to each one.

<sup>3</sup> HRE covers three categories of content (knowledge, values and attitudes, and skills and abilities for action); the research for the Seventh and Eighth Reports focused on only the first: specific concepts of human rights knowledge. This is not to suggest that the other dimensions are considered less important. It was simply a methodological decision to focus on a single segment of the thematic spectrum and thus facilitate a more detailed analysis.

Other novel features of the Seventh Report were the sample and the selection of variables and indicators. The sample no longer consisted of alternating grades in the school system, but instead focused on a block of successive grades pertaining to a specific age group, 10 to 14 years, which held top priority within the IIHR educational strategy. As a result of this methodological decision, the object of study became more cohesive. The analysis could cover a curriculum sequence (five consecutive grades) imparted at an age that is critical for the student's cognitive, emotional and social development. An added advantage was that the study addressed two different phases in the school system (the final three grades of primary school and the first two years of secondary school).<sup>4</sup>

The variables and indicators for the Seventh Report were selected using much more detailed 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, taking a broad overview of subjects associated with human rights, democracy and values. The Seventh Report targeted specific human rights knowledge (albeit of a basic nature, given the age of the student population). The selection was based on the very detailed table of curricular content in the *Curricular and Methodological Proposal for Incorporating Human Rights Education into Formal Schooling for Children from 10 to 14 Years of Age*.

The research covered three variables. The first, *human rights concepts and conceptual developments*, entails the theoretical constructs that equip students to understand the notion of human rights intellectually and argue it rationally. The second, *history of human rights*, studies landmark events in the process by which human society came to recognize essential human dignity and forge concrete tools to defend it in the face of arbitrary use of power. The third, *legal norms and institutions for human rights*, identifies legal instruments and specialized entities created to safeguard the protection of rights.

### *Eighth Report (2009): Development of specific human rights concepts in textbooks for students from 10 to 14 years of age*

The *Eighth Report* centered on another important domain of the educational system. It examined *educational resources*, especially the tool that is most widespread in schools: the textbooks used by students and their teachers. The hypothesis was that progress in HRE depends on whether human rights content, in addition to appearing in the explicit curriculum, is clearly and appropriately developed in the textbooks that students use every day, and these books contain no references contrary to the values and principles of human rights.

This hypothesis led to a more in-depth study than was the case in the Second Report (2003). It posited that progress in HRE will not come about because of the mere presence of content in the books. The conceptual development of human rights needs to be accurate overall and consistent with the recognized doctrine (and of course, always in a way that is age-appropriate for the students). To the extent that school textbooks broach human rights concepts frequently, rigorously, in depth and with a cross-cutting perspective, students and teachers, who also use the books, will be more likely to achieve comprehensive learning.

<sup>4</sup> The same selection of school grades would be carried over into the Eighth and Ninth Reports.



The Eighth Report drew necessary parallels with the previous study (Seventh Report, 2008) because textbooks are not autonomous materials; instead, they need to be consistent with the entire official school curriculum. This is why the Seventh and Eighth Reports both cover the same *reference period* (2000 and 2008); the same school grades (the final three years of primary school and the first two years of secondary, when students are from 10 to 14 years of age); the same concentration on *human rights knowledge*, and the same table of variables and indicators.

The number of indicators used (43), although far from covering the entire field of human rights, was extensive enough to map out an overview of the textbooks. The 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.

### *Ninth Report (2010): Development of the methodology for human rights instruction in textbooks for students from 10 to 14 years of age*

The *Ninth Report* took a new look at the textbooks most commonly used for classes on Civics or Ethics (also known, for example, as Citizenship Education) in 2000 and 2010 in the school grades attended by students from 10 to 14 years of age, that is, the same books examined in the Eighth Report. This study, however, took an entirely new perspective, focusing on the *methodology for teaching human rights* as evidenced in student exercises and activities.

The hypothesis of the study enriched the earlier reports. The idea was that the progress of HRE does not depend merely on whether human rights content is present in the explicit curriculum and receives conceptually appropriate treatment in the textbooks. It also depends on whether this type of content is taught using an acceptable methodology, consistent with and respectful of human rights principles.

The research gauged educational methodologies by studying the main instructional tool that teachers use to conduct their classes and work with their students: textbooks. The study did not examine expository material (theoretical development of human rights issues, already covered in the Eighth Report), concentrating instead on the practical component: exercises designed for students to perform.

The advantages of analyzing textbook exercises are many. These resources are in the hands of large numbers of teachers, perhaps all the teachers in the country, as are the texts themselves; they are widely used by teachers on a daily basis; they were created by subject specialists; they tend to be well developed and comprehensive; they often include answer sheets for teachers to use, and they generally serve as a model teachers can follow in preparing their evaluations of student learning (exams).

The boundary set on the analytical sample was that these exercises must refer explicitly to human rights:

1. exercises contained in chapters or sections of the textbook whose titles make explicit mention of human rights or fundamental rights, or
2. exercises whose text makes explicit mention of the concept of human or fundamental rights in general, or a particular human right or rights.

Three variables of analysis were applied to the selected exercises. Two were associated with the content of the exercises: both the values and attitudes they embodied, and the skills or abilities necessary to

complete the exercise. The third variable explored how the student activity was designed and the educational strategies or resources used for promoting student participation. The study examined how these variables were presented in the curriculum and how thoroughly they were covered, using indicators suggested in the IIHR *Curricular and methodological proposal*.

Table 4 summarizes the structure of research for the second cycle of the Report, including the current Tenth Report introduced in the next section.

Table 4. Structure of the second cycle of Inter-American HRE Reports					
Report N°	Year	Subject fields	Domains	Variables	Indicators
VI	2007	Normative development of HRE and student government	3	7	18
VII	2008	Development of human rights concepts in the curriculum: 10 to 14 years of age	2	3	43
VIII	2009	Development of human rights concepts in textbooks: 10 to 14 years of age	2	3	43
IX	2010	Development of the methodology for human rights instruction in textbooks: 10 to 14 years of age	1	3	20
X	2011	Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a rights approach	1	4	15
Total			9	20	139

The tables in the second research cycle contain more indicators than the tables in the first and an equal or smaller number of domains and variables. The purpose was to concentrate narrowly on the most relevant variables and develop more finely tuned descriptions of their forms of expression, so as to draw detailed conclusions and offer specific recommendations for educational systems; this is done by constructing more indicators.

## The Tenth Report: Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a focus on rights

### *Background and justification of the selected theme*

The agreements contained 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 teach human rights. They all concur on a two-fold 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*.

The term “school environment” covers a vast, complex system that contains a diverse body of components, all of them necessary and relevant for the process of education. The apparently simple expression “school” includes such diverse dimensions and factors as the rules, regulations and public policies that govern education; the different manifestations of the curriculum; pedagogical tools used by the people involved in education; teaching itself; extra-curricular activities for student participation, and other stakeholders in the world of education, especially parents and the community. The progress

and outcome of the educational process cannot be understood without considering how these factors fit together, their synergies and tensions. This ecosystem as a whole and its individual components all need to be imbued with the vision, content and practices of HRE.

Earlier versions of the Inter-American HRE Report focused on certain of these components based on recommendations by the IIHR in-house research team and following discussion with Institute authorities. Specific target components for the study were identified as “research domains” for the report. Each domain was selected on the basis of its relative weight or importance within the school system in the abstract.

The theme for this report, however, originated differently. It was expressly requested by several of the region’s ministries of education that serve as counterparts to IIHR work, especially those involved in the initiative of the Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education. The Institute received a request from these ministries to produce an annual report targeting a phenomenon that is arousing ever-greater concern among national education authorities: violence in the schools.

The request reflected a valid and very current concern that is clearly germane to the effective exercise of human rights in the schools. School-based acts of violence, regardless of their source or severity, constitute violations by certain members of the school community of the human rights of others. From the rights perspective, they must always be identified and reported. Above all, they must be prevented so they do not even occur. Given this request, the Institute decided that the Tenth Report would examine the phenomenon of violence in Latin American schools, particularly violence played out among the main stakeholders in education (between students and teachers, and between students), often known as *school violence* or *intra-school violence*.

It has become a problem of great concern to the region’s top education authorities, faced with the perception that acts of violence have been on the upswing over the past decade and reaching alarming proportions in many countries. The subject is widely discussed in the media and in the marketplace, usually in the absence of any reliable information. There is little basis beyond journalistic reports about certain headline-grabbing cases and generic information of questionable credibility taken from the rumor mill. Beyond certain experts, few are familiar with academic studies conducted in the region, which are rarely in the hands of the very people in the education sector who most need them: school administrators, teachers, students and parents.

The IIHR feels it is important to reframe this issue as a problem of dignity and rights, shedding light on its many different angles with a clear human rights lens and avoiding prejudices and stereotypes, arbitrary apocalyptic hypotheses, groundless opinions and threatening talk of “iron-fisted” crackdowns. The latter is particularly dangerous, not only because specialized research has shown such responses to be ineffective, but also because they tend to condone or even encourage the violation of certain other human rights in the name of a form of “order” or “peace” defined unilaterally by those who hold power.<sup>5</sup>

Thus the IIHR took on the challenge of examining this problem using the particular theoretical perspective and methodological framework of the Inter-American HRE Report. The overall purpose

<sup>5</sup> Krauskopf, Dina, *Estado del arte de los programas de prevención de la violencia en ámbitos escolares*. OPS-GTZ, Lima, 2006; Abad, J.M. y J.A. Gómez, *¡Preparados, listos, ya! Una síntesis de intervenciones efectivas para la prevención de violencia que afecta a adolescentes y jóvenes*, OPS-GTZ, Lima, 2008; Rodríguez, Ernesto, “Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias: Aprendizajes y desafíos desde las políticas públicas en América Latina”, Paper given in the seminar “Learning to live without violence: a challenge for young people and their schools,” Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Under-secretary of Public Education and UNESCO, Mexico City, June, 2010.

is to provide tools that will help people in the education community become more sensitive to the problem, analyze it objectively, take action to prevent it and, if necessary, face up to it without ever losing their human rights perspective and using HRE as a strategy for intervention.

This means the theoretical-pedagogical construct needs to be reversed. The educational system should not take on the objective of “fighting violence” *per se* (a task proper to police and the courts), but instead should plan ways to create and sustain conditions that will guarantee safety and peaceful coexistence in school facilities and education communities, as these goals are clearly in the purview of educators. “Learning to live together” is, in fact, one of the great and undeniable purposes of education.<sup>6</sup>

Living together means more than mere peaceful coexistence among people sharing the same physical space. The United Nations Development Programme, for example, explains it as a social dynamic based on relations of trust and cooperation, in which all people feel like part of a society, enjoy their human rights and experience socially constructed opportunities expressed in part by the State, its rules and its democratic institutions.<sup>7</sup>

When educational institutions teach students to live together, manifestations of violence may and in fact do erupt, and the school needs to respond. The school should recognize these manifestations and call them by their name—acts of violence—without ambiguity, because whatever goes unnamed tends to become invisible and cannot be handled clearly or effectively. However, manifestations of violence are serious disruptions of the educational process. Even beyond their particular causes, often external to the school, if they are not contained, they reveal the school’s own limitations and inadequacies for managing, negotiating or constructively transforming conflicts that arise within its walls and among its members.

Again, while the school’s institutional mission is not to combat violence, it still needs to recognize the manifestations of violence and work conscientiously to prevent them. It must be able to identify factors that favor violence and heighten the potential for violent acts to occur (*risk factors*) so as to neutralize them, and find other factors that can reduce the likelihood of violent acts (*protection factors*), to strengthen them.<sup>8</sup> When necessary, if the school finds itself faced directly with episodes of violence, it must handle them using tools that are consistent with its educational nature and function, always from a rights perspective.

### *Theoretical framework: School and types of violence*

The first step for addressing the problems of violence in the school setting (as in overall society) is to banish an initial conceptual error: alluding to violence as if it were a single, uniform phenomenon. Instead we will use the plural expression “types of violence” to cover the highly diverse spectrum of situations and behaviors commonly encapsulated in this term.

Expressions of violence in school settings can vary in many ways, such as their relationship to the school, origin, type and degree of severity; such factors are also interwoven with other phenomena

<sup>6</sup> Together with “learning to be,” “learning to do” and “learning to learn,” these are the four pillars of education defined by UNESCO and now universally accepted. See: *Learning: The Treasure Within*, Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, led by Jacques Delors. UNESCO, 1996.

<sup>7</sup> UNDP, *Marco conceptual del segundo Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano*. UNDP, San José, Costa Rica, 2007.

<sup>8</sup> On factors of risk and protection for episodes of violence, see Ministerio de Educación de la Nación, Ministerio de Educación de la Provincia de Córdoba, and Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos, OEI, *Actuar a tiempo. Estrategias educativas para prevenir la violencia*. Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2005, pp. 26-27 and 36.

from each different socio-historical and geographic context. In Latin America, the problems may range from fairly constrained manifestations of violence such as harassment or bullying among peers, to clear aggression among students, acts of vandalism against school property, mistreatment between teachers and students, taking weapons into the schools, open or subtle influences from the drug world, including drug retailing and the presence of gangs, excesses committed by police guards inside or outside the schools, and many more.<sup>9</sup>

Specialized studies use different methods to classify types of violence in the schools, although two particular classification systems are most common: one rates the relationship between violent acts and the school itself, as an institution; the other rates the type and degree of violence. Studies based on the relationship with the school distinguish between (i) violence by or from the school (institutional violence exercised by the school itself or by the education system against its members); (ii) violence toward or against the school (acts that directly target the school, that is, intended to destroy or damage the institution's infrastructure and legitimacy), and (iii) violence in the school (events inside the school that mirror criminal acts generally occurring on the outside, in society).<sup>10</sup>

Studies based on types and degrees of violence often distinguish between physical violence and symbolic violence, sometimes adding an additional class of less severe behavior they call "incivility."<sup>11</sup> Other authors use more operational classification systems, identifying five manifestations of violence: (i) vandalism (against school property); (ii) disruptiveness (against school activities); (iii) indiscipline (against the rules); (iv) inter-personal violence (among students, teachers, etc.) and (v) crime (illegal actions subject to criminal consequences).<sup>12</sup>

These two classification systems can be combined into a table showing the major expressions of violence in the schools. The matrix shown here was developed by Brazilian specialist Cândido Gomes (Table 5).

Forms of school violence are closely associated with phenomena of social transformation and the types of violence experienced by overall society. Today, basic elementary-school education has become nearly universal in most of the world, and Latin America is no exception. Public education, once little more than a program proposal and an optional plank in the government platform for whichever authorities happened to be in office, came to be understood as a human right binding on the States. This change triggered a massive process to educate populations characterized by vast socio-cultural diversity. Inequality, inequity and social violence have "invaded" the school, formerly considered a sort of "sanctuary," an exclusive stronghold for the minorities that owned property and political power in each society.<sup>13</sup>

Similarly, the causes and conditions under which different manifestations of violence develop in Latin America vary from region to region, according to expert Ernesto Rodríguez. The Southern Cone is experiencing the "consequences of deindustrialization and social breakdown trends" that sidelined broad swaths of the population who had been fully integrated before the recent wave of crisis. Central America is contending with "the legacy of 1980s armed conflicts, limitations of the 1990s peace

<sup>9</sup> Rodríguez, Ernesto, "Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias"... pg. 4.

<sup>10</sup> Gomes, Cândido Alberto, "Abrindo espaços: Puentes entre escuela, comunidad y vida", paper given at "Abrindo espaços: múltiplos olhares", UNESCO, Fundação Vale, Brasília, DF, 2008; Rodríguez, Ernesto, "Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias"...

<sup>11</sup> Gomes, Cândido Alberto, "Abrindo espaços: Pontes entre a escola, a comunidade e a vida"...

<sup>12</sup> Rodríguez, Ernesto, "Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias"...

<sup>13</sup> Gomes, Cândido Alberto, "Abrindo espaços: Pontes entre a escola, a comunidade e a vida"... pg. 2.



**Table 5. Preliminary classification of types of school violence**

Types of violence	By the school	Against the school	In the school
<b>Physical</b>	Physical punishment.	Vandalism (including graffiti), trespassing, burglary and theft, fights between students and teachers.	Fights between students, burglary, theft and damage of student property, sexual violence <sup>(*)</sup> , competition among groups for control over areas of the school grounds (often in collusion with adults).
<b>Symbolic</b>	Humiliating forms of punishment, meaningless curriculum requirements, demanding prior cultural and social knowledge as a prerequisite for student success.	Challenging the rules of coexistence in the school and society, including threats and physical or online harassment or stalking against adults.	Threats, aggressive words and gestures among students, physical and online harassment or stalking, moral violence (libel, slander) <sup>(**)</sup> , forced social isolation <sup>(***)</sup> , etc.
<b>Incivility</b>	Ill-mannered words and gestures by adults, imbued with class-based or ethnic-based judgments, generally used to enforce obedience when challenged.	Aggressive words and gestures by students against adults, willfully ignoring school rules and standards of “good manners,” repeated instances of punishable behavior.	Aggressive words and gestures among students, contrary to school rules and standards of “good manners,” often revealing gender, age, ethnic or social class prejudices.

**Note:** Shaded areas indicate behaviors that tend to occur more often in schools with socially vulnerable populations.

**Source:** Gomes, Candido Alberto, “Abriendo espacios: Puentes entre escuela, comunidad y vida”, paper given at “Abrindo espaços: múltiplos olhares”, UNESCO, Fundação Vale, Brasília, DF, 2008, pg. 4.

(\*) Known as the Maria da Penha Law (No. 11.340, August 7, 2006, art. 7), a landmark in Brazil’s fight against violence against women; the law defines sexual violence as any behavior that forces a woman to witness, sustain or participate in an undesired sexual relationship by means of intimidation, threat, coercion or use of force; that induces her to negotiate her sexuality or use it in any sense; that prevents her from using contraceptives or that forces her into marriage, pregnancy, abortion or prostitution by means of coercion, intimidation, bribery or manipulation; or that limits or prevents her from exercising her sexual and reproductive rights. Education research suggests that this definition should be expanded to include fondling and physical contact brushed off as joking or teasing.

(\*\*) Also forbidden under the Maria da Penha law.

(\*\*\*) Symbolic violence includes psychological violence, defined by the law as any behavior that may cause damage to psychological health and self-determination.

processes, the impact on economic dynamics of unskilled labor in foreign-owned assembly plants (*maquila*), and heavy migration especially into the United States.” Meanwhile, in large countries such as Brazil, Mexico and Colombia, the explanations seem to be associated more with “the proliferation of powers parallel to the legal structures (drug cartels, armed groups, etc.) in the framework of weakened States and extremely critical structural situations.”<sup>14</sup>

Nevertheless, above and beyond all these differences and peculiarities, the same author recognizes a common problem in all the countries of the region: “the widespread establishment of a culture of violence that ‘settles’ nearly all conflicts (even the most minor and irrelevant) by violent means.”<sup>15</sup> Education needs to address this very phenomenon and this perspective and attitude toward social life and interpersonal relationships. It must begin by understanding the many complexities involved, and it must avoid lapsing into false over-simplifications or stigmatizing stereotypes – both of which are ineffective.

<sup>14</sup> Rodríguez, Ernesto, “Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias”... pg. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, pg. 3.

Specialized studies have evaluated the many strategies implemented by different countries to fight school- or youth-related violence, attempting to discern which ones have produced results, and which have not. Below is a very revealing table developed by Ernesto Rodríguez. It starts with common strategies applied along a three-part scale (primary, secondary and tertiary intervention) and intersects them with degrees of success or failure identified by evaluation (see Table 6).

It is generally found that punishment-based strategies (“iron-fist,” “crackdown,” “zero tolerance,” military models) tend to be the least effective and indeed are generally counterproductive, as are strategies to target “vulnerable youth” or to “rehabilitate” offenders and gang members.<sup>16</sup> By contrast, strategies that have achieved more and better results are based on prevention, target the overall youth population (they are non-specific), and lay the groundwork for a culture of peace and human rights in the school and society. The study identified certain success factors, such as promoting teamwork, recognizing students as young people and rights-holders, linking education to the world of work, citizenship training and conflict resolution, and presence in the school of other specialists to back up the teachers (guidance counselors, student advisors, etc.).<sup>17</sup>

### *Research domain and hypothesis*

Seen as a whole, the results reveal the importance of developing educational policies to prevent potential violence. These policies should target the entire student body and be designed to improve the climate in the schools and facilitate daily coexistence. They should be based on human rights values and principles, a culture of peace and democratic citizenship, and rest on the development of self-esteem, communication skills and interpersonal relationships.

The Tenth Report is rooted in the conceptual and political conviction that there is a *two-way relationship between safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools and human rights education*. In the first place, if members of the education community feel comfortable and safe inside the schools and enjoy interactions based on respect and solidarity, human rights learning is easier and more practical. These qualities become part of the “hidden curriculum” of every educational system, which has at least as much educational value as the overt, explicit curriculum. Daily living teaches the most fundamental human rights values and attitudes: that everyone deserves a sense of dignity; that everyone is a rights-holder and deserves self-esteem; that others have a right to receive consideration and care, and that all are equals in dignity and rights.

In the second place, there is a reciprocal influence. Human rights training for members of the education community encourages more peaceful, democratic and safe interactions for everyone, because HRE builds up the values, attitudes and behaviors that should govern respectful relations among individuals/ rights-holders (freedom, equality, solidarity, peace, justice, tolerance, etc.).

In short, a school that works on HRE is contributing to peaceful coexistence and safety, and vice-versa. The two will either grow together or deteriorate together. This is why, if one dimension of school life falls short (such as recurring incidents or situations of some sort of violence), one pedagogical

<sup>16</sup> Krauskopf, Dina, *Estado del arte de los programas de prevención de la violencia en ámbitos escolares...*; Abad, J.M. and J.A. Gómez, *¡Preparados, listos, ya!...*; Rodríguez, Ernesto, “Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias”...

<sup>17</sup> Acosta, Felicitas, *Escuela media y sectores populares: Posibilidades y potencia de la escuela moderna*. Editorial La Crujía, Buenos Aires, 2008; Abramovay, Miriam (coord.), *Revelando tramas, descubriendo secretos: Violencia e convivencia nas escolas*. RITLA-SEE/GDT, Brasília, 2009.

Table 6. What works and what doesn't work

	Successful experiences	Innovative experiences	Questionable experiences
<b>Primary strategies</b>	Open schools in Brazil (UNESCO-Ministry of Education).  Fostering a culture of peace in the schools (UNESCO and associates).	Youth participation in participatory budget processes.  Youth participation in social oversight of public policies.	"Morality" campaigns through the mass media and in formal education.
<b>Secondary strategies</b>	Training and workplace experience for at-risk youth.	Youth participation in local and community development exercises.	Youth houses and youth clubs for "potential offenders."
<b>Tertiary strategies</b>	Juvenile justice system and alternatives to incarceration in Costa Rica.	Modern incarceration systems for adolescents in trouble with the law.	"Crackdowns" and "zero tolerance" programs in Central America.
<p><b>Explanatory notes:</b>  <i>Primary strategies:</i> general and diffuse measures that tend to operate long before criminal acts occur, promoting non-violent actions and encouraging alternatives to crime and violence.  <i>Secondary strategies:</i> policies and legal frameworks to develop measures for giving a more immediate response to acts of violence, targeting groups or individuals associated with youth gangs or similar groups.  <i>Tertiary strategies:</i> policies and legal frameworks for interventions to provide long-term responses subsequent to acts of violence, and attempts to lessen trauma or long-term disability.  <i>Successful experiences:</i> have been scientifically tested and evaluated and produced satisfactory outcomes and impacts among target youth in a sufficient number of cases.  <i>Innovative experiences:</i> have undergone preliminary testing and evaluation and have produced good outcomes, but insufficient cases are on record as yet.  <i>Questionable experiences:</i> a sufficiently high number have been tested and evaluated to demonstrate that they do not meet the minimum conditions necessary to be considered successful experiences or good practices.  <b>Source:</b> Rodríguez, Ernesto, "Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias." Aprendizajes y desafíos desde las políticas públicas en América Latina", Paper given in the seminar "Learning to live without violence: a challenge for young people and their schools," Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Under-secretary of Public Education and UNESCO, Mexico City, June, 2010.</p>			

strategy is to tackle the other dimension: rights education. The evidence from studies cited in the above section confirms such an assertion.

This report builds on the hypothesis that the progress of HRE depends on whether the education sector has public policies and strategies for intervention designed to promote safety and peaceful coexistence inside the schools, and whether these policies and strategies are designed and implemented with a focus on rights. Therefore the idea of the research was to inquire whether the signatory countries of the Protocol of San Salvador have such policies along with strategies for preventing and managing violence, what they are, how they are grounded and how they are implemented.

The approach is consistent with research directions already established in the Inter-American HRE Report. In the decade since it began, the report has scrutinized government positions and policies on HRE, on the understanding that the State is responsible for ensuring the effective exercise of the population's human rights. The theme of the Tenth Report focuses on the effective exercise of a variety of rights, not only the right to education and to HRE. Most of these are directly at play in the school environment: in this particular case, the right to life, to humane treatment both physically and psychologically, prohibition of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, freedom from discrimination, and right to health, participation and due process.

With respect to the research methodology, the decision to select national education policies on safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools as the object of study meant introducing two changes from earlier reports. First, the study is not based on a particular sample by age group or grades in the school system because these policies apply generally to the whole system. Second, it does not perform an



analysis of progress over a predetermined period because this is the first measurement to be made on this subject. Instead, the idea of this report is to draw a *baseline* for future comparative studies. Even so, the notion of “development” in the title of the report reflects the desire to produce a dynamic, evolving analysis. The survey began not only with the content of policies, but also the date when they were proposed and implemented; this made it possible to compare them with earlier provisions (or lack thereof).

### *Context information and table of variables and indicators*

The information collected in the countries for this report is divided into two clearly differentiated sections. The first gives of a brief contextual introduction to provide a preliminary view of how teachers and the general public perceive the current situation of safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools – or to approach it from the opposite angle, how they perceive the situation of violence or types of violence in the school setting. Because this was an informal survey of perceptions, local researchers were instructed to collect personal opinions from students, teachers and others, as well as any that may have appeared in the news media.<sup>18</sup>

The second stage was to compile data on education policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools. This was done by using the matrix of variables and indicators developed for this study by expert advisors. The matrix consists of four variables and 15 indicators, as follows:

The first variable, *statistical information and assessments*, was included to verify whether lead entities in the national education sector had access to information on incidents or situations of conflict in the public schools. This empirical foundation provides the essential basis for assessing the real situation of safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools. The indicators point to the existence (or absence) of factual data, procedures for documenting and processing data, and analytical studies of the data.

The second variable, *policies, plans and programs*, was intended to determine whether national education authorities had general policies and strategies for handling the kinds of problems targeted for study. Policies and actions were classified into three levels of generality: guidelines or instructions, plans, and programs or projects. One indicator applied to each level. A crucial fourth indicator asked whether these different types of policies had been designed with a human rights perspective.

The third variable, *policy implementation*, delved more deeply into the rationale and the expected timetable of public policies; that is, it looked into the activation and implementation of policies. The indicators asked whether basic conditions were in place for implementing such policies: responsible institutional entities, budget, participation by different education stakeholders, informational materials, and training programs.

The fourth variable, *monitoring and evaluation of policies*, looked into the completion of the policy cycle, asking how much oversight was exercised over policy implementation, effects and outcomes. The indicators explored whether compliance with policy provisions was subject to any official monitoring, whether evaluations took place and whether results or conclusions were available.

The full matrix can be seen in Table 7.

<sup>18</sup> The guide for collecting these impressions, which we call “context information” can be found in Section VI, Appendix 3.

**Table 7. Field: Public policies for education**  
**Domain: Policies on safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools**

Variables	Indicators	Means of verification
1.  Statistical information and situation assessments	1.1 Availability of statistical information and databases in the ministry of education on incidents or situations of violent conflict in the nation's schools.	• Interview with the head(s) of statistics for the ministry of education (or other government agency, if relevant).
	1.2 Practice of some procedure for systematic processing and analysis of available statistical data.	• Review of the existing database on conflicts in the schools (in the ministry of education or other government agency).
	1.3. Availability of descriptive or narrative studies by the ministry of education based on available statistical data.	• Listing of available studies.
2.  Policies, plans and programs	2.1 Existence of <i>guidelines or instructions from the ministry</i> to promote safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools and prevent and manage conflict in the nation's schools.	• Interview with the head(s) of the ministry office responsible for this subject.
	2.2 Existence of one or more <i>plans</i> on this subject.	• Document(s) from the ministry giving specific instructions on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence in the schools (communiqués, rulings, regulations, etc.).
	2.3 Implementation of one or more <i>programs or projects</i> specific to this subject.	
	2.4 Explicit presence of human rights education values and principles in existing guidelines, plans and programs or projects on this subject.	• Text of the plan(s) and specific existing programs or projects.
3.  Policy implementation	3.1 Existence of a department or departments responsible for peaceful coexistence, safety and preventing and managing conflict in the schools.	• Organizational chart of the ministry.
	3.2 Availability of budgetary resources for carrying out existing plans, programs or projects.	• Interview with the head(s) of the office responsible for this subject.
		• Review of the education budget.
	3.3 Participation by education stakeholders in carrying out plans and programs or projects:	• Interview with the head(s) of the office responsible for this subject.
	3.3.1 School principals	• Text of the plan(s) and existing programs or projects.
	3.3.2 Teachers	
	3.3.3 Service staff	
	3.3.4 Parents	
	3.3.5 Community	• Copies of the dissemination and training materials produced and distributed.
	3.4 Existence of dissemination and training materials on this subject, with a rights approach, produced and distributed by the ministry of education.	
	3.5 Existence of training activities on this subject for the people involved in education.	
	3.5.1 School principals	
4.  Policy monitoring and evaluation	4.1 Monitoring of compliance with policies, plans and programs or projects on peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention and management of conflict in the schools.	• Interview with the head of the office responsible for this subject.
	4.2 Conducting evaluations on the progress of existing plans and programs or projects.	• Review of evaluations and official studies on the operation of existing plans and programs.
	4.3 Availability of findings or conclusions on the progress of existing plans and programs or projects.	• Interview with the head of the office responsible for this subject.

## *Research procedure and sources of information*

Information was collected and analyzed following the procedure that has become standard for the Inter-American HRE Report. Local consultants collect raw material for the study in the countries, following specifications provided by the IIHR in detailed guidelines. This material is then sent to the Institute to be processed and analyzed, together with supporting documentation and other materials.

The team of research consultants in the countries was made up of former Institute students together with employees of the ministries of education who had participated in earlier issues of the report. This time, the inter-American network of associates was enhanced with contributions by researchers from the nongovernmental organization “Fe y Alegría.”

The research matrix was filled out with documentary institutional information as the preferred source. A few interviews were included (in the table, see the column “means of verification”), always with officers from the ministries or secretariats of education responsible for relevant departments: the head of the statistics office or the person responsible for programs on safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools, if any. The purpose of the interviews was to seek support for locating and fully understanding documentary information (laws, orders, regulations, official communiques, empirical data, assessments, evaluations, etc.), rather than to ask for subjective views or personal opinions.

Two particular limitations became evident. The first, most unfortunately, was that despite many efforts deployed by the IIHR, no researchers took part from either Haiti or Suriname, so that no information is available on these two countries.

The second has to do with the federal states of Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela. In these cases, it was an extremely complex task to collect information covering the entire territory of the country, because the different provinces or states have high degrees of autonomy for enacting their own educational policies and designing school plans, programs and projects. In such cases, the report focused only on national-level information issued exclusively by the central ministry or secretariat of public education. No information was gathered on provincial or state education policies, with a few exceptions.

Table 8 gives details on the main sources of information identified by on-site consultants in the countries and analyzed for this report. The sources come from 17 of the 19 countries that are signatories of the Protocol of San Salvador, with the exception of Haiti and Suriname, as noted above.

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Argentina	Criminal Procedural Code: chapter II.	Legislative Branch.	1981
	<b>Argentine Observatory of School Violence.</b>	Ministerio de Educación de la Nación Coordinación de Programas para la Construcción de Ciudadanía.	2004
	Law for the Comprehensive Protection of the Rights of Children and Youth No. 26061: article 15.	Legislative Branch.	2005
	National Education Law No. 26.206: articles 11, 30, 67, 123, 126, 127 and 129.	Legislative Branch.	2006
	National Program for the Rights of Children.	Ministerio de Educación. Coordinación de Programas para la Construcción de Ciudadanía.	2006
	<b>National Program for Mediation in the Schools.</b>	Ministerio de Educación de la Nación. Coordinación de Programas para la Construcción de Ciudadanía.	2008
	Order No. 93/09 on guidelines for pedagogical and institutional organization of compulsory education: article 4.	Ministerio de Educación de la Nación. Consejo Federal de Educación.	2009
Bolivia	Ministry Order No. 162/01. Regulations for the Administration and Operation of Educational Units at the Pre-school, Primary and Secondary Levels.	Ministerio de Educación.	2001
	Education Law 070 Avelino Siñani and Elizardo Pérez: articles 3, 4 and 6.	Legislative Branch.	2010
	Ministry Order No. 010/2011 on general regulations for school management: articles 101 and 104.	Ministerio de Educación.	2011

*Continues...*

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Brazil	National Human Rights Plan I.	Secretaria Especial dos Direitos Humanos da Presidência da República.	1996
	Law No. 8069. Statutes for Children and Youth: articles 5, 91, 93 and 125.	Legislative Branch.	1990
	National Human Rights Plan II.	Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos da Presidência da República.	2001
	<b>Open Schools Program. Education, Culture, Sports and Work for Youth.</b> Resolução/CD/FNDE/No. 052 (Programa Escola Aberta. Educação, cultura, esporte e trabalho para a juventude).	UNESCO/Fundo de Desenvolvimento de a Educação/Ministério da Educação/Governo Federal.	2004
	<b>National Program for Human Rights Education.</b>	Ministério da Justiça/Ministério da Educação/Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos da Presidência da República.	2003 (#1) 2007 (#2)
	National Human Rights Plan III.	Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos da Presidência da República.	2009
Colombia	Culture of legality.	Ministerio de Educación Nacional.	2003
	<b>Development of citizenship skills to prevent violence and build democracy in Colombia.</b>	Ministerio de Educación Nacional.	2005
	<b>Education for and about peace, coexistence and citizenship (Ten-year Education Plan).</b>	Ministerio de Educación Nacional.	2006
	Portfolio with 54 structured programs on citizenship skills.	Ministerio de Educación Nacional.	2006
	<b>Alliance for peace-education for peace (OEI/ UNDP/UNICEF/UNHCHR/IOM/CAB/WB).</b>	Ministerio de Educación Nacional/multilateral cooperation organizations.	2006
	Eduderechos: education for the exercise of human rights.	Ministerio de Educación Nacional.	2010
	<b>Finding and selecting programs and projects on education for peace and peaceful coexistence.</b>	Ministerio de Educación Nacional/civil society organizations.	None
	Instruction for understanding and building citizenship.	Ministerio de Educación Nacional.	None

*Continues...*

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Costa Rica	Law on Juvenile Criminal Justice.	Legislative Branch.	1996
	Legal code for children and youth, chapter 5.	Legislative Branch.	1997
	Executive Order No. 33149-J. Creation the National Commission for the Prevention of Violence and Promotion of Social Peace (CONAPAZ).	Ministerio de Justicia y Paz/Ministerio de Seguridad Pública y Gobernación/Ministerio de Educación Pública/Ministerio de Salud/Ministerio de Cultura y Juventud/Instituto Nacional de la Mujer (INAMU)/Patronato Nacional de la Infancia (PANI).	2006
	Project for ethics, esthetics and citizenship.	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Dirección Curricular.	2007
	Student government.	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Dirección de Vida Estudiantil. Depto. de Participación Estudiantil.	2007
	Community service.	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Dirección de Vida Estudiantil. Depto. de Participación Estudiantil.	2007
	<b>Student arts festival</b>	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Dirección de Vida Estudiantil. Depto. de Convivencia Estudiantil.	2007
	<b>The school in our hands.</b>	Ministerio de Educación Pública/UNESCO. Dirección de Vida Estudiantil. Depto. de Convivencia Estudiantil.	2007
	Student games and sports.	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Dirección de Vida Estudiantil. Depto. de Salud y Ambiente.	2007
	Blue flag.	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Dirección de Vida Estudiantil. Depto. de Salud y Ambiente.	2007
	<b>Ministry directive “Institutional actions for peaceful coexistence in the schools,” Circular DM-005-07-2010.</b>	Ministerio de Educación Pública. Office of the Minister.	2010
	<b>Guidelines for intervention to prevent and respond to weapons violence in the schools.</b>	Ministerio de Justicia y Paz.	2010
	<b>Decree No.36451. Restructuring the MEP and entities responsible for safeguarding peaceful coexistence. Chapters IV, V and VI.</b>	Ministerio de Educación.	2011
	National Plan for the Prevention of Violence and Promotion of Social Peace 2011-2014.	Ministerio de Justicia y Paz/United Nations system/Comisión Nacional para la prevención de la Violencia y Promoción de la Paz Social (CONAPAZ)/Comisión de Control y Calificación de Espectáculos Públicos/Dirección General de Resolución Alternativa de Conflictos (DINARAC)/ Dirección General para la Promoción de la Paz y la Convivencia Ciudadana (DIGEPAZ)/Red de Paz/Fundación Friedrich Ebert ha.	2011
	<b>Executive Decree No. 36779-MEP. Creation of the National Program for Peaceful Coexistence in the Schools (Programa Convivir).</b>	Ministerio de Justicia y Paz/Ministerio de Educación/UNICEF.	2011

Continues...

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Chile	Executive order No. 524, General Regulations for the organization and operation of Student Centers in Secondary Schools, officially recognized by the Ministry of Education.	Ministerio de Educación.	1990
	<b>Policy on Peaceful Coexistence in the Schools for high-quality education for all.</b>	Ministerio de Educación. Secretaría Técnica. Unidad de Apoyo a la Transversalidad.	2002
	Policy on Participation by Parents and Guardians.	Ministerio de Educación. Secretaría Técnica. Unidad de Apoyo a la Transversalidad.	2003
	Executive Order subject to Constitutional Review No. 24 of 2005. Regulations for School Councils.	Ministerio de Educación.	2005
	Regulations governing school rules.	Ministerio de Educación.	2005
	General Education Law 20370, articles 2 and 9.	Legislative Branch.	2009
Ecuador	Legal code for children and youth, article 193.	Legislative Branch.	2003
	Constitution of Ecuador: articles 347 and 393.	Legislative Branch.	2008
	National Plan for Quality of Life.	Secretaria Nacional de Planificación (SENPLADES).	2010-2011
	National Ten-year Plan for Comprehensive Protection of Children and Youth: policies 6, 9, 19 and 23.	Consejo Nacional de la Niñez y Adolescencia Secretaria del Frente Social.	2004
	Basic Law on Inter-cultural Education: articles 2, 6, 7, 11, 14, 34, 65, 131, 132, 133 and 134.	Legislative Branch.	2011
El Salvador	<b>Plan for Safe Schools.</b>	Ministerio de Educación.	1995
	Program for Human Rights Education.	Ministerio de Educación.	2009
	<b>“Learning without Fear” campaign.</b>	Ministerio de Educación.	2009
	Agreement on School Prevention and Protection.	Ministerio de Educación/Policía Nacional Civil.	2010
	Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education.	Ministerio de Educación, El Salvador/Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, Uruguay/Inter-American Institute of Human Rights	2010
	<b>Plan for Prevention in the Schools, 2011.</b>	Ministerio de Educación/Policía Nacional Civil.	2011

*Continues...*



**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Dominican Republic	General Law on Education 66-97: articles 4, 5, 6, 38, 39 and 42.	Legislative Branch.	1997
	Department Order 5/97 creating Student Councils, Class Councils and Working Committees as student organizations within the school structure.	Secretaría de Estado de Educación y Cultura.	1997
	Mechanisms for student participation such as Class Councils and Class Committees.	Ministerio de Educación. Departamento de orientación y psicología.	1997
	Program for Sex-Love Education.	Ministerio de Educación. Departamento de orientación y psicología.	2000
	Ordinance No. 9-2000, regulations for APMAEs (Associations of Parents, Guardians and Friends of the School): article 3.	Ministerio de Educación. Departamento de orientación y psicología.	2000
	Implementing Regulations for the Statute on Education Executive Order No. 639O3: articles 33, 74 and 35.	Ministerio de Educación.	2000
	<b>I stay away from violence. How about you?</b>	Ministerio de Educación/Media companies.	2000
	Law 136-03, Legal Code for Protection of the Rights of Children and Adolescents: articles 48 and 49.	Legislative Branch.	2003
	Plan of Action. Values education.	Ministerio de Educación. Departamento de orientación y psicología.	2003
	<b>Programa: “Violence. No thanks.”</b>	Ministerio de Educación/TV Dominicana.	2005
	<b>Student police.</b>	Ministerio de Educación.	2005
	Safe Neighborhood.	Ministerio de Interior y Policía.	2010
	<b>Project “Youth Development and Prevention of Violence in the Dominican Republic.”</b>	UNESCO/Office of the First Lady.	2011
	Ordinance governing school rules: articles 30, 76 and 77.	Ministerio de Educación.	2009
	<b>Regulations of the Dominican Educational System for Peaceful Coexistence and Discipline in Public and Private Schools.</b>	Ministerio de Educación/Consejo Nacional de la Niñez y la Adolescencia.	Em validação
Guatemala	Education Law: articles 2 and 91.	Legislative Branch.	1991
	<b>Open schools.</b>	Consejo de Cohesión Social/Secretaría de Bienestar Social.	2009
	<b>Ministry Agreement No. 381-2010 with Regulations for peaceful coexistence and discipline in public schools.</b>	Ministerio de Educación.	2010
	Education Law: articles 2 and 91.	Legislative Branch.	2010

Continues...

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Mexico	Basic Law on Education: articles 7, 8, 30, 41, 55, 59 and 75.	Legislative Branch.	1993
	National Development Plan: section 3.	Secretaría de Educación Pública/UNICEF.	2007
	National Agreement for Safety, Justice and the Law. Objective XX.	Executive Branch: Secretaría de Gobernación.	2008
	General guidelines for the organization and operation of pre-school, primary, secondary, special and adult education in Mexico City.	Secretaría de Educación Pública: Administración federal de servicios educativos en el Distrito Federal.	2009
	<b>Project “Opening the Schools for Equality.”</b>	Secretaría de Educación Pública/OEI.	2009
	<b>Gender equality and violence prevention.</b>	Secretaría de Educación Pública/UNICEF.	2009
	<b>National Safe Schools Program.</b>	Secretaría de Educación Pública/UNICEF.	2009
	Sectoral Program for Education; Partnership for high-quality education.	Secretaría de Educación Pública.	2009
	<b>Guidelines for responding to complaints or reports of school violence, school mistreatment and/or child sex abuse in pre-school, primary, secondary, special and adult education schools in Mexico City.</b>	Secretaría de Educación Pública: Administración federal de servicios educativos en el Distrito Federal.	2010
	General Law on a Life free of Violence Life for Women.	Legislative Branch.	2011
Nicaragua	<b>Public Safety Program.</b>	Policía Nacional.	2006
	Human Development Plan 2008-2012.	Gobierno de Reconciliación y Unidad Nacional.	2008
	<b>Plan for Secondary Schools. Safe schools.</b>	Policía Nacional/Ministerio de Educación.	2008
	DARE Program.	Policía Nacional/Ministerio de Educación. This is a program developed in the USA and adopted by other countries to fight drug use.	2008

*Continues...*

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Panama	Law 2, incorporating the systematic study of human rights into the national education system.	Legislative Branch.	1984
	Educational psychology councils.	Ministerio de Educación.	1986
	Executive Order 162, creating school rules for students in public and private secondary schools.	Ministerio de Educación.	1996
	Executive Order 142, amending Executive Order 162.	Ministerio de Educación.	1997
	Strategic Government Plan 2000- 2014.	Executive Branch.	2000
	Executive Order 777, setting measures on institutions of arbitration, reconciliation and mediation.	Ministerio de Gobierno y Justicia.	2007
	Comprehensive Safety Program, PN L1003.	Ministerio de Gobierno (National Police) and Ministerio de Justicia (Correctional System)/ Ministerio de Educación.	2008
	Leaders leaving footprints.	Ministerio de Educación.	2010
	National Secondary Curricula 2011.	Ministerio de Educación/Secretaría Nacional de Niñez.	2011
	Direct Care Program for Victims of Sexual Violence.	Ministerio de Educación.	2011
	Civics and electoral education.	Ministerio de Educación/ Tribunal Electoral de Panamá.	None
Paraguay	General Education Law No. 1264: articles 10, 11, 15, 129, 135 and 151.	Legislative Branch.	1998
	National Education Program.	Ministerio de Educación y Cultura.	2008
	Healthy schools.	Ministerio de Salud Pública y Bienestar Social: Dirección General de Promoción para la Salud.	2008
	<b>“Learning without fear” campaign</b> (international document adopted as a framework for the Ministerio de Educación y Cultura).	Ministerio de Educación y Cultura / Organización Plan Internacional.	2010

*Continues...*

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Peru	General Law on Education 28044: articles 8, 31, 34, 36, 53 and 56.	Legislative Branch.	2003
	<b>Directives for Development of the School Year. I Have the Right to be Respected. Programs to promote human rights, peaceful coexistence and discipline in the schools. Committees of Teacher-Advisors.</b>	Ministerio de Educación: Dirección de Tutoría y Orientación (DITOE).	2005
	National Human Rights Plan.	Ministerio de Justicia: Consejo Nacional de Derechos Humanos.	2006
	National Education Program: objective 2.	Ministerio de Educación. Consejo Nacional de Educación.	2006
	<b>School-based Child Protection Councils (DESNN).</b>	Ministerio de la Mujer y Desarrollo social/ Ministerio de Educación.	2007
	<b>Order of the Deputy Minister 0022-2007-ED. “Rules on strengthening peaceful coexistence and discipline in the schools, time management and citizenship education, civics and patriotism for students in the institutions and programs of primary and secondary education.”</b>	Ministerio de Educación.	2007
	<b>“School monitors” Program.</b>	Ministerio Público.	2008
	<b>National Plan for Quality of Life 2009-2010 (new).</b>	Ministerio de Educación Pública.	2009
	<b>Forum against bullying in the schools.</b>	Ministerio de la Mujer y Desarrollo social/ Ministerio de Educación.	2009
	<b>Observatory on violence and peaceful coexistence in the schools.</b>	Non-profit civil association. Representatives of the central government, municipalities, non-government organizations and civil society institutions.	2009
	<b>Law 29719, promoting nonviolent coexistence in schools.</b>	Legislative Branch.	2011

*Continues...*

**Table 8. Sources examined for the Tenth Report and authorities responsible for developing them**

Country	Public policy instruments associated with peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools	Originating authorities	Date
Uruguay	Full-time School Project.	Administración Nacional de Educación.	2001
	School Meals Program.	Administración Nacional de Educación.	2003
	Community Teachers Program.	Administración Nacional de Educación.	2005
	Law No. 18.437, General law of Education: chapter III: National education policy: articles 12 and 13; chapter VII: cross-cutting lines: article 40.	Legislative Branch.	2008
	Educational Camps Project.	Administración Nacional de Educación/ UNESCO.	2009
	“Enjoy your School” Program.	Administración Nacional de Educación.	2009
	Inter-American Covenant on Human Rights Education.	Ministerio de Educación, El Salvador/Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, Uruguay/Inter-American Institute of Human Rights.	2010
	A.P.R.EN.D.E.R. School Program.	Administración Nacional de Educación: Dirección de Derechos Humanos, CODICEN.	2010
	Secondary School Protocol for Intervention in situations of domestic violence affecting adolescents.	Administración Nacional de Educación: Dirección de Derechos Humanos, CODICEN.	2010
	National Plan of Education: sections I and II.	Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/UNESCO/Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto/United Nations Uruguay.	2010
Venezuela	Order 669. Requires institutions to develop school rules.	Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación (MPPE).	1985
	Basic Statute on Justices of the Peace (LOJP): article 56.	Legislative Branch.	1994
	Basic Law on Protection of Children and Adolescents: articles 621 and 629.	Legislative Branch.	2007
	<b>School Ombudsmen.</b>	National Ombudsman/School Ombudsmen/ Dirección General de Protección y Desarrollo.	2001
	Comprehensive Prevention Program “Sowing values for life.”	Oficina Nacional Antidrogas.	2007
	<b>Agreements for Peaceful Coexistence.</b>	Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación (MPPE) (not present in all municipalites, nor is there a document supporting the initiative).	2008
	<b>DIBISE (Bicentennial Security Operation) goes to school.</b>	Oficina Nacional Antidrogas/Guardia Nacional Prevención del Delito.	2011
	Program on sexual and reproductive rights.	National Ombudsman/Ministerio del Poder Popular para las Comunas y Protección Social/ Instituto de Derechos del Niño.	In process of implementation
	<b>Promoting the Right to be Respected.</b>	National Ombudsman/Ministerio del Poder Popular para las Comunas y Protección Social/ Instituto de Derechos del Niño.	In process of implementation
	Programs and policies for protection and care of children and adolescents.	National Ombudsman/Ministerio del Poder Popular para las Comunas y Protección Social/ Instituto de Derechos del Niño.	In process of implementation

Note: policies shown in boldface explicitly address issues of peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence.



## Section III

### Research findings

#### Sources consulted

##### *Documentary sources*

A glance at the table of documents consulted for this study could give the impression that the region has a rich body of education policies for managing the problems of peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools. Such an impression would be mistaken. In fact few policies address this subject expressly, and even those tend to be general, vague and scattered among a plethora of diverse documents that do not fit together easily (legal codes, laws, orders, regulations, ministry guidelines, plans of action, programs, projects, public information campaigns and the like).

As to whether these policies are relevant and specific, a look at the chronology is instructive.<sup>1</sup> The most specific, explicit and relevant policies on this subject are of recent vintage, the great majority dating from the second half of the 2000s.

By contrast, policies developed from the late 1980s through the mid-2000s are general, indirect and reflect the then-common notion of “school discipline;” that said, they do include an embryonic perspective of the rights of the child inspired by the international adoption of the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* in 1989 and its entry into force in 1990. This report’s in-country researchers have cited these sources, despite the fact that they are outdated and very general, because the school systems in the region continue to use them as a basis for action when problems arise involving peaceful coexistence, safety and violence in the schools. Despite their limitations, in some cases these are the only policies available and therefore continue to appear on the list of sources.

Another point that emerges clearly from the chronology of the sources is the region’s widespread move toward direct and explicit policies on this subject. Since around 2004, the countries have been developing and applying increasing numbers of such policies; Chile has been a pioneer in this regard, with its 2002 *Política de Convivencia Escolar*, or policy for peaceful coexistence in the schools. Even as this report is being written, several countries are fully engaged in the process of either writing new policies, consulting with the education community on the subject, or piloting the new policies.

The challenges to peaceful coexistence and safety in the schools have either worsened or become more visible (or both) because of the critical socioeconomic, political and cultural transformations in Latin American societies over the past few decades, seared by yawning gaps of development, inequality and exclusion. Today more than ever before, the issues surrounding violence, both in overall society and as reflected in the schools, are at the heart of public discourse. Debates and studies have proliferated, and interventions by civil society and the state are on the rise.

Preliminary findings from research for the Tenth Report suggest that national authorities, including those at the helm of public education, are paying attention and taking action. To a large extent, they are reacting to specific incidents and have mobilized in response to public outcry or suggestions by citizens. In principle, it is encouraging to find that the problems of violence in the schools are no longer being consigned entirely to individual school principals and teachers, nor are the countries

<sup>1</sup> See Table 8 at the end of Section II.



underestimating the problem as little more than a simple conflict that can be settled quickly either by applying traditional rules of school discipline, or by invoking criminal laws. A new awareness is taking root that the problem requires special handling, a more in-depth approach that respects the particular circumstances of each national context. It cannot be dismissed without analysis and without proposals that originate and grow inside the education system itself, guided by its top managers. It cannot be addressed without public policies.

This awareness is new. As noted above, nearly all the policies now on the books of the ministries of education arose between 2005 and 2010, and in many countries are still being developed. The detailed analysis given below will examine the extent to which objective conditions are in place or have been created for these policies to be well grounded, relevant, discussed with the education community and respectful of human rights values and principles.

### *Contexts and perceptions*

As was explained in the description of the research process, the IIHR team added a new request for consultants on the Tenth Report in the interest of producing a more complete study of public policy texts. Researchers were asked to speak informally with people close to the educational community and capture their concerns about the issue, as well as media reports.

The idea was not to conduct a rigorous qualitative inquiry, first because the questions were informal, and second, because the Inter-American HRE Reports are always based on documentary information. The intention was simply to “get the lay of the land,” that is, probe the general impressions of the main stakeholders in education, especially teachers, and determine whether their perceptions were similar throughout the region. Below is a summary of the comments that came up most frequently during these informal conversations.

- For the most part, teachers in all the countries, and the general public alike, are deeply concerned about problems with peaceful coexistence, safety and violence in the schools and sense that these problems are growing steadily. The evidence they give to justify their concern tends to be anecdotal, a summary of particular extreme cases, sporadic and highly publicized, most of which they learned about through the news rather than from personal experience. Their views tend to be based heavily on impressions. It is still unclear, therefore, how much of this evidence is grounded in objective information or in the media, and how much of it applies generally to a country’s entire educational system.
- Perceptions of the causes of problems with peaceful coexistence and violence in the schools vary according to the geography of the region and the socioeconomic setting of the different institutions. Opinions in South America center around poverty, social exclusion and child labor, added to the low quality of education and expulsion from the system (masked as “dropping out of school”) as factors that trigger frequent incidents of vandalism, theft and different kinds of physical aggression against the school, among students and toward teachers. Interviewees in Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean, while recognizing these same factors, tended to stress the destabilizing influence of youth gangs (*maras*) and the drug trade that expose students and teachers to extortion and death threats, often borne out.

- As for the chief manifestations of violence, the emphasis is on the school environment: the most dangerous places and situations are en route from home to school, upon entering or leaving the facility, and the risks inherent in keeping the school open to entry by outside persons. Such concerns are widespread in the poorest and most problem-ridden areas and in communities where youth gangs and drug peddling bands are heavily present, as the schools are operating hubs for such groups, of which students themselves are sometimes part. The greatest concerns are expressed by teachers in El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico and the Dominican Republic, who say that these conditions strongly influence school dropout rates and high levels of turnover by teachers asking to be transferred out.
- Given the particular concern about violence in poorer and more marginalized areas, and the effect these conditions have on the environment inside the schools, public policies tend to call for targeted interventions in such zones or in particular schools considered “high risk.” This is the case of programs like *The school in our hands* in Costa Rica, the *Community teachers program* in Uruguay and the *Plan for the prevention of school violence* in El Salvador.
- Another source of anxiety for teachers in nearly all the countries is the problem of students bearing arms and using them to intimidate and threaten others, especially when clashes take place among students in rival groups. Not all school systems take measures in this regard, however. (The documentary sources showed that only Costa Rica has a school action protocol for such cases, while the other countries of Central America handle it as a problem for police intervention). The role of the police in reacting to different types of violence varies considerably by country. In the absence of a plan or explicit guidelines for responding to cases of violence, the most common reaction is to call for the police to intervene in the most serious situations. In some cases, as in Nicaragua and El Salvador, efforts are underway by the ministries of education and the police to form a common front against problems of school violence.
- Despite public policy measures that ministries of education have taken and continue to take in all the countries, researchers found widespread unease among teachers, who express anxiety as they see the problem growing steadily.
- Teachers also recognize the presence of institutional manifestations of violence and see teachers discriminating against certain students. They therefore emphasize the need to develop human rights education for the entire teacher population. Nonetheless, several expressed skepticism, arguing that teachers in general are already overburdened with activities which, combined with low salaries, may stand in the way of additional training. Shortcomings in infrastructure and hygiene, inadequate control by school authorities over certain areas of the facility (particularly in the bathrooms) also contribute to a deteriorating school environment where conditions are unappealing and dangerous and are an affront to the dignity of people who need to use them.
- Another item of constant concern is domestic violence. Teachers argue that children and adolescents tend to replicate the patterns they learn and experience in their homes, and this affects the climate in the school. They complain that society has handed them the responsibility for solving issues that originate outside the school and exceed their skills and opportunities for intervention, and that they have not been trained to deal with such problems.

- In their examination of the media, researchers found that in many countries, these issues are raised not only to publicize extreme cases of violence, but also to spread the opinions of experts and the findings of studies by civil and academic entities (generally more numerous than studies by the educational system itself). In countries where the press repeatedly publicizes extreme cases, reports often lapse into sensationalism and theatrical overstatement, vigorously pushing the authorities to carry out harsh crackdowns. Media coverage of these cases has such an impact that it tends to trigger a response by education authorities, who feel obligated to react with public policy measures.
- Not all teachers consulted agreed with the typically heavy-handed, pro-crackdown rhetoric of most news media. Some in the Southern Cone expressed mistrust and certain reservations, noting that powerful private commercial interests are at work in all matters of security and violence prevention. School safety, like public safety in general, creates many lucrative business opportunities for the sale of services and equipment, such as security personnel, metal detectors, weapons tracing, security cameras and closed circuit security video systems. These commercial interests seize the moment to hold themselves up as the solution to problems of violence in cities, neighborhoods, public institutions and ultimately, the schools.<sup>2</sup>

These perceptions were detected informally and expressed superficially, but they reflect a diversity of elements and approaches from those who are thinking about these problems. They unquestionably merit specific studies in each country, which would provide enlightening guidance to education authorities as they design public policies for this problem.

## **Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a focus on rights**

### *Statistical information and situation assessments*

The first variable in the research matrix asked whether the ministries or secretariats of education in the countries of the region had access to processed factual information and analytical studies on incidents or situations of conflict in their public schools, as this provides an essential basis for sustaining any policy on peaceful coexistence, safety and response to violence in the schools. It is impossible to plan or carry out actions on what is unknown. Table 9 summarizes the information collected from the countries of the region.

The three indicators for this variable fall into a logical, chronological sequence: 1.1 Statistical information and databases; 1.2 Documentation and data analysis, and 1.3 Descriptive or narrative studies of the data. The reasonable expectation is that the presence of the first will lead to action on the second and, if both are present, will yield the third. However, the conditions marked by the indicators do not always evolve in a straight line. For example, even if data processing and descriptive or narrative studies exist, they may be based on limited information, as in the case of pilot plans, in the absence of complete information on the whole country.

<sup>2</sup> In October 2011, this debate heated up in Buenos Aires, Argentina, following a decision by the city government to install security cameras in all the local schools, which some found objectionable as a violation of the rights of both children and teachers.

**Table 9. Variable 1: Statistical information and situation assessments**

Country	Indicator 1.1 Statistical information and databases	Indicator 1.2 Documentation and data analysis	Indicator 1.3 Descriptive or narrative studies
Argentina	√ √	√ √	√ √
Bolivia	----	----	----
Brazil	√	√	√ √
Chile	√ √	√ √	----
Colombia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Costa Rica	√ √	√ √	√
Dom. Rep.	√	----	----
Ecuador	√	----	----
El Salvador	√	√	n/a
Guatemala	----	√	√
Mexico	√ √	√ √	√ √
Nicaragua	n/a	n/a	n/a
Panama	√ √	√ √	*
Paraguay	----	----	*
Peru	*	----	*
Uruguay	----	----	----
Venezuela	*	n/a	*

Notes:  
 \* Work is in progress toward meeting the terms of the indicator.  
 √ The indicator is partially satisfied.  
 √ √ The indicator is acceptably satisfied.  
 ---- Based on available information, the indicator is not satisfied.  
 n/a Not available: no information was obtained to estimate the status of the indicator.

Ideally, education systems should be able to satisfy all these indicators for the entire country. Already in 2002, a pioneering report by the World Health Organization, WHO, on violence and health had recommended:

Recommendation 2.

Enhance capacity for collecting data on violence

Reliable data on violence are crucial not only for setting priorities, guiding programme design and monitoring progress, but also for advocacy to help raise awareness about the issue. Without information, there is little pressure on anyone to acknowledge or respond to the problem [...] It is also equally important that this information be shared across agencies and that internationally accepted standards for data collection be

adopted to enhance the comparability of data across these agencies and even between nations and cultures.<sup>3</sup>

A few years later, another landmark report on violence against children, prepared for the United Nations Secretary General by expert Paulo Sergio Pinheiro, recommended emphatically that reliable data should be collected using indicators based on international standards, and that they be processed and used to develop a true research program:

I recommend that States improve data collection and information systems in order to identify vulnerable sub-groups, inform policy and programming at all levels, and track progress towards the goal of preventing violence against children. States should use national indicators based on internationally agreed standards, and ensure that data are compiled, analysed and disseminated to monitor progress over time. [...] Data should be disaggregated by sex, age, urban/rural, household and family characteristics, education and ethnicity. States should also develop a national research agenda on violence against children across settings where violence occurs, including through interview studies with children and parents, with particular attention to vulnerable groups of girls and boys.<sup>4</sup>

With the proviso that the three indicators are closely intertwined, their findings in the region will be examined one at a time. Indicator 1.1 ascertains whether *the national ministries or secretariats of*

<sup>3</sup> WHO, *World report on violence and health* Geneva, Switzerland, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Pinheiro, Paulo Sergio, Independent Expert for the United Nations, *An end to violence against children. UN Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children*. Recommendation 11, 2006, pg. 22.

*education have statistical information and databases on incidents or situations of violent conflict in the nation's schools.*

Of the 17 countries surveyed, just over one-half (53%) have this kind of information to some degree. National authorities in five countries (29%) have it to an acceptable degree, while the other four countries (23.5%) have it partially (information is incomplete, disperse or indirect).<sup>5</sup> Two countries are in the process of compiling the information, one of which has very recent legislation (Peru, 2011). Another four countries (23.5%) have no available information of national scope, while the situation remained unclear in two more (12%).

Any thorough examination of this issue requires statistical data compiled using reliable methods with nationwide coverage. Hard data and tangible documentation provide the only means to assess real-life phenomena, construct and validate hypotheses on commonalities and causes, and adopt policy measures that tackle problems at the root without succumbing to name-calling or sensationalist perceptions often fueled by news stories on the most extreme events.

The ministry of education does not need to be the one physically compiling these data. Some other entity can easily do so, such as the police or the ministry of justice. In such cases, however, if the results are to serve educational needs, (i) the ministry of education should have the opportunity to be involved, giving its opinion and approval on the design of data collection exercises to incorporate the perspective that educational institutions need; and (ii) data must be easily and quickly available for analysis by the ministry of education as a basis for making decisions. In the absence of these minimum conditions, the mere existence of data offers little or no benefit to the education system.

In several countries studied, the ministry of education compiles data from individual complaints or reports filed on violence in school facilities; the complaints may be received in writing or through a special telephone hot line (see Guatemala, Paraguay and Venezuela). This type of information, while useful, tends to be biased and inadequate.

To begin with, it reflects only particular situations of violence, generally extreme cases; but it provides no information about the everyday overall climate of peaceful coexistence and safety in the school. In the second place, it records only those situations on which an explicit report has been filed by victims or targets, whether students, parents or teachers, which generally comprise a very small share of the cases actually occurring. Files of recorded complaints omit many situations that, for a variety of reasons, are never officially reported (for example, due to fear of reprisal, fear of social stigma, no guarantee of confidentiality, ignorance of proper procedures or skepticism about the likelihood of obtaining justice). In the third place, the situation of conflict is reported by the person filing the complaint, giving his or her own personal view of what happened. Such reports are often not subject to any procedures for verification or collecting evidence, and therefore are too incomplete to shed light on all the angles of the situation or to clarify what actions can be taken to prevent these events from recurring.

<sup>5</sup> The distinction between acceptable information and partial information was drawn with the use of a simple numerical standard and makes no judgment about the quality of data, processing or analysis; clearly, such an assessment would be important, but it lies beyond the scope of this research. Education researchers interested in this subject in the different countries would be well advised to take an in-depth look at the data and studies to determine how relevant and accurate they are. Another proviso is that this analysis is based only on material in the national lead institution, leaving out any information available in the provinces, states or departments of federal nations such as Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela.



For the purposes of this report, the presence of statistical information based exclusively on reports and complaints filed was rated as partial satisfaction of the indicator, and only if certain conditions were met. For example, the information could qualify if it was a response to explicit instructions by education authorities; if it covered all the facilities in the country, and if the information had undergone some type of processing so it could be studied and could lead to action. Lacking such conditions, the indicator was deemed not to have been satisfied.

The intent of indicator 1.2 was to ascertain whether the country's lead institution for education practiced *some systematic procedure for processing and analysis of available statistical data*. The results of this indicator followed a pattern very similar to the first one, although at slightly lower overall levels. In general, it seems clear that education authorities possessing information and databases tend to process and analyze their data in some fashion, even if their methods are less than optimal. Of the 17 countries studied, the same five that had acceptable amounts of data were achieving acceptable levels of systematic processing and analysis (29%). Another three countries (18%) performed partial processing and analysis, while six (35%) did none at all. No information was obtained from three of the countries. In total, eight of the 17 countries (47%) subject their data to some form of processing.

They tend to use their own criteria for classification and disaggregation of information, proper to their particular needs. Here Pinheiro's recommendation, given above, is worth recalling: "States should use national indicators based on internationally agreed standards..." The use of common standards and categories for processing data would make it possible to produce comparative studies about situations in the different countries.

Some of the countries that conduct nationwide surveys on this subject also compile data on victimization and perceptions of violence, generally a more sophisticated and nuanced. Two examples are the national survey of violence in the education sector (*ENVAE*) conducted by the Chilean ministry of security, and the Argentine observatory of school violence (*Observatorio Argentino de Violencia Escolar*) under the Argentine ministry of education and the Universidad Nacional General San Martín, Argentina.

Indicator 1.3 measures a factor that entails more rigorous and in-depth work by the lead institutions of education: *the availability of descriptive or narrative studies by the ministry of education based on available statistical data*. It should not be surprising, then, that positive findings are less widespread than for the first two indicators. Clearly, the degree to which the three indicators on this variable yield a positive result declines progressively in terms of the presence or density of information, and in this case the trend is more pronounced than for the first two indicators.

Of the total 17 countries studied, only three (18%) have acceptable quantities of studies on available data. Two more (12%) are partially in compliance with the indicator, having fewer studies or studies of lesser scope, while another four (23.5%) are presently developing them. Finally, five countries have no data to indicate compliance with the indicator, and in three, it was impossible to determine. Overall, only five of the 17 countries (29%) have descriptive or narrative studies developed by the ministry of education. Although this indicator produced poor results, it is indeed encouraging that four more countries (23.5%) are currently working on studies of this kind.

### Good practices: Observatorio Argentino de Violencia en las Escuelas<sup>1</sup>

This initiative of the National Ministry of Education and the Universidad Nacional de San Martín, “Argentine Observatory of School Violence,” was implemented through Agreement No. 366 of 2004. Its purposes are to make combined efforts for studying the problems of violence in the schools and contribute to consolidating democratic practices and introducing opportunities to practice citizenship in the school setting.

#### Objectives

- Provide theoretical and practical tools for people engaged in educational and community practices.
- Build a nucleus of inter-disciplinary research on violence in the schools, considering both its multiple causes and the different ways it is expressed and represented.
- Debate and ponder the problems of violence and their implications for teaching and learning.
- Contribute to the development of public policies for preventing and addressing violence in the schools.

#### Results

The *Observatorio* took its last measurement in 2007-2008 and found data nearly identical to findings from the previous report (2005-2006), but with slight declines and minimal discrepancies. The results were as follows:

- i) Students report they are well treated; on average, three out of four students say they are treated well or very well by their classmates.
- ii) Behaviors defined as incivility are reported more frequently, as a general rule, in the publicly managed schools. The most common form of incivility reported is destroying school supplies, which was ranked markedly higher than all others (more than double).
- iii) Bullying per se, defined as violent victimization, was found at a consistently low frequency, having risen only slightly since the previous measurement.
- iv) Reported real victimization, compared to observed victimization, was significantly lower than in the previous measurement. The most common types of observed victimization were physical aggression (62%, down from 70.6%) followed by threats (50% down from 57.4%) and theft (43% down from 46%), making these the most visible forms of aggression in school settings.
- v) Fully 70% of students feel there is no violence in their schools. Public-school students perceive their schools as violent more often than private-school students.

<sup>1</sup> Website of the *Observatorio argentino de violencia en las escuelas* of the Ministry of Education, office of the President <[http://www.me.gov.ar/construccion/observa\\_pub.html](http://www.me.gov.ar/construccion/observa_pub.html)>.

Some of the processes for analyzing or sorting empirical data as a basis for developing studies call for a multi-sectoral initiative rather than falling exclusively to the ministries of education. These are good examples of synergy among institutions in each country, and sometimes with international organizations as well, to combine efforts, expertise and resources. Indeed, for the purpose of promoting peaceful coexistence and preventing school violence, it makes no difference what institutions do the studies, but only that the lead agency of public education play an active part.

This is the case in Chile, for example, where a current national survey was designed with the participation of the ministry of education, international organizations including UNESCO and UNICEF, and other public and private agencies. Panama is in the initial stages of a study by the ministry of education, UNICEF, the Norwegian Red Cross and the Panamanian Red Cross. In Peru, a nationwide study on bullying and school violence is being designed jointly by the ministry of education, the ministry of health and the ministry of women and social development, through its department of children and adolescents.



In any case, a negative finding on this indicator under the present research does not mean that the country has no type of studies on the problem. The indicator shows only that the national ministry or secretariat of education has conducted no studies itself or is not directly involved in any. In some cases, universities, independent experts and civil society organizations have conducted their own studies. However, this Inter-American HRE Report focuses on the governments and asks whether they are fulfilling their responsibilities for matters associated with human rights education, and therefore it is particularly interested in actions or omissions by the State itself.

Certain countries were found to be in partial compliance with the indicator. This means that researchers found only one, or at the most two, analytical studies, generally isolated and focused on particular cases (certain schools or regions), and not giving a broad view of the overall situation in the country.

By contrast, two particular countries deserve to be singled out for their positive score on all three indicators of the variable: Argentina and Mexico. These two countries were ranked as fully in compliance with the variable because of their regular programs for collecting and analyzing data. Regular, systematic collection of data is crucial for monitoring the status of peaceful coexistence, safety and episodes of violence in the schools, analyzing them thoroughly, and taking measures for reparation and prevention. These two cases illustrate good practices of inter-sectoral synergy fostered by the agency responsible for education in the country.

Argentina has a research program called Argentine observatory of school violence (*Observatorio Argentino de Violencia Escolar*), designed and implemented jointly by the ministry of education and the Universidad Nacional San Martín. The program has been running since 2005 at regular intervals every two years. Its objective is to develop systematic, comparative knowledge over time as the underpinning for public policies. Mexico has the national “safe schools” program (*Programa Nacional Escuela Segura*) created in 2009 by the national secretariat of education and UNICEF. It has an information system that combines the program’s quantitative data with self-assessments on school violence by each school. The data and self-assessments are used as a basis to develop an agenda for each school, calling for different types of intervention tailored to the most critical problems. If these proposals have been effective, it is because they are fully institutionalized and have national scope, regular operations and sound theoretical and technical design.

### *Policies, plans and programs*

The purpose of the second variable was to ascertain whether the country’s top education authority has general policies and action plans to address the problems covered by this report. The research classified policies and actions into three levels of generality, *guidelines, plans and programs or projects*, and assigned an indicator for each one.

For the least rigorous and most general level, defined as the least structured, the indicator asks whether the national ministry or secretariat of public education has issued *guidelines* (indicator 2.1). These broad principles serve to orient education officials, whether supervisors, school principals, teachers, support staff or others, as to how they should go about promoting peaceful coexistence and safety or how to prevent and confront situations of violence in the schools. It may be a full body of guidelines contained in a single document, or a number of directives issued separately, perhaps responding to particular situations that may have arisen in the country’s educational arena.

### Good practices: Programa Nacional Escuela Segura-PNES, Mexico<sup>1</sup>

The idea of the PNES, or “National Safe Schools Program,” is that the school can contribute to social cohesion and integration in school-based communities by developing a culture of peace. Since July 2007, the program has been part of the national security strategy *Limpiemos México*, which forges ties of cooperation with various institutions, especially the Secretariat of Public Safety and its neighborhood watch program *Comunidades Seguras*, the Secretariat of Health and its national anti-drug program *Salud sólo sin drogas* and the Secretariat of Social Development, with its program to reclaim public spaces, *Recuperación de Espacios Públicos*. The initiative seeks to strengthen strategies and actions that will foster a culture for preventing unsafe schools, built on the development of citizenship skills and the construction of democratic settings in the schools through mechanisms such as participatory school planning, educational management and social participation. The objective is to encourage all members of the school community to become involved in matters of collective interest and to solve conflicts non-violently, using such means as dialogue and negotiation.

The program is nationwide while fully respecting federalism in education; it is implemented under coordination agreements signed with local education authorities. Its reach will be gradually extended toward all public schools interested in promoting preventive security measures and strategies for peace and non-violence. Eventually it will cover all the states and Federated Entities in the country. The PNES tackles addresses safety in the schools from three different angles:

- i) Social participation brings together parents, teachers and students to cooperate in setting up prevention networks surrounding school life. It also orchestrates efforts with government institutions and civil society organizations, which help the schools consolidate their safety measures.
- ii) School management involves developing actions associated with the organization of the schools. For such actions to take place, the school needs to foster an environment of democratic coexistence that encourages participation, discussion and analysis of situations and problems that affect the welfare of the school community. This field of action requires agreements among teachers, school administration and students concerning how to resolve conflicts, discuss and review rules of school life and foster participation in matters of collective interest.
- iii) Development of citizenship skills is a way to leverage the lessons that students have learned in their different courses, especially those that teach analysis of high-risk situations, prevention measures, commitment to self-care and care of others, and thinking critically about ethical perspectives and actions.

Because this is a nationwide program in which the states and Federated Entities are equally responsible for transparency of information and dissemination of results, the PNES National Coordinating Center will ask state-level coordinating centers to issue quarterly and annual reports to be consolidated at the national level.

<sup>1</sup> Website *Programa Nacional Escuela Segura* of the Secretariat of Public Education, <<http://basica.sep.gob.mx/escuelasegura/start.php>>.

A second level, more specific and structured, would be that the national education system has a special *plan* on this subject (indicator 2.2). It would be a relatively extensive document, generally of national scope, although an exception might be a document designed from the beginning with more narrowly focused coverage, such as geographical (regional, local or pilot) or targeting a certain predetermined type of school. By its very nature, any plan can be expected to include theoretical, strategic and operational components; for example, it could contain a conceptual foundation, an explanation of the scope of coverage, an assessment of the surrounding context, a strategy, quantifiable goals, specific actions to be taken, a working timetable, and names of those responsible.

Finally, moving to greater specificity and operational details for public policies, the country would have one or several *programs or projects* to have a direct impact on real conditions in the schools (indicator 2.3). Programs or projects are strategies for intervention.

Another key indicator looked beyond the relative generality of current ministry policies and strategies, analyzing their philosophical and pedagogical moorings (indicator 2.4). It questioned whether the text of the guidelines, plan and programs or projects for peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools had been conceived with a rights perspective. It asked whether these instruments were explicitly grounded in human rights and in the practice of HRE, including related concepts such as education for peace, culture of peace, democracy and citizenship.

Table 10 summarizes the data collected.

A first observation from the reports by local researchers is that the technical concepts *guidelines, plans, programs and projects* are not used in the same way by all the countries or even at times from one education administration to the next in a single country. This sometimes blurs the distinctions between categories, especially plans versus programs, that in the rigorous technical sense are clearly different in both breadth and longevity.

The matrix of variables and indicators, as designed in the original planning for the Tenth Report, drew a clear distinction between these specialized concepts, based on two objectives. The first goal was to cover all relevant education policies in each State, careful to overlook none, no matter its structure, scope or timing; the second was to analyze the different levels of generality and the scope of the different existing policies. The first objective was fully met in the sense that this study did produce the region's first-ever comprehensive survey of policies. Success was less resounding for the second objective. These concepts need to be used advisedly, based on approximation rather than absolutes, because the terminology may vary from one context to another.

The application of indicator 2.1 showed that 13 of 17 countries (76.5%) already have some type of ministry guidelines or instructions on peaceful coexistence and violence prevention in the schools. Of these, eight countries (47%) have developed them to an acceptable degree, and five countries (29%), to a partial degree. Two countries are in the process of developing them (12%), and only two (12%) were found to have none at all.

The indicator found a high degree of compliance because this very broad category of public policies includes provisions contained in separate and distinct regulatory instruments (such as the general law of education, children's code, disciplinary rules, orders by different ministries or circulars by education authorities). The category could also apply for rules of a general nature, perhaps not specifically targeting the problems covered by this study, but including them under one of its articles or paragraphs, albeit briefly or schematically.

By contrast, indicator 2.2 found significantly lower levels of compliance, indeed the lowest levels of the entire variable. Of the 17 countries, only seven (41%) have some kind of plan on this subject, one (6%) to an acceptable degree and six (35%), only partially. Three countries (18%) are in the process of drafting plans; but nearly half the universe under study, seven of the 17 countries (41%), report no compliance with this indicator.

Indicator 2.3 found a visible rise in the number of responses to the problem. A review of specific programs and projects on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools reveals some degree of compliance in the great majority of countries from which information was obtained (94%). Of the 17 countries for which information is available, 10 (59%) received acceptable scores, while six (35%) are partially acceptable. Only one country turned up no initiatives of this kind.

Table 10. Variable 2: Policies, plans and programs

Country	Indicator 2.1 Ministry guidelines or instructions	Indicator 2.2 Specific plans	Indicator 2.3 Specific programs or projects	Indicator 2.4 Inclusion of HRE values and principles
Argentina	√ √	----	√ √	√ √
Bolivia	----	----	----	----
Brazil	√ √	√	√√	√√
Chile	√ √	----	√√	√√
Colombia	√ √	√	√√	√√
Costa Rica	√ √	√	√√	√√
Dom. Rep.	*	*	√	√√
Ecuador	√ √	√	√	√√
El Salvador	√ √	√	√√	√√
Guatemala	√	----	√	√√
Mexico	√ √	----	√√	√√
Nicaragua	√	√√	√	√
Panama	√	----	√√	√√
Paraguay	√	*	√	√√
Peru	√	----	√√	√√
Uruguay	----	√	√	√
Venezuela	*	*	√√	√

## Notes:

\* Work is in progress toward meeting the terms of the indicator.

√ The indicator is partially satisfied.

√√ The indicator is acceptably satisfied.

---- Based on available information, the indicator is not satisfied.

n/a Not available: no information was obtained to estimate the status of the indicator.

In sum, even when policies are classified without undue rigidity, the findings point to an interesting overall observation. If public policies are placed on a continuum between extremes from “generality to specificity,” the majority of countries fall into two clear categories: the most common are operational, specific and limited in coverage (*programs and projects in the schools*), and the second most common are the exact opposite, with policies as general as possible (*guidelines or instructions from the ministry*). Intermediate-type policies, the least common, are defined as comprehensive but also specific, referring directly and explicitly to problems of peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools (*specific plans*).

Significantly, many of the existing policies, especially plans, programs and projects, were inspired by or developed in cooperation with civil society organizations or international organizations. In some cases, it was even reported that the initiative had originated when these entities approached the State to exert pressure and work with it on this problem. Examples include an international initiative, the *Learn without Fear* campaign adopted in Paraguay, the UNESCO *Open Schools* program in Brazil, Mexico’s program on opening schools for equality (*Abriendo Escuelas para la Equidad*), with the OEI, and Costa Rica’s national program for peaceful coexistence in the schools (*Programa Nacional de Convivencia en Centros Educativos*), developed jointly by the ministry of education, the ministry of justice and UNICEF.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Other examples can be found in the table of sources at the end of Section II of this report.

Indicator 2.4 questions whether existing policies are based on a human rights approach, and its findings were positive throughout the region. Education policies on peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools, identified as such for this report, explicitly and clearly incorporate the values and principles of human rights education. Of the 17 countries for which information was obtained, 13 (76.5%) reflect these values and principles extensively, while three (18%) do so partially. Together they make up 94.5% of the universe of study. The case was otherwise in only one country, not due to a deliberate decision to bypass the rights perspective, but because researchers there identified no education policies on this subject.

It can be concluded that education policies in effect on this subject were conceived with a rights perspective and instilled by international agreements the States have signed, especially the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989). There is no room for doubt because the policy texts make explicit mention of these human rights instruments. However, the presence of a rights perspective in the policies studied goes beyond merely citing international instruments as a standard. It means human rights are present in other ways as well. For example, they could underpin activities for organizing program and project work with other members of the education community, or serve as course content in program and project training activities for both students and teachers. The sidebars contained in this chapter give clear examples, citing the text of education policies from several countries in the region.

The overall findings for this variable can be summarized by concluding that the region is making rapid progress but remains ambivalent. A very positive sign is that since the second half of the last decade, most of the States have been adopting initiatives for intervention in primary and secondary schools with plans to build peaceful coexistence deliberately and systematically and tackle possible situations of violence. These initiatives arose in the framework of legal instruments that began to appear in the countries during the 1990s under the influence of international human rights standards, which led them to review their education systems under the new paradigm of children's rights.

The findings are an encouraging sign for the region's progress in human rights education. They show that the countries' lead education institutions are aware that this is a serious problem to be addressed through careful State policies, and they are determined to develop them with a rights perspective. The States are not indifferent, nor are they carelessly turning to mechanisms based on an authoritarian, repressive mentality that ignores the rights perspective.

Less encouraging is the fact that very few countries in the region have attained the fullest, most comprehensive level of planning: national plans that are attuned to the needs and specificities of each State. The presence of so few plans to address these matters suggests that many difficulties still stand in the way of developing an authentic policy of national scope that is systematic, comprehensive and all-encompassing.

As was said before, the general guidelines and instructions at the macro level arose from a decision by the countries to adopt international and regional standards on human rights and children, which today have taken hold strongly in this region. Specific programs or projects at the micro level appear to be spreading in response to concrete problems that have begun to penetrate daily life in the schools. This why the countries have diverse kinds of programs and projects, many of them centered on one or more of the types of violence that affect schools. Examples include programs on violence against women, sexual violence, violence associated with drug use, domestic violence, violence en route



## Human rights perspective in educational policies on peaceful coexistence and violence prevention in the schools

### CHILE

*Policy on Peaceful Coexistence in the Schools and high-quality education for all, Ministry of Education, 2002*

#### Leading and guiding principles

1. All members of the educational community are subject to the law.

When we learn to live together and when together we learn to live, we must implicitly and explicitly recognize one another as legitimate partners in coexistence and understand daily coexistence as a unique opportunity for learning and valuing diversity and plurality in human relationships. [...]

Article No. 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights says: *All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.* In light of these words, in every educational community that is at the service of people and society, the essential rights of human nature, as expressed in the Constitution of the Republic of Chile, are expected to be upheld, exercised and promoted by each and every one of the different participants in education: teachers, students, teachers' aides, parents and guardians in peaceful coexistence every day.

All members of the community are rights-holders, with no exceptions. As equal bearers of these intrinsic, inalienable rights, children, young people and adults are all called upon to build community in every school. [...]

8. Rules for Peaceful Coexistence: where the law meets ethics.

Human rights are the point where the law intersects with morality. They are founded on ethics as a type of historic achievement of moral autonomy. Without the law to back them up, without rules and regulations to enable them, they are a mere statement of intent.

The entrance of the law into the schools is associated with this principle and with discharging responsibilities to other members of the school community. Therefore, this guiding principle needs to be translated into rules for peaceful coexistence, procedures for managing conflicts and sanctions established by the institution in its School Rules.

*Document 2002, pp. 41 and 57.*

### BRAZIL

*Open Schools Program, UNESCO/Fundo de Desenvolvimento de a Educação/Ministry of Education/Federal Government, 2007*

[E]ducation is fundamental for the strategy of social change. It becomes a vehicle for developing and strengthening democracy and for steadily lessening cultural, social and economic inequality. Its main role can be encapsulated as doing away with historic forms of injustice and finally making institutions more democratic, promoting a Brazil that knows its rights and is able to assert itself, organize and fight for its freedom.

*Introduction, pg. 3.*

Another feature of the program is the relationship with human rights issues. While not claiming to solve the country's structural problems, it contributes by leading the people involved in program actions to see themselves as rights-holders, a prerequisite for the exercise of citizenship. The basic assumption is that if the community takes ownership of the school setting and begins to manage the multi-faceted issues associated with the concrete reality of daily life, it will develop an attitude of greater self-esteem, defend rights endowed by the legal system, and want to get involved in finding new mechanisms to protect other rights not yet considered. The school, as a socio-political environment, is an appropriate setting for transforming daily life with the practice of rights, where all members value and respect the others.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in article 26, reads, “[Education] shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.” It goes on to say, in article 27, “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.” The activities of the Programa Escola Aberta, or Open Schools Program, are consistent with these ideas; they welcome the views of the community, encouraging peaceful coexistence, acceptance of others just as they are, and promoting every effort to share knowledge and cultural values.

*Document 2007, pp. 10 and 22-23*

## MEXICO

*“Opening Schools for Equality” Project. Secretariat for Public Education and OEI, 2009*

### Regulatory framework

The General Law on Access by Women to a Life Free of Violence (LGAMVLV) was enacted on February 2, 2007 through an act of the Mexican Congress. Articles 1, 2 and 3 of the law state that the Mexican Federation, its states and federated entities and municipalities must work in coordination to guarantee “the right of women to a life free of violence,” in accordance with international treaties on the human rights of women ratified by the State of Mexico. For this purpose, the law says that all necessary measures must be taken to guarantee that every type of violence against women is prevented, acted upon, sanctioned and eradicated throughout all the stages of life, and to promote the comprehensive development and full participation of women in all spheres of life. [...]

### Specific sphere of action for the Secretariat of Public Education under the new law

- Develop educational policies with the principles of equality, equity and non-discrimination between women and men and full respect for human rights;
- Introduce educational programs that foster the culture of a life free of violence against women and respect for their dignity; [...]
- Guarantee the right to education for girls and women: literacy, access, retention and completion of studies at all levels through access to scholarships and other subsidies; [...]
- Train teachers about the human rights of women and girls;
- Design educational programs to include a focus on respect for the human rights of women and educational content that will help change those models of social and cultural conduct that are based on prejudices and stereotypes and that place one sex in a position of inferiority; [...]

*Abriendo Escuelas para la Equidad, Guía Práctica, 2009, pp. 20 and 21*

## URUGUAY

*Programa Escuelas Disfrutables, ANEP-CEIP, 2009*

### General objective

The “Enjoy your School” Program calls for inter-disciplinary interventions in urban schools throughout the country to address factors that cause institutional distress, responding to situations with a comprehensive approach. Interventions are guided by a perspective of rights and practices consistent with the current socio-historical juncture in the public school.

*Document 2009, pg. 4*

*Continues...*



## EL SALVADOR

*Plan de Prevención de la Violencia Escolar, Ministry of Education and National Police, 2011*

The “Plan for the Prevention of School Violence” has held prevention activities with the participation of teachers, and the National Police have joined in with awareness-raising projects and security services around the schools. Emphasis is placed on the participation of parents and teachers in processes to prevent school violence, as the family is the guarantor of the human rights of children and young people. [...]

Offices of education in the different departments of the country request workshops for schoolteachers on topics of human rights education. They analyze the problem and work out a strategy for reviewing and implementing school rules, regulations for student promotion and handbooks on various subjects including peaceful coexistence and protection of the school.

Human rights education provides a means to strengthen coordination and participation, and this work is supported by Integrated Citizen Management teams in all 14 departments of the country. [...]

This work draws strength from the policy on inclusive education, human rights education, gender education and values education.

*Document and timetable 2011, pg. 1*

## COSTA RICA

*Creation of the Programa Nacional de Convivencia en Centros Educativos (Programa Convivir), Ministry of Public Education, 2011*

Article 1. - *Programa Convivir*. This “National Program for Peaceful Coexistence in the Schools” is a public policy instrument and a framework to guide actions by the Ministry of Public Education with the objective of learning to live together, set forth under the “National Plan for the Prevention of Violence and Promotion of Social Peace, 2011-2014.” The program will guide and coordinate all the actions that members of the different educational communities undertake to support training in the values of peaceful coexistence: respect for diversity, active participation in the community, cooperation, autonomy and solidarity.

### Guiding Principles of the Program

Article 2. - Integrated education. [...]

Article 3. - Children and youth as subjects of rights and duties. - Children and youth are full subjects of rights and obligations. Educational institutions should facilitate fulfillment of the right to education and protect the overriding interest of children and young people.

Article 4. - Upholding the rights of every member of the educational community. All members of the community are holders of rights and duties, with no exceptions. As equal bearers of these intrinsic, inalienable rights, children, young people and adults are all called upon to build community in every school. [...]

*Executive Order No. 36779-MEP of 9/19/2011, pp. 2 and 3*

between home and the school, and more. The different areas of emphasis reflect whatever needs each country feels most acutely.

The macro level and micro levels are equally important and useful, but there is still a need for more in-depth, comprehensive educational proposals that cover vast geographic areas, that are organic, developed via participatory processes and based on inter-sectoral commitments. This is easier when public policy instruments such as national plans are in place.

Over the last three decades, the United Nations and its specialized agencies for human rights, education and children (UNHCHR, UNESCO, UNICEF and the like) have been encouraging the countries to develop such plans in their different fields of action. As a result, countries that formulated

plans succeeded in setting national agendas and pushing for systematic, inter-sectoral actions in each field. Examples include national human rights plans, Education for All plans and all the human rights education plans; the former two became widespread in this region, but unfortunately, the latter is still lagging behind.

Along these same lines, the WHO developed a very specific recommendation that generally provides guidance on requirements to be met for all planning.

Recommendation 1. Create, implement and monitor a national action plan for violence prevention

National planning to prevent violence should be based on a consensus developed by a wide range of governmental and nongovernmental actors. It should include a timetable and evaluation mechanism, and enable collaboration between sectors that might contribute to preventing violence, such as the criminal justice, human rights, education, labour, health, and social welfare sectors.<sup>7</sup>

### *Policy implementation*

This third variable targeted the conditions and basic features for implementing the countries' current education policies in the field of peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools. The variable was measured using five very direct and specific indicators. The first two ask if national-level ministries or secretariats of public education meet the two minimum prerequisites for handling and responding to these issues: *whether the institution has a department or departments formally responsible for addressing this problem* (indicator 3.1) and *whether budgetary resources are available for carrying out existing plans, programs or projects* (indicator 3.2).

The remaining indicators identify three other important features of the policy implementation process: *whether provisions have been made for participation by all the different stakeholders in education*, such as school principals, teachers, service staff, parents and the surrounding community (indicator 3.3); *whether dissemination and training materials with a focus on rights are available, produced and distributed by the ministry of education* (indicator 3.4), and *whether training activities on this subject are being offered to the different participants in education* (indicator 3.5).

Table 11 summarizes the information gathered.

The great majority of the countries in the region, 14 of the 17 studied (82%), satisfy indicator 3.1 in some measure, with compliance rated acceptable in five (29%) and partial in another nine (53%). In one country, no information was obtained.<sup>8</sup> Partial compliance means that researchers failed to identify a specific entity within the ministry of education that was clearly responsible for the problem. Several different departments (sometimes pertaining to different ministries) had some share of responsibility, although not clearly delimited, and all were acting separately. This reflects an institutional response in principle, although the dispersion of objectives and the assignment to a variety of State agencies, with no joint coordinated action, does not guarantee an effective response to these serious problems.

Indicator 3.2 on the existence of a budget for implementing plans, programs and projects on peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools, found the lowest levels of compliance under this variable. Only six of the 17 countries (35%) were found to have some type of official budget resources. Half of these, or three countries (18%), satisfied the indicator partially in that

<sup>7</sup> World Health Organization, *World report on violence and health*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2002.

<sup>8</sup> Researchers in Colombia were unable to obtain information on variables 3 and 4 of the study.

### Good practices: Plan de prevención de la violencia escolar, El Salvador<sup>1</sup>

The “Plan for the Prevention of School Violence” has held prevention activities with the participation of teachers, and the National Police have joined in with awareness-raising projects and by providing security services around the schools.

Emphasis is placed on the participation of parents and teachers in processes to prevent school violence, as the family is the guarantor of the human rights of children and young people. Experience shows that prevention is more effective in the presence of inter-institutional coordination that involves many community members in the prevention strategy, creating a local network of protection for children and youth.

The department-level offices of education have embraced the plan and are teaching technical personnel to support prevention work in the schools. The heads of these offices sit on department-level security councils. Each department-level office has a representative who reports progress and difficulties to the office and to the manager of territorial development of education.

Offices of education in the different departments of the country request workshops for schoolteachers on topics of human rights education. They analyze the problem and work out a strategy for reviewing and implementing school rules, regulations for student promotion and handbooks on various subjects including peaceful coexistence and protection of the school. Human rights education provides a means to strengthen coordination and participation, and this work is supported by Integrated Citizen Management teams in all 14 departments of the country.

El Salvador has taken up the human rights education curriculum proposal developed by the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IHR, 2006) and is implementing it as part of the model for inclusive full-time school. Students have access to a diversified education that is attractive and offers additional opportunities to develop art, culture, sports and recreation.

To bring about equality and expand school protection, the program has created cores of local participation in which several schools share an educational vision, resources and strategies and rotate students to make better use of infrastructure. This work draws strength from the policy on inclusive education, human rights education, gender education and values education.

#### Scope

School administration and parents play an active role in supporting the plan for school prevention in close coordination with the principal, teachers, students and department liaisons.

The program for art, culture, recreation and sports coordinates with the national youth council to strengthen implementation of the student social services program, based on successful experiences. The idea is to implement a methodology for education among peers and support it with materials, equipment and supplies for recreation and sports.

<sup>1</sup> From a document provided by the Ministry of Education, 2011, pg.1.

funds are available under much broader plans or programs made up of many other components (the National HRE Plan in Brazil), come from contributions received for international cooperation projects (Dominican Republic), or are very limited and narrow (Uruguay).

Two countries (12%) reported no budget for this work, while researchers in nine countries, the majority of the universe of study (53%), found either no information at all, or insufficient information to judge the current budget situation. This should not be interpreted to mean that existing programs are simply not being implemented. There is evidence that they are in fact taking place, but it is not clear how their daily operations are funded (in some cases, resources may be coming from other budget items, or from projects with international organizations or private companies). In any case, this indicator points out a weakness found in many good proposals. Without a stable official budget, it is practically

### Good practices: Plan Colegio Seguro, Nicaragua<sup>1</sup>

Nicaragua's "Safe Schools" Plan has been underway since January 2007, a nationwide policy based on principles of equality and quality in education. Part of the effort to start the plan moving was to designate school security as a strategic factor for promoting public safety, human security and even human development. Safety in the schools has become an extremely important matter for teachers, students, citizens and institutions. Threats and dangers increase with each passing day, creating the need for preventive action to control and safeguard the environment in the school and the surrounding community.

This is why the National Police, with the cooperation of the Ministry of Education, is carrying out the "Safe Schools" Plan, which began as an initiative of the institution itself to prevent crime in society. It uses participatory methods to bolster efforts by the community and the school in institutions that have high rates of violence and vulnerable environments.

#### Integrated approach<sup>2</sup>

- Minimize motivations for offenders.
- Remove socio-urban conditions that promote opportunities for crimes to occur.
- Relieve socio-structural factors that trigger criminal behaviors.

#### Lines of intervention

Define very specifically who will take part and delimit the coordinates of the scenario for operations. Identify particular people and relationships to be targeted as a top priority.

- School-community relationship.
- Student-school relationship.
- Student-teacher relationship.
- Peer relationships.

<sup>1</sup> From a document supplied by the National Police, 2011, pg.1.

<sup>2</sup> Koyra, M., "Plan Colegio Seguro. La escuela como medio de prevención de la violencia", paper given at the 29th Interdisciplinary Course on Human Rights, Justice and Security, IHR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2011.

impossible to carry out on-going specialized actions with good coverage that require professional support in addition to regular teachers (social workers, counselors, psychologists and in certain cases for prevention of serious violence or crimes, police officers).

Indicator 3.3, participation by the different stakeholders in education, paints a more promising picture for the region. Somewhat over three-fourths of the countries in the study have policies on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools whose text explicitly incorporates a variety of participants in implementation, in addition to the country's lead agency for education. Ten countries (59%) do so consistently, repeatedly and on a sound footing; in another three countries (18%), the point is raised timidly, occasionally or irregularly. Two countries (12%) make no mention of this kind of inclusion, and no information was obtained from the other two.

This indicator addresses a key feature of education policies by which to evaluate their most basic tenets: whether they are essentially hierarchical (organized top-down) or whether the policies lay out objectives and standards but encourage each school and its stakeholders (teachers, students, parents, neighbors of the school, etc.) to take ownership and make the policies a reality. If the leaders in policy implementation are given active participation and decision-making authority, they not only exercise their right to participate in matters they care about, but also are certain to take ownership of the

Table 11. Variable 3: Policy implementation

Country	Indicator 3.1 Responsibility is assigned to departments in the ministry	Indicator 3.2 Budget resources are available	Indicator 3.3 Various stakeholders participate	Indicator 3.4 Materials with a focus on human rights are available	Indicator 3.5 Training is available for stakeholders in education
Argentina	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √
Bolivia	----	n/a	----	√	----
Brazil	√	√	√ √	√ √	√ √
Chile	√ √	√ √	√	√ √	√ √
Colombia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Costa Rica	√ √	n/a	√ √	*	√
Dom. Rep.	√ √	√	√ √	√ √	√ √
Ecuador	----	----	√ √	√	√ √
El Salvador	√	n/a	√ √	√	√ √
Guatemala	√	n/a	n/a	√	√
Mexico	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √
Nicaragua	√	n/a	√ √	----	√ √
Panama	√	----	√	√	√
Paraguay	√	n/a	----	*	√
Peru	√	n/a	√ √	√	√ √
Uruguay	√	√	√ √	√ √	√ √
Venezuela	√	n/a	√	√	√

Notes:  
 \* Work is in progress toward meeting the terms of the indicator.  
 √ The indicator is partially satisfied.  
 √ √ The indicator is acceptably satisfied.  
 ---- Based on available information, the indicator is not satisfied.  
 n/a Not available: no information was obtained to estimate the status of the indicator.

policies and commit to them, which ultimately helps bring about better results. Renowned Salvadoran human-rights educator Joaquín Samayoa says:

In my experience, consensus-based production of rules and regulations from inside each school community tends to be more appropriate and effective than documents emanating from the upper strata of the educational system.<sup>9</sup>

This facet of education policies for peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention cannot not always be evaluated qualitatively on the basis of official documents. Sometimes, as occurred with some of the papers examined for this Tenth Report, the texts do not clearly differentiate among the many people involved in education (they speak generically about the education community, assuming certain stakeholders are included but without specifying who); other policies lack an explicit description of everyone's duties and competencies, that is, whether they are empowered to deliberate and propose policies, and above all, to make decisions about them. A word of caution is in order here. If such details are not specified clearly, the participation asserted in such policy documents may end up being more token than real. Claims can be verified with certainty only through a critical study of how policy procedures are regulated, followed by field studies on actual implementation. Several good examples of countries that satisfy this indicator are outlined in the sidebars in this section.

Indicator 3.4 asked whether the ministry of education produces and distributes rights-based materials for training and public education on the problems under study. Three-fourths of the countries gave

<sup>9</sup> Joaquín Samayoa, in a note to the IIHR, April, 2011.

### Good practices: El Cole en Nuestras Manos, Costa Rica<sup>1</sup>

“The School in our Hands” is an initiative that the Ministry of Public Education has been conducting since 2008. It promotes institutional practices to help the educational community take ownership of the school, successful student retention and respectful, peaceful coexistence in the framework of human rights. The work began as a pilot project in 64 secondary schools distributed among 18 educational administrative regions.

#### Areas of Action

Work is being done to strengthen the participating schools in four broad areas:

- *Access to Education.* This means providing all the conditions that will allow students to gain access to the educational system, including services, socioeconomic support, school infrastructure and supplies, and the like.
- *Strengthening the academic and educational environment.* This means promoting educational options through teaching processes that are relevant, consistent with cultural surroundings and suited to the characteristics of students.
- *Harmonious coexistence.* The program promotes strategies to encourage the development of students such that they will gain a sense of belonging to their school in an atmosphere that is respectful of fundamental rights and freedoms. It includes actions for building appropriate interpersonal relationships, art and culture, sports and recreation, and the like.
- *Help with psycho-social problems.* Through this program, the school is reclaiming its role as a system that protects students; it provides intervention in risk situations, including detection, assistance, reference and monitoring in cases such as violence, drug use and trafficking, teen pregnancy and paternity, family breakdown, and so on.

#### How does it work?

This is a two-stage project. Phase one, “Developing counterparts and designing the plan,” involves setting up school committees, assessing needs, mapping local support networks and drafting a work plan. Phase two, “Strengthening counterparts and monitoring the Plan,” provides technical assistance and on-site support to redefine needs, reformulate actions and carry out work plans.

The program promotes self-determination so the schools can identify their own needs and work out strategies to address those needs. The Department of Student Life (DVE) provides support in the form of technical assistance, monitoring and follow-up, and individual care. DVE efforts emphasize awareness-raising and training for teachers and administrative staff and promoting student participation with a focus on active involvement and management through leadership development and writing and negotiating proposals.

<sup>1</sup> Website of the student life department of the Ministry of Public Education, <<http://www.vidaestudiantilcr.com/index.php?id=95>>.

positive results, six of which were acceptable in quantitative terms (35%) and another seven, partially acceptable or limited (41%). Two countries are currently developing materials (12%), one country has none (6%), and no information was obtained from the other (6%). In their reports, the researchers in the countries recorded the existence of different kinds of materials, although few were singled out for specific mention. Most common are the policy documents themselves, in either digital form or hard copy, as well as working materials for teachers, students and families (brochures, guides and handbooks). Many hold festivals and public-awareness drives, such as the internationally-based *Learn without Fear* campaign in El Salvador and Paraguay, *Live without violence* (*Vive sin violencia*) in Venezuela and *I have the right to be respected* (*Tengo derecho al buen trato*) in Peru.



Unfortunately, there is very little information on how these materials are distributed among members of the educational community. Without knowing the type and volume of mechanisms used, it is impossible to say whether they reach the entire country on an equal footing. Furthermore, gauging the effectiveness of campaigns and drives requires information on the communications media being used and how notices are run (number and duration of messages on the air, timetables and frequencies of spots, etc.).

Officials of the ministries or secretariats of education emphasized in their interviews that policy documents and materials for educational work are posted on their official websites. This is significant as an explicit, public assertion that the educational system has a position and has adopted certain relevant policies. Nevertheless, it is only realistic to admit that the Internet is not a medium that the main stakeholders in education use habitually to find out about public policies and educational content. Of course it is an excellent choice for public information, but it cannot be assumed that teachers, students and family members all over the country will be automatically and massively checking these websites. If they are not enhanced with other types of materials, their real impact is not only low, but also difficult to estimate.

Indicator 3.5, asking whether actions are in place to provide training on this subject for the different people in education, produced the largest number of positives of the entire variable. Fifteen of the 17 countries (88%) reported different types of training activities for principals, teachers, students and families, 10 to an acceptable degree (59%) and five, only partially (29%). Only one country reported no such actions (6%), while in another, no information was obtained on this indicator.

The activities generally consist of lectures and workshops for different audiences and on different topics, mostly falling into one of two main categories. The first category is training for school professionals (principals and teachers) on the content and implementation of public policies in this field. It covers such topics as human rights education, how to perform situation assessments on peaceful coexistence and violence in the school, legal and psychological guidance, strategies for conflict resolution, using participatory methods to develop codes or regulations on peaceful coexistence in individual schools in countries that have such codes or regulations, evaluation of policies for peaceful coexistence in the schools, and the like.

The other category is training for the broader educational community and covers more general topics to raise awareness about problems with peaceful coexistence, developing social relationships and preventing violence in the classroom, school, home and community. This training covers such topics as self-esteem and communication, life skills, ethics and values, citizenship and human rights, crime prevention, alerts on new types of crime, especially Internet-based offenses, addiction prevention, gender equality, sexuality and HIV-AIDS prevention, culture, recreation and sports, etc.

The last three indicators under this variable are closely intertwined. If it is understood that any solution to such a complex set of problems requires the participation of many different people, especially the entire educational community, then it is clear that these people need to be trained, either directly or through materials. Training and awareness-raising are the forte of the educational system, and in order to extend its reach, the countries often create different types of cooperation between the lead agency of education in the country, and other entities. Examples may include other government departments (local governments, the ombudsman, child welfare, other ministries such as women or



### Good practices: Programa Escuelas Disfrutables, Uruguay<sup>1</sup>

National Program to Strengthen Emerging Movements in the Schools

#### General objective

The “Enjoy your School” Program calls for inter-disciplinary interventions in urban schools throughout the country to address factors that cause institutional distress, responding to situations with a comprehensive approach. Interventions are guided by a perspective of rights and practices consistent with the current socio-historical juncture in the public school.

#### Design of an institutional program with a wide diversity of practices

- i) Process of reformulating multi-disciplinary teams in the elementary school.
- ii) Target of intervention: the school as an institution.
- iii) Geographic coverage: teams will be assigned an area of jurisdiction consisting of no more than 20 schools. This will help communities join local networks to coordinate resources with the schools and public policies.
- vi) Universal coverage for urban schools all over the country.
- v) Adoption of different structures to guarantee diversity of approaches.
- vi) Various programs for intervention implemented simultaneously with differentiated objectives, lines of action and purposes.

#### Outline of intervention programs

- i) Eight schools for two years on a rotating basis.
- ii) Schools with Community Teachers Programs, joint actions.
- iii) Intervention in emergency situations and workshops on self-care.
- vi) Intervention in the framework of protocols, school policies or public policies (networks, campaigns, etc.).

#### Results

In the second half of 2010, the inter-disciplinary teams handled emergency situations in 188 schools in Montevideo and Canelones and 218 schools in outlying departments. This totals 406 schools. In the framework of Program 1, to promote working agreements of greater scope and intensity, interventions were reported in 94 schools in Montevideo and Canelones and 62 schools in outlying departments. The 157 schools have the full-time services of psychologists and social workers for two years, especially in the second half of the year.

Self-care workshops have been held at the department level. The Community Teachers Program joined forces with this work in the outlying departments, reaching a total of 151 schools. The result of this cooperation was to multiply achievements by both programs, and such inter-disciplinary coordination clearly strengthened the participating schools.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Taken from the website of the Consejo de Educación Inicial Primaria, <<http://www.cep.edu.uy/>>.

<sup>2</sup> Informe semestral de actividades, Equipos Interdisciplinarios, December 2010, pg. 3.

social development, health, security, internal affairs or justice, the board of elections, the local police, etc.), local or international nongovernmental organizations (such as Plan International) and inter-governmental organizations (UNICEF, UNESCO, WHO, UNFPA, IIHR, OEI, and the like).

Inter-institutional activities can be very effective and productive if they are planned jointly and carried out in close coordination; this is not always the case in the countries examined, despite the best of intentions. Informants in the countries recognized effective inter-sectoral cooperation as a valuable but

## Participation by education stakeholders in carrying out plans and programs or projects

### COSTA RICA

*Creation of the National Program for Peaceful Coexistence in the Schools (Programa Convivir), Ministry of Public Education, 2011*

#### Considering:

IV. That in order to develop good practices for peaceful coexistence in schools, it is essential for the entire educational community to apply knowledge, abilities and skills for negotiation, consensus-building and conflict management. [...]

#### Title 3. Strategies to promote peaceful coexistence

Article 7. - Guidelines for developing the strategy. Each school should develop a strategy to promote peaceful coexistence. Schools will have guidelines to use as the basis for developing their strategy. These guidelines will outline suggested activities for assessing the current state of coexistence in the school, designing actions to improve coexistence, ranking actions for priority attention based on urgency and importance and deciding how and when to implement them and who should be responsible.

All members of the educational community should be involved in carrying out these actions, which should be tailored to the characteristics of the population and the setting of each school.

*Executive Order No. 36779-MEP of 9/19/2011, pp. 1 and 3*

### PERU

*Rules to improve Peaceful Coexistence and School Discipline, Time Management, Citizenship Training, Civics and Patriotism for Students in Primary and Secondary Schools and Programs, Ministry of Education, 2011*

#### VI. Specific provisions

##### 6.1.1. The Principal

c. Call meetings of teacher-advisors, teachers, parents and other participants in education to achieve objectives [...]

##### 6.1.2. Duties of the coordinator for peaceful coexistence and discipline in the school.

g. Receive and process initiatives from the educational community intended to improve school discipline. [...]

##### 6.3.1 Teacher-advisors and guidance counselors

a. Develop educational and guidance activities with the support of parents, psychologists and other professionals to shape student behavior and help strengthen mutual respect, tolerance, interpersonal relationships, teamwork, solidarity and other values and attitudes in social, athletic and community activities where students interact.

*Order of the Deputy Minister 0022-2007-ED, 2011*

### BRAZIL

*Open Schools Program, UNESCO/Fundo de Desenvolvimento de a Educação/Ministry of Education/Federal Government, 2007*

At the same time, education needs to be consolidated as a shared undertaking by the school and the community; such coordination will produce the changes needed so that, in the near future, this transformational education may become a reality. Moreover, the school is the only existing public institution in many communities and therefore an ideal setting for the exercise of citizenship and access to public policies. Strengthening this relationship contributes to the development of the Political-Pedagogical Model of the School, which should be dynamic and serve to orient everyday life in the school and guide the organization of teaching and educational work, with the active participation of all stakeholders. [...]

“Open Schools Program: Education, Culture, Sports and Work for Youth” was designed to promote a new conception of the school as an alternative setting for weekend activities of training, culture, sports, and recreation for students in the public primary and secondary schools and their communities. [...]

*Introduction, pg. 4.*

“Open Schools Program: Education, Culture, Sports and Work for Youth,” a government project that begins by opening up the schools on weekends as a public facility run by the local communities. [...]

Inspired by this conviction and these principles, the OPEN SCHOOLS PROGRAM gains legitimacy by promoting and expanding school-community integration, holding out greater access to opportunities for promoting citizenship and helping reduce violence in the school community. Therefore, it is based on an understanding of the school as an intersection between historically acquired formal knowledge and popular forms of knowledge. The school setting is accordingly seen as a place ideally suited for peaceful coexistence among different people and for learning the ethics of cooperation as opposed to coercion.

*Document 2007, pp. 7-9.*

## ECUADOR

*Rules for peaceful coexistence, Ministry of Education, 2007*

### Considering:

THAT members of the educational community should know and assert their rights and duties so as to improve peaceful coexistence inside and outside the schools, in accordance with articles 28 and 29 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child; [...]

Art. 1. INSTITUTIONALIZE the Code of Peaceful Coexistence (an instrument that should be developed, applied, evaluated and improved on a regular basis) in all educational facilities in the country, at the different levels and formats of the system, as an instrument constructed collectively by the educational community that underpins the School Rules and becomes a new model for peaceful coexistence in the community.

Art. 2. DECLARE that the purpose of applying the Code of Peaceful Coexistence is to achieve strengthening and comprehensive development of members of the educational community including teachers, students and families, in the exercise of their rights and obligations, educational quality and harmonious coexistence.

*Agreement No. 182.*

## MEXICO

*National Safe Schools Program, Secretariat of Public Education, 2009*

### Specific objectives:

Facilitate peaceful coexistence with democracy, solidarity and respect in the school community, with the participation of teachers, parents and students, to create safe environments. [...]

### Fields of action:

The National Safe Schools Program approaches school safety from three different angles: social participation, school management and the development of citizenship skills.

- Social participation brings together parents, teachers and students to cooperate in setting up prevention networks surrounding school life. It also orchestrates efforts with government institutions and civil society organizations, which help the schools consolidate their safety features.

*From the website <<http://basica.sep.gob.mx/escuelasegura/start.php>>*

*Continues...*

## ARGENTINA

*The role of adults with regard to children and youth, contributions for building the educational community; Argentine Observatory of Violence in the Schools, 2007*

It is important to provide opportunities so that all adults who are associated with the work of the school can ponder and think together about their role with new generations. An open dialog about the different viewpoints and perspectives that adults have regarding children and young people will help them strengthen their role in an atmosphere of care and protection.

For this purpose, we in the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology of the Nation have developed this material so that teachers, families, members of community organizations and neighbors of the school can talk in more depth about the issues that concern them regarding children and young people.

The material we are introducing today consists of two sections: a conceptual framework that outlines several concepts useful as a basis for analyzing the place of adults in the world of children and youth, and a proposal of activities to encourage discussion and thought about the different facets of our role as adults.

*Document 2007, pg. 5*

## DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

*Roadmap for preventing violence before the beginning of the next school year, Ministry of Education, 2011*

IV. Training retreats (counselors, psychologists, teachers, principals, parents) on strategies for the prevention of violence in the schools. April/August.

- a) Develop a preliminary protocol to prevent violence in the classrooms and schools (April).
- b) In the framework of the PROFEI and in coordination with other entities, the program will train counselors and psychologists to work with families using support material prepared for parenting classes, with a heavy emphasis on preventing domestic violence, as well as validation of the protocol for prevention of violence in the schools in preparation for the coming school year (May and June).
- c) Convene families from all schools (parenting classes including guardians) to reflect on the content of the brochures and on violence prevention (May and June). [...]

*Document 2011, pg. 1*

challenging goal. In too many cases, efforts were disjointed, and similar but unconnected interventions were made repeatedly. This further underscores the importance of the WHO recommendation (2002) on national plans to prevent violence in the schools and in overall society.

### *Policy monitoring and evaluation*

The fourth and last variable in the matrix for this research is a logical and chronological continuation of the first three. The three indicators examine whether the country's lead agency for education *monitors compliance with policies, plans and programs for peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention and management of conflict in the schools* (indicator 4.1), *performs evaluations on the progress of existing plans and programs or projects* (indicator 4.2), and *whether findings or conclusions on the progress of existing plans and programs or projects are available* (indicator 4.3).

A quick overall look at Table 12 reveals that, compared to the other three variables in the matrix, this yields the fewest positive results in the region. Such a finding can be explained in part because the concern with developing specific policies on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention

Table 12. Variable 4: Policy monitoring and evaluation

Country	Indicator 4.1 Monitoring compliance with policies	Indicator 4.2 Evaluations of existing plans and programs or projects	Indicator 4.3 Availability of findings on existing plans and programs or projects
Argentina	√ √	√ √	√ √
Bolivia	----	----	----
Brazil	√	√	√
Chile	----	----	----
Colombia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Costa Rica	*	*	----
Dom. Rep.	√	√	----
Ecuador	√	----	----
El Salvador	*	*	----
Guatemala	----	----	√
Mexico	√√	√√	√√
Nicaragua	√	*	----
Panama	√	√	√
Paraguay	√	----	----
Peru	√	----	----
Uruguay	√	----	----
Venezuela	√	----	----

Notes:  
 \* Work is in progress toward meeting the terms of the indicator.  
 √ The indicator is partially satisfied.  
 √√ The indicator is acceptably satisfied.  
 ---- Based on available information, the indicator is not satisfied.  
 n/a Not available: no information was obtained to estimate the status of the indicator.

in the schools is relatively recent, as this study discovered when examining the sources. The first educational policy documents in this field, still very general and vague, arose in the mid-2000s. The most specific and targeted were developed toward the end of the decade, that is, two or three years before this report. Nevertheless, the application of each indicator gives additional information that should be considered.

The best results came from indicator 4.1 on whether policies are monitored for compliance and for expected progress. A total of 11 countries (65%) apply some strategy for monitoring or follow-up on these policies; two do so regularly and thoroughly (12%) and the other nine do so irregularly, inconsistently or partially (53%). Two countries are in the process of developing or implementing monitoring mechanisms (12%), and another three do not yet have such mechanisms.

The findings of the other two indicators drop off quite abruptly. On indicator 4.2, which asks whether current policies are evaluated, only five of the 17 countries studied (30%) have some type of evaluation mechanism. Two countries have set up acceptable, regular evaluations (12%), and three evaluate partially or sporadically (18%). Another three countries (18%) are currently developing or are about to develop some evaluation mechanism, while in eight countries, nearly half the universe of study (47%), none was identified.

The figures obtained on availability of evaluation findings and conclusions are even more meager. Five countries (30%) have either quantitative or qualitative findings and conclusions, two to an acceptable

degree (12%) and three, partially (18%). No country was in the process of developing them. The majority, 11 of the 17 countries (65%), have none.

Interestingly, the two countries that performed best on the latter two indicators have developed information systems that collect quantitative and qualitative data to support every stage of the policy process, from context assessments to final evaluation of results and impact (the *Observatorio Argentino de Violencia en las Escuelas* in Argentina and the comprehensive information system of Mexico's *Programa Nacional Escuela Segura*). The Argentine *Observatorio* dates back to 2004, which means it has been in effect longer than other policies in the region, but although Mexico's 2009 *Programa Escuela Segura* has been running for only three years, it is nevertheless producing evaluations and findings on a regular basis.

In other words, the relative “youth” of a plan, program or project cannot be used as an excuse for not evaluating and is insufficient reason for official results on its operations to be unavailable, even if they are only partial or provisional. Specialists and local and international academic institutions will always make valuable contributions to research and evaluation, but they cannot and should not relieve the public system of discharging its responsibility.

This is an important point because without strategies for monitoring and evaluation, any public educational policy runs the risk of walking blind and can become watered down. The danger is especially acute in a complex, multi-faceted problem area such as this, which fluctuates constantly with shifts in local, national and even regional conditions, especially where manifestations of violence in or near the schools are associated with organized crime. All that remains to be said is that all information produced by the educational system on this problem and on the effectiveness of its interventions needs to be shared with all relevant members of the educational community (principals, teachers, students, families) and transformed into strategy guidelines to improve public policy responses.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Rodríguez, Ernesto, “Jóvenes y violencias en las escuelas medias”...

### Good practices: Programa Escuela Abierta, Brazil<sup>1</sup>

Brazil developed the Open Schools Program to promote education on human rights and a culture of peace and thus improve peaceful coexistence in the schools. The idea of the program is to open schools over the weekend to offer educational, artistic, sports and recreational activities. The proposal began as a UNESCO initiative called *Abrindo Espaços*, with the secretariats of education of the states and municipalities. Years later, it became federal public policy, renamed *Escola Aberta*. The program is presently active in all the states of Brazil and in Brasília, with 2,223 “open schools,” and the results and impact have been widely praised and are very positive.

In 2000, during commemorations of the International Year for the Culture of Peace, UNESCO-Brazil launched the program *Abrindo Espaços: educação e cultura para a paz*. From 2000 to 2006, in cooperation with the municipal and state secretariats of education, the program opened 10,000 schools and received nearly 10 million people in the first five states where it was implemented (Pernambuco, Rio de Janeiro, Rio Grande del Sur, Bahía and Sao Paulo).<sup>2</sup> Over the years, many positive outcomes have been reported:

- i) a significantly improved climate in the school and its surrounding areas;
- ii) lessening of violence against school property;
- iii) broad community participation in school activities;
- iv) lower rates of interpersonal violence on the school grounds, and
- v) development of a culture of volunteerism in some places.<sup>3</sup>

In 2004, several years after the *Abrindo Espaços* program began, the Ministry of Education and UNESCO launched the *Escola Aberta* Program on a firm footing as public policy.<sup>4</sup> The program offers new alternatives given the lack of access to cultural offerings. Activities available in the schools are open to the entire community and thus tend to improve the quality of relationships between teachers, students, families and the educational community in general.

In 2008, the Ministry of Education conducted a nationwide evaluation of the program under the Universidade de Brasília's Center for the Selection and Promotion of Events. The evaluation identified several areas for improvement in both the selection of schools and the organizational structure of the program. For the purposes of this research, the most important finding is the reduction of violence identified under the indicator “perception of violence in the school.”

1 Noleto, Marlova Jovchelovitch, *Construindo sabere : referências conceituais e metodologia do Programa Abrindo Espaços: educação e cultura para a paz*. UNESCO, Fundação Vale, Brasília, 2008. (Série saber e fazer; 1, 2, 3).

2 In São Paulo the program was set up in nearly the entire state network, covering 5,306 schools out of a total of 6,000. Called *Escola da Família*, it attracted 30,000 volunteers and 35,000 university students working directly in the schools. Series 1, 2008, pg. 13.

3 Series 3, 2008, pg. 81.

4 Series 1, 2008, pg. 45.





## Section IV

### Conclusions

#### Sources consulted: documentary sources

Educational policies on matters of peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools are still rare in the countries of the region. Moreover, they tend to be overly general, vague and scattered among a plethora of documents of different kinds, difficult to synthesize. To determine how relevant and specific they are, a look at the chronology is enlightening: the most specific, explicit, relevant policies are of recent vintage, most of them having appeared between 2005 and 2010. By contrast, policies developed from the late 1980s through the mid-2000s are general, indirect and reflect the then-common notion of “school discipline;” that said, they do include an embryonic perspective of children’s rights inspired by the international adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989 and its entry into force in 1990.

The chronology of the sources also reveals the region’s general tendency to develop policies on this subject that are increasingly direct and explicit. They have been appearing rapidly since around 2004, and the pace has picked up in the past three years. As this Tenth Report report is being written (October 2011), several countries are fully engaged in the process, whether writing policies, discussing them with the education community or testing them on a pilot basis.

The results show that national authorities at the helm of education are paying attention and getting involved, largely as a reaction to specific incidents of violence inside the school, and mobilized by demands and proposals from the public. This complex set of problems is no longer being left entirely in the hands of school principals or teachers, nor is it seen lightly as a simple dichotomy, easy to solve by applying traditional school disciplinary rules or criminal laws. There is a new understanding that the hopes of building peaceful coexistence in the school environment, guaranteeing that schools are safe and preventing outbreaks of violence that threaten the entire educational community are objectives that deserve special, more profound handling suited to the circumstances of each national and local setting. There is a newly emerging awareness that these matters merit serious consideration and action proposals that arise from within the educational system itself, guided by education authorities but involving all affected groups.

#### Contexts and perceptions

In all the countries studied, it was found that teachers and the general public alike are deeply concerned about problems with peaceful coexistence, safety and violence in the schools and feel that these problems are growing steadily. This sense of concern tends to be based on anecdotal evidence, an accumulation of particular extreme cases, sporadic and highly publicized, most of which they learned about through the news rather than from direct experience.

Perceptions of the causes of these problems vary according to the geography of the region and the socioeconomic setting of the different institutions. Opinions in South America center around poverty, social exclusion and child labor, added to the low quality of education and expulsion from the system (masked as “dropping out of school”) as factors that trigger frequent incidents of vandalism, theft

and different kinds of physical aggression against the school, among students and toward teachers. Interviewees in Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean, while recognizing these same factors, tended to stress the destabilizing influence of youth gangs and the drug trade that expose students and teachers to extortion and death threats, often borne out.

As for the chief manifestations of violence, teachers focus mostly on the school environment and comment that the most dangerous places and situations are en route from home to school, upon entering or leaving the facility, and the risks of keeping the school open to entry by outside persons. They also worry about students who carry weapons, thus giving greater clout to their intimidations and threats. Many educational systems, lacking specific policies for situations of this kind, simply call the police.

Despite directives handed down by the ministries of education in the countries, researchers found widespread unease among teachers, who describe their anxiety as they see the problem growing steadily. Even so, there is no lack of critics who object to certain police-type solutions (such as the use of security cameras in the schools), pointing to powerful commercial interests in the security industry and in prevention of community or school violence.

Teachers have no lack of critical self-awareness. They have also heard the outcry against teacher discrimination and violence toward students, and therefore advocate HRE training for all teachers. Shortcomings in infrastructure and hygiene, inadequate control by school authorities over certain areas of the facility (particularly in the bathrooms) also contribute to a deteriorating school environment where conditions are unappealing and dangerous and are an affront to the dignity of people who need to use them.

These perceptions among teachers, gathered informally for this study, reflect the broad range of factors involved and the different perspectives for seeing the problems of peaceful coexistence, safety and violence in the schools. Nor can the influence of the press be ignored. In countries where the media energetically exploit extreme cases, they often lapse into sensationalism and melodrama, contributing to simplistic, often biased perceptions among the population and pushing authorities to take fast, harsh action.

The report notes that at present the media appear to be “setting the agenda” in this field, with all the risks that implies. First, educational authorities feel pressured into knee-jerk reactions to the most highly publicized cases, launching policies and actions that are not well thought out or have not been consulted. Second, they fail to assert their own well-founded position on problems and make it heard with the same force as the media or other private interests speaking through the media, including the economic concerns of companies that sell security services.

### **Development of policies for safety and peaceful coexistence in the schools with a focus on rights: statistical information and situation assessments**

1. Only a little over half of the 17 countries studied (53%) report that *the ministries of education have statistical information and data bases on incidents or situations of violent conflict in the nation's schools*, to varying degrees. Five countries (29%) have this information to an acceptable degree, while the other four (23.5%) have it partially (information is incomplete, disperse or indirect). Having reliable empirical data of national coverage is critical if the countries are to take a serious

approach to these problems without succumbing to name-calling or sensationalist perceptions, so often fueled by news stories on the most extreme events.

Statistical data can be gathered by the ministry of education itself or by other entities, including the police or the ministry of justice. If they are to serve educational needs, such data need to meet certain minimum requirements. The ministry of education should have the right to express its opinion and approve decisions on the design of data collection exercises to incorporate the perspective that educational institutions need; and the data must be easily available for analysis by the ministry as a basis for making decisions. In the absence of these minimum conditions, the mere existence of data offers little or no benefit to the education system.

2. In several countries, the ministry of education compiles data from individual complaints or reports filed on violence in schools; the complaints may be received in writing or over a special telephone hot line. This type of information, while useful, tends to be biased and inadequate. It reflects particular situations, mostly extreme cases, which comprise a very small share of all the events that actually occur, and there are no procedures for verification and collecting evidence.
3. Researchers found that in eight of 17 countries (47%), the lead institution for education practiced some *procedure for processing and analysis of available statistical data*. The same five countries that had acceptable amounts of data were also achieving acceptable levels of processing and analysis (29%), while another three (18%) did so only partially. Altogether, this indicator points to results similar to the last one, although with lower levels of achievement. Education authorities possessing information and databases tend to process and analyze their data in some fashion, even if their methods are less than optimal. A few of the countries that conduct nationwide surveys on this subject also compile and process data on victimization and perceptions of violence that are more sophisticated and nuanced.
4. Systematic processing of data entails classifying and disaggregating the information; each country tends to use its own criteria for this purpose, even though specialized organizations recommend that national indicators be based on internationally accepted standards. A move toward using common criteria and categories in processing data would make it possible to draw comparisons across different situations.
5. Positive findings on the *availability of descriptive or narrative studies by the ministry of education based on available data* are less widespread than for the previous indicators. There is a steady decline in the degree to which the three indicators on this variable yield a positive result, and the third drops off more abruptly than the first two. This is not surprising because producing analytical studies entails more rigorous and in-depth work than merely collecting and processing statistical data. Only five of the 17 countries (29%) have such studies: three in acceptable quantities (18%) and two partially, as they have fewer studies or studies of lesser scope. Although this indicator produced poor results, it is encouraging that four more countries (23.5%) are currently working on studies of this kind.
6. Some of the processes for analyzing or sorting data and developing studies call for a multi-sectoral initiative rather than falling exclusively to the ministries of education. These are good examples of synergy among national institutions or with international organizations, combining efforts, expertise and resources.

## Policies, plans and programs

7. The technical concepts *guidelines, plans, programs and projects* are not used consistently among countries, and the distinction between one category and the next is often blurred. The concepts should be used cautiously and understood as approximations, not absolutes, as the terminology can vary from one place to another.
8. Thirteen of 17 countries (76.5%) already have some type of ministry guidelines or instructions on peaceful coexistence and violence prevention in the schools. Of these, eight countries (47%) have developed them to an acceptable degree, and five countries (29%), to a partial degree. The indicator found a high degree of compliance because this very broad category of public policies includes provisions contained in separate and distinct regulatory instruments (the general law of education, children's code, disciplinary rules, orders by different ministries or circulars by education authorities). The category could also apply for rules of a general nature, perhaps not specifically targeting the problems covered by this study, but including them under a particular article or paragraph, albeit briefly or schematically.
9. The indicator on the existence of *specific plans in this field* points to significantly lower levels of compliance, indeed the lowest of the entire variable. Of the 17 countries, only seven (41%) have some kind of plan on this subject, one (6%) to an acceptable degree and six (35%), only partially.
10. By contrast, *specific programs and projects on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools* are present to some degree in the great majority of countries from which information was obtained (94%). Of the 17 countries, 10 (59%) received acceptable scores, while six (35%) are partially acceptable.
11. If the public policies are placed on a continuum between the extremes of “generality/specificity,” the overall tendency is for the majority of the countries fall into two clear categories: the most common are operational, specific policies with limited coverage (*programs and projects in the schools*), followed by the exact opposite, with policies as general as possible (*guidelines or instructions from the ministry*). The types of policy found most infrequently were intermediate: comprehensive but also specific, referring directly and explicitly to issues of peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools (*specific plans*). The macro level and micro levels are equally important and useful, but there is still a need for more in-depth, comprehensive educational proposals that cover vast geographic areas, that are organic, developed via participatory processes and based on inter-sectoral commitments. This is easier when public policy instruments are in place, such as national plans.

In conclusion, the region is moving ahead quickly, but remains visibly ambivalent. A very positive sign is that since the second half of the last decade, the States have been adopting initiatives for intervention in primary and secondary schools to build peaceful coexistence deliberately and systematically and tackle possible situations of violence; but it is not encouraging to find so few examples of the fullest, most comprehensive level of planning: national plans that are attuned to the needs and specificities of each State. The presence of so few plans to address these matters suggests that many difficulties still stand in the way of developing authentic policies of national scope that are systematic, comprehensive and all-encompassing.

12. Many of the existing plans, programs and projects were inspired by or developed in cooperation with civil society organizations or international organizations. In some cases, it was even reported that the initiative had originated when these entities approached the State to exert pressure and work with it on this problem.
13. Researchers identified education policies on peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools that explicitly and clearly incorporate the *values and principles of human rights education*. Of the 17 countries, 13 (76.5%) reflect these values and principles extensively, while three (18%) do so partially. Together they make up 94.5% of the universe of study. This means they were conceived with a rights perspective instilled by international agreements the States have signed, especially the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The presence of a rights perspective in these policies goes beyond merely citing international instruments as a standard; it means that human rights are present in other ways as well. For example, they could underpin activities for organizing program and project work with other members of the education community, or serve as course content in program and project training opportunities for members of the education community.

### Policy implementation

14. In answer to the question of *whether the ministry of education has a department or departments formally responsible for addressing this problem*, the indicator was met to some degree in 14 of the 17 countries studied (82%): it was acceptable in five (29%) and partial in the other nine (53%). Partial compliance means that researchers failed to identify a specific entity within the ministry of education that was clearly responsible for the problem, but instead, several different departments (sometimes pertaining to different ministries) had some share of responsibility, although not clearly delimited, and all were acting separately. This reflects an institutional response in principle, although the dispersion of objectives and the assignment to a variety of State agencies, with no joint coordinated action, does not guarantee an effective response to these serious problems.
15. The indicator that produced the fewest results was the *existence of a budget for implementing plans, programs and projects on peaceful coexistence, safety and prevention of violence in the schools*. Only six of the 17 countries (35%) were found to have some type of official budget resources. Three (18%) satisfied the indicator partially. Two countries (12%) reported no budget, while researchers in nine countries, the majority of the universe of study (53%), found no information in some cases, or insufficient information to judge the current budget situation.

The fact that the budget is partial or non-existent does not mean that current policies are not being implemented at all. There is evidence that they are taking place to some degree, but it is not clear how much or how their daily operations are funded (resources may come from other budget items or programs, or from projects with international organizations or private businesses). In any case, this indicator points out a weakness found in many good proposals. Without a stable official budget, it is practically impossible to carry out on-going specialized actions with good coverage that require professional support to enhance the work of regular teachers (social workers,



counselors, psychologists and in certain cases for prevention of serious violence or crimes, police officers).

The picture for the region is more promising in terms of the *participation of different stakeholders in education*, as three-fourths of the countries in the study have policies on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools whose text explicitly calls for a variety of stakeholders to take part in implementation, in addition to the country's lead agency for education. Ten countries (59%) do so consistently, repeatedly and on a sound footing; in another three countries (18%), the point is raised timidly, occasionally or irregularly. If the leaders in policy implementation are given active participation and decision-making authority, they not only exercise their right to participate in matters they care about, but also are certain to take ownership of the policies and commit to them, which helps bring about better results.

Formal official documents are not always enough for a good evaluation of policy implementation. Sometimes the texts do not differentiate among the many people involved in education (they speak of the "education community" without specifying who it is), or they fail to define everyone's duties and competencies, that is, whether they are empowered to deliberate and propose policies, and above all, to make decisions about them. A word of caution is in order here. If such details are not specified clearly, the participation asserted in such policy documents may end up being more token than real.

The *ministry of education produces and distributes rights-based materials for training and public education* on the problems under study. Three-fourths of the countries give positive results, six of which were acceptable in quantitative terms (35%) and another seven, partially acceptable or limited (41%). Most common are print versions of the policy documents themselves, as well as study materials for teachers, students and families (brochures, guides and handbooks), festivals and public-awareness drives. Unfortunately, there is very little information on how these materials are distributed among members of the educational community and to what extent, so it is impossible to say whether they reach the entire country on an equal footing.

The ministries of education emphasize that regulatory documents and public-education materials are posted on their websites, but in reality, the Internet is not a medium that the main stakeholders in education use habitually to find out about public policies and educational content. If it is not enhanced with other sources of information, its impact is not only low, but difficult to estimate.

16. Of all the indicators for this variable, the most successful is *whether training activities on this subject are offered to the different participants in education*. Fifteen of the 17 countries (88%) reported different types of training activities for principals, teachers, students and families, 10 to an acceptable degree (59%) and five, only partially (29%).

The activities generally consist of lectures and workshops for different audiences and on different topics, in two main categories. The first category is training for school principals and teachers on the content and implementation of public policies. It covers such topics as human rights education, how to perform situation assessments on peaceful coexistence and violence in the school, legal and psychological guidance, strategies for conflict resolution, support for the participatory development of school codes or regulations on peaceful coexistence (in countries that have them)



evaluation of policies for peaceful coexistence in the schools, and the like. The other category, training for the broader educational community, raises awareness about problems with peaceful coexistence, developing social relationships and preventing violence. The training covers such topics as self-esteem and communication, life skills, ethics and values, citizenship and human rights, crime prevention, alerts on new types of crime, especially using the Internet, addiction prevention, gender equality, sexuality and HIV-AIDS prevention, culture, recreation and sports, etc.

17. The countries very often create forms of cooperation between the country's lead entity of education and other entities to multiply the impact of training and awareness-raising. Examples may include other government departments (local governments, the ombudsman, child welfare, other ministries such as women or social development, health, security, internal affairs or justice, the board of elections, the local police, etc.), local or international nongovernmental organizations (such as Plan International) and inter-governmental organizations (UNICEF, UNESCO, WHO, UNFPA, IIHR, OEI, and the like).

Inter-institutional activities can be very effective and productive if they are planned jointly and carried out in close coordination; this is not always the case in the countries examined, despite the best of intentions. Effective inter-sectoral cooperation is recognized as a valuable but challenging goal. Because efforts were found to be disjointed in so many cases, with similar but unconnected interventions being made repeatedly, the need is more pressing than ever to develop national plans for preventing violence in the schools and in overall society.

### Policy monitoring and evaluation

18. As a whole, this variable in the research matrix yielded the fewest positive results by comparison with the others. Such a finding can be explained in part because the concern with developing specific policies on peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools is relatively recent.
19. The best results are on *policy monitoring* to determine whether policies are reviewed and are progressing as expected. A total of 11 countries (65%) apply some strategy for monitoring or follow-up on these policies; two do so regularly and thoroughly (12%) and the other nine do so irregularly, inconsistently or partially (53%). Other countries are in the process of developing or implementing monitoring mechanisms (12%).
20. The findings drop off quite abruptly on *evaluation of the results of current plans, programs and projects*. Only five of the 17 countries studied (30%) have some type of evaluation mechanism. Two countries have set up acceptable, regular evaluations (12%), and three evaluate partially or sporadically (18%). Another three countries (18%) are currently developing or about to develop some evaluation mechanism, while in eight countries, nearly half the universe of study (47%), none was identified.
21. The figures obtained on *availability of evaluation findings and conclusions* are even more meager. Five countries (30%) have either quantitative or qualitative findings and conclusions, two to an acceptable degree (12%) and three, partially (18%). No country was in the process of developing them. The majority, 11 of the 17 countries (65%), have none. The two countries that performed

best on the latter two indicators (Mexico and Argentina) have developed information systems that collect quantitative and qualitative data to support every stage of the policy process, from context assessments to final evaluation of results and impact.

The fact that a plan, program or project is relatively new or recent cannot be used as an excuse for not evaluating and is insufficient reason for official results on its operations to be unavailable, even if they are only partial or provisional. Specialists and local and international academic institutions will always make valuable contributions to research and evaluation, but they cannot and should not relieve the public system of discharging its responsibility. Without strategies for monitoring and evaluation, any public education policy runs the risk of walking blind, especially in a complex, multi-faceted, constantly changing problem area such as the one covered by this report.

## Section V

### Recommendations

It is not the task of the Tenth Report to suggest actual content for policies to create healthy coexistence in the schools, guarantee safe school environments and prevent outbreaks of violence that threaten the educational community. Such policies call for tailor-made approaches attuned to the circumstances, needs and concerns of each particular national or even local setting. The process of building effective policies is led by the authorities in charge of education in each country.

The only such recommendation that can be drawn from the report is that, if the country has no policies in this regard or if existing policies are incomplete or fragmented, the State should undertake to introduce them based on a thorough, well-grounded assessment and action proposals produced from within the educational system itself, guided by authorities but involving all relevant sectors.

In fact this process has already begun and is moving ahead quickly in the region. The purpose of this research was to conduct systematic observation of the progress of human rights education; drawing on its findings, the IIHR would like to offer several recommendations to the States Parties of the Protocol of San Salvador for developing, consulting on, implementing and evaluating such policies.

National education authorities are advised:

- To explore the perceptions held by teachers, other members of the education community and the general public concerning peaceful coexistence, safety and violence in the schools (which, as this report found, are many and varied); once these perceptions are understood, they can be used as input (i) to guide relevant educational policies in areas where they may offer a useful contribution, or (ii) to design actions for raising awareness and clarifying areas in which perceptions are mistaken or biased.
- To explore perceptions and opinions on current policies in this field among the different people involved in education – how appropriate the policies are and how well they are working; this is a recognition of their right to participate and a necessary condition for such policies to be implemented effectively.
- To explore the role played by the mass media in creating citizen perceptions on safety and violence in the schools and the impact of the media on “setting the agenda” in this field, to ensure that this task is not wrested from the key players: the agency that stands at the helm of education in the country, and members of the education community. The ministry of education must exercise and retain leadership in this field with the same energy and diligence as it displays in matters of the curriculum.
- To make sure that the ministries of education have statistical information and data bases that are as complete as possible on incidents and situations of violent conflict in the country’s schools; access to reliable empirical data of nationwide coverage is crucial for addressing these problems conscientiously without succumbing to name-calling or unfounded perceptions.
- If some government office other than the ministry of education gathers such data, it is important to ensure that (i) the ministry has the right to express its opinion and give its approval for the design of data collection exercises to incorporate the perspective that educational institutions need, and (ii) the data must be easily available for analysis by the ministry as a basis for making decisions.

- To use clear rules for classifying and sorting the information, and specific indicators based on internationally accepted standards in order to move toward common rules and categories for processing data; this will facilitate comparisons between conditions in different places or in a single place over time.
- To foster descriptive and narrative studies based on available data, to be conducted by the ministries of education or other national or international organizations working together with the ministries of education.
- To promote the design of specific national plans for handling problems of peaceful coexistence, safety and violence prevention in the schools and in overall society, that are comprehensive, complete and all-encompassing, have the broadest geographic coverage, are developed in participatory fashion and are grounded in inter-sectoral commitments to work together. By its very nature, any plan should include theoretical, strategic and operational components; for example, it could contain a conceptual foundation, an explanation of the scope of coverage, an assessment of the surrounding context, a strategy, quantifiable goals, specific actions to be taken, a working timetable, the names of those responsible, resources and evaluation mechanisms.
- To adopt a genuine human rights approach in all policies on this subject, whether existing or still in development; policies should not merely make reference to international instruments, but should incorporate them as a blueprint to organize continuing work with the education community as part of programs and projects for intervention in the schools.
- To guarantee that each school and the many different players in its educational community (principals, teachers, support staff, students and parents) enjoy real, active participation and have decision-making power in developing, implementing and evaluating policies on this subject, as a recognition of their right to participation and a guarantee that everyone will take ownership of the policies and commit to them.
- To ensure that there is at least one office or unit within the ministry of education responsible for handling this problem and for applying current policies, and to endow it with sufficient official budget resources to carry out regular actions of nationwide coverage. If more than one unit holds this mandate, it is essential for them to work together in coordination. If various units hold similar responsibilities in more than one government department (for example, in several different ministries), inter-sectoral government bodies should be set up for coordination and cooperation.
- To strengthen endeavors by the ministry of education and other entities committed to addressing this problem, for producing and distributing training and dissemination materials that provide accurate, well-founded information on the problems that need to be prevented and solved, and that have a clear human rights focus.
- To systematically and regularly evaluate existing public policies in this field and the actions for school intervention derived therefrom; see that the findings and conclusions of these official evaluations (i) are communicated to and discussed with the education community, and (ii) are made available to the mass media and the general public.
- To identify and study best practices performed in this field in other countries of the region and the world, and to learn from them.

## Section VI - Appendices

### 1. Tables used in the first cycle of HRE Reports

#### *First Report (2002): Development of HRE in the normative sphere*

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 document
	Inclusion of HRE in official documents and national educational plans.
Institutional development	Existence of government departments specialized in HRE.
	Government programs specialized in HRE.

#### *Second Report (2003): Development of HRE in school curricula and textbooks*

Variables	Indicators
<b>Domain 1: Curricular regime</b>	
Incorporation of HRE contents 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, and political and ideological pluralism.
	Content on education 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 HR and constitutional guarantees.
	Content on justice, State institutions and the Rule of Law.
	Content on democracy, voting rights, elections, and political and ideological pluralism.
	Content on education in values (solidarity, human dignity, peace, tolerance, and understanding among nations).
<b>Domain 2: School textbooks</b>	
Incorporation of contents into educational textbooks for 5th, 8th and 11th grades	Content on HR and constitutional guarantees.
	Content on justice, State institutions and the Rule of Law.
	Content on democracy, voting rights, elections, and political and ideological pluralism.
	Content on education in values (solidarity, human dignity, peace, tolerance, and understanding among nations).
<b>Domain 3: Cross-cutting perspectives</b>	
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 peoples and afro-descendants are depicted in textbooks illustrations.
	Number of indigenous peoples and afro-descendants in textbook illustrations.
	Auxiliary or complementary bibliography on intercultural issues and bilingualism.
Interaction between the Civil Society and the State	Role of the civil society in the process of preparing the curriculum.
	Contents that address the knowledge and/or participation of the civil society in different governmental and non-governmental organizations in course programs and textbooks.

*Third Report (2004): The development of HRE in teacher education*

Variables	Indicators
<b>Domain 1: Education and training in legislation and policy documents and institutions</b>	
Contents 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.
Contents 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.
<b>Domain 2: Basic training</b>	
Curricula of teaching training schools	Course content on human rights. Didactic content on human rights teaching. Research papers, theses and essays on human rights education.
Curricula of other higher education teacher training institutions	Course content on human rights. Didactic content on human rights teaching. Research papers, theses and essays on human rights education.
<b>Domain 3: In-service training for educators</b>	
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. Materials on the teaching of human rights.
Courses, one-day events, or activities for educators provided by the Office of the Ombudsman	Courses, workshops, or one-day events on human rights. Agreements between Ombudsman and other organizations. Materials on the teaching of human rights.

*Fourth Report (2005): Development of HRE in national planning*

Variables	Indicators
<b>Domain 1: Developing the plan</b>	
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 human rights education 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, expert meetings, 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 the preparation of the plan.
<b>Domain 2: Contents of the plan</b>	
Formal components 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.



Thematic 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.
<b>Domain 3: Implementing the plan</b>	
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 to the HREPLAN is being used.

*Fifth Report (2006): Development of HRE in curriculum contents and courses 10 to 14 years of age*

Variables	Indicators
<b>Domain 1: Curriculum design process</b>	
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.
<b>Domain 2: Curriculum slots for 2000 and 2005</b>	
Courses for 12-year programs	Map by grades.
Course load (hours) of the map	Curriculum format and design.
	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.
<b>Domain 3: Teaching resources for 2000 and 2005</b>	
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.

## 2. Tables used in the second cycle of HRE Reports

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

Variables	Indicators
<b>Domain 1: Right to education –as context–</b>	
Adoption of norms 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.
<b>Domain 2: Right to human rights education (2000-2007)</b>	
Adoption of legal provisions regarding 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.
<b>Domain 3: Student government programs (1990-2000-2007)</b>	
Adoption of legal provisions on student governments	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 governments in the schools.

### *Seventh Report (2008): Development of specific human rights concepts in the curriculum for students from 10 to 14 years of age*

Variables	Indicators
<b>Domain 1: Curriculum programs for 10- to 12-year-olds – Primary school</b>	
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).

Variables	Indicators
Domain 2: Curriculum programs for 13- to 14-year-olds – High School <sup>1</sup>	
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.
1.12 Citizenship.	
1.13 Global citizenship.	
1.14 Economic and social development. Sustainable development.	
2.  Inclusion of the history of human rights	2.1 Historical background of human rights in ancient times 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, people with disabilities).
	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 the country, if applicable.

<sup>1</sup> Shading has been added to the indicators that were exclusively applied to 13- to 14-year-olds.

3.  Inclusion of basic human rights standards and institutions	3.1	Democracy.
	3.1.1	Historical evolution 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).

*Eighth Report (2008): Development of specific human rights concepts in textbooks for students from 10 to 14 years of age*

Domain 1: Curriculum programs for 10- to 12-year-olds. Primary		
Variables	Indicators	
1.  Inclusion of concepts and basic conceptual developments 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.	Humans 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.  Incorporation of basic standards and institutions on human rights	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	
Variable	Indicators <sup>(*)</sup>
1. Inclusion of concepts and basic conceptual developments on 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.
	1.12 Citizenship.
	1.13 Global citizenship.
	1.14 Economic and social development. Sustainable development.
2. Inclusion of the history of human rights	2.2.1 Development of human rights in the 20th and 21st centuries.
	2.4.1 The two International Covenants: Civil and Political Rights, and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
	2.5.1 CEDAW Convention.
	2.5.2 Other human rights instruments for specific populations (indigenous, refugees, disabled).
	2.8 Cases of massive human rights violations in recent history in the world, Latin America and this country, if applicable.
3. Incorporation of basic standards and institutions on human rights	3.1.1 Historical development of the concept of democracy.
	3.2.1 Elections and suffrage.
	3.4.1 Transparency and accountability (or in negative terms, the fight against corruption and impunity).
	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.

*Ninth Report (2010): Development of the human rights education methodology in school textbooks: 10 to 14 years of age*

Domain: Student exercises	
Variables	Indicators
1. Inclusion of human rights values and attitudes	1.1 Human dignity
	1.2 Life and personal safety
	1.3 Identity and self-esteem
	1.4. Freedom
	1.5 Duty
	1.6 Equality/freedom from discrimination
	1.7 Appreciation of diversity (in different senses)
	1.8 Coexistence and cooperation
	1.9 Fairness
	1.10 Solidarity
	1.11 Pluralism
	1.12 Peace
2. Inclusion of skills or abilities for behaving in favor of human rights	2.1 For critical thinking
	2.2 For communication and effective argumentation
	2.3 For cooperative work
3. Use of educational strategies and resources to encourage participation	3.1 Direct investigation of real-life conditions outside the school (local community and its members)
	3.2 Problematicization of ideas and situations (poses questions, dilemmas, conflicts among rights, debate of positions and interests involving human rights, etc.)
	3.3 Reenacting or role-playing realistic scenarios (acting out situations involving human rights, real or hypothetical but believable)
	3.4 Innovative, non-traditional support materials
	3.5 Progressively in-depth exploration of issues or research strategies

(\*) The indicators given are specific to Domain 2–Secondary Level—and have been added to those already used for Domain 1–Primary Level; they will not be repeated here in the interest of brevity).





# Inter-American Institute of Human Rights

## General Assembly

(2010-2014)

Thomas Buergenthal  
*Honorary President*

Sonia Picado S.  
*President*

Rodolfo Stavenhagen  
*Vice President*

Margaret E. Crahan  
*Vice President*

Pedro Nikken  
*Permanent Advisor*

Mayra Alarcón Alba  
José Antonio Aylwin Oyarzún  
Line Bareiro  
Lloyd G. Barnett  
César Barros Leal  
Allan Brewer-Carías  
Marco Tulio Bruni-Celli  
Antônio A. Cançado Trindade  
Douglass Cassel  
Gisèle Côté-Harper  
Mariano Fiallos Oyanguren  
Héctor Fix-Zamudio  
Robert K. Goldman  
Claudio Grossman  
María Elena Martínez  
Juan E. Méndez  
Elizabeth Odio Benito  
Nina Pacari  
Máximo Pacheco  
Mónica Pinto  
Hernán Salgado Pesantes  
Mitchell A. Seligson  
Wendy Singh  
Mark Ungar

## Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

Dinah Shelton  
José de Jesús Orozco Henríquez  
Rodrigo Escobar Gil  
Felipe González  
Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro  
Luz Patricia Mejía  
María Silvia Guillén

Roberto Cuéllar M.  
*Executive Director*

## Inter-American Court of Human Rights

Diego García Sayán  
Leonardo A. Franco  
Manuel E. Ventura Robles  
Margarette May Macaulay  
Rhadys Abreu Blondet  
Alberto Pérez Pérez  
Eduardo Vio Grossi

The academic programs and activities of the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights are made possible through contributions of agencies of international cooperation, foundations, non-governmental organizations, United Nations and Organization of American States agencies and bodies, universities and academic centers. The diversity of the contributions strengthens the IIHR mission and reinforces the pluralism of its educational action in favor of democratic values and respect for human rights in the Americas.