

Human Rights Education Survey Paper by Andrea Cohen (2015)

1. Introduction

1.1 There is nothing self-evident about human rights education (HRE). The inherent and inalienable quality of human rights does not extend to the teaching of human rights – being born with the right to be taught one’s human rights. If it did, there wouldn’t be the need for United Nations declarations and programs, and a vast array of (inter)national NGOs and organizations working to promote human rights education in schools. Human rights educators believe that understanding the meaning of human rights by individuals, groups, and political and community organizations, begins within each of these communities of people. With understanding comes informed action. Yet before understanding comes knowledge - knowing what human rights are, the foundational documents that lay them out, and how they affect actions by and between individuals, groups, and the state. This is the domain of education in general and HRE in particular.

1.2 In 2011, the United Nations adopted the Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training recognizing the right to access to human rights education (HRE), specifying not only what should be learned, but also why and how: “The adoption of this new Declaration also offers educators and policy makers an occasion to reassess national policies and priorities in the light of international standards” (HREA press release, 19 December 2011).

1.3 The Declaration was signed during Phase Two of a three phase program by the UN to encourage HRE as part of each nation’s educational curriculum, the UN World Programme for Human Rights Education (UNWPHRE, proclaimed by the General Assembly on 10 December 2004) and followed the UN Decade for Human Rights Education 1995-2005. Phase One (2005-2009) focused on primary and secondary education; Phase Two (2010-2014) focused on “higher education and on human rights training programmes for teachers and educators, civil servants, law enforcement officials and military personnel at all levels;” Phase Three (2015-2019) will focus on “strengthening the implementation of the first two phases and promoting human rights training for media professionals and journalists.”

1.4 The Plans of Action accompanying each of these Phases lay out a 4 step process starting with an analysis of the current situation followed by a setting of priorities and developing a national strategy. Implementation and monitoring of progress and evaluation of effectiveness round out the procedure (UNWPHRE Plans of Action for all Phases). Ministries of Education - or their equivalents or representatives - were encouraged to, at a minimum, take steps to assess the current knowledge of human rights and pedagogical steps undertaken for HRE.

1.5 A number of countries heeded the call (examples are Cambodia, Japan, the Asia-Pacific region, Bangladesh in addition to the countries included here) and conducted surveys, using the data to make recommendations to the State for ways to achieve the goal of implementing a more rigorous and formal inclusion of HRE in traditional and non-traditional education nationwide. This first course of action inventoried what is currently being done primarily in primary and secondary education, and teacher preparation and continuing education programs. This also established a baseline with which to measure progress in the future.

2. Surveys

2.1 Since completing a survey on the state of HRE in the United States in 2000 there is little new information available regarding human rights knowledge. The goal of this brief overview of international surveys is to identify a set of recommendations for conducting one or more surveys in the US that fit the particular national context of the US while benefiting from the experiences of these other countries as they conducted surveys.

2.2 The following surveys were read for this review (see Table 1 for a summary):

Australia, 2011, Australian Human Rights Commission: Human rights education in the national school Curriculum: Position Paper of the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Canada, 2013, Canada Teachers' Federation: Human Rights Education in Canada: Results from a CTF Teacher Survey.

Denmark, 2013, The Danish Institute for Human Rights: Mapping Human Rights Education in Danish Schools.

Ireland, 2011, The Center for Human Rights and Citizenship Education: Teachers, Human Rights and Human Rights Education: Knowledge, Perspectives and Practices of Primary School Teachers in Ireland.

Scotland, 2013, BEMIS Scotland: A Review of Human Rights Education in Schools in Scotland.

USA, 2000, Dennis N. Banks, Ph.D.: Promises to Keep: Results of the National Survey of Human Rights Education 2000.

2.3 The reasons for choosing these surveys included:

1. Some geographic spread and global representation.
2. Socio-economic and education system similarities.
3. Comparable methodologies for consistency in reviewing outcomes and recommendations. The methodologies of choice were (online) questionnaires and interviews.

4. The inclusion of all levels of formal education including teacher training and continuing professional development.

Analysis

3.1 The leitmotifs to be gleaned from the surveys point to:

- **Definition of HRE:** The definition of HRE follows the 2011 UN Declaration of HRE & Training (if done after 2011) or the UN World Programme for Human Rights Education (if completed before 2011).
- **Lack of understanding:** The definition of HRE is not always understood by teachers which results in the actual practice of HRE found in a variety of subjects including Physical Well-Being.
- **A top-down approach:** The national government must take the lead followed by local governments and administrators, and educational policy makers and administrators tasked with setting standards and mandates.
- **Limited knowledge:** Teachers (primary through secondary) are limited in their own knowledge of human rights and HRE and therefore shy away from teaching human rights unless it is specifically part of the curriculum or lesson plan or focuses on a well-known violation such as the Holocaust.
- **Teacher preparation:** Teacher education programs and continued professional development offerings do not have HRE as a mandatory subject either in terms of content or pedagogy.
- **Curriculum restrictions:** There is limited room in the curriculum given standards and benchmarks to be met within the existing curriculum. Some reports recommend the inclusion of HRE in the national curriculum to address this issue.

See Appendix 1 for a summary of major findings and recommendations.

3.2 All the surveys approach the enforcement of HRE from the top-down, primarily because the UNWPHRE directly addresses the State, and the reports satisfy their reporting obligations. The recommendations, therefore, involve the State and educational mandates. The desire is to make it mandatory, explicit, visible, and everywhere. This requires key stakeholders to buy-in: the State, education ministers, education experts, HRE experts, NGOs, national/state/local/district education administrators, teachers, parents, community groups, faith communities.

3.3 In addition, all the surveys come to comparable conclusions: not enough HRE is being done in every sector of formal education: primary, secondary, and teacher preparation and continued professional education; HRE must be infused into the curriculum; the state has the obligation to enforce integration - top-down.

3.4 The recommendations lay out an extensive list of strategies for action, many of which incorporate materials readily available online and from human rights related organizations.

3. Discussion

4.1 Human Rights Education is a powerful tool against injustice and violations or abuses of human rights as set forth in human rights instruments. Quality education, for supporters of HRE, includes education about human rights. This knowledge will then impact a child's values, attitudes, and behaviors in a way that leads to a human rights-based approach to life and fellow human beings.

4.2 The overall objective is to make HRE mandatory, explicit, visible, and everywhere. This requires key stakeholders to buy-in: The State, education ministers, education experts, HRE experts, NGOs, national/state/local/district education administrators, teachers, parents, community groups, faith communities. The surveys all acknowledge the main locus of change in teacher education programs. Many teachers surveyed expressed that their lack of knowledge about human rights and international human rights instruments resulted in a reluctance to teach these concepts unless it fit into an existing lesson or unit, or tied into school culture.

4.3 The surveys highlighted the problem of HRE falling under the category of education in general rather than as a distinct subject. This distinction is crucial. If HRE is a discrete subject, it becomes part of the traditional pantheon of pedagogy. If, however, HRE is something general and not bounded by the parameters of a particular subject, it begins to look less like the teaching of human rights through human rights instruments and more like a general disposition course that includes human-rights based ideas and concepts but that has no direct link to the foundation (documents) of human rights.

4. Recommendations

5.1 It is vital to determine what the results of a survey will provide not only in terms of information but also, and perhaps more importantly, in terms of action plans. The scope and nature of a survey (or series of surveys) falls into three main categories:

- **General human rights knowledge.** Survey target audiences: K-12 school children; university students (undergraduate and graduate); K-12 teachers; pre-service teachers; community members.
- **Human rights education practice.** Survey targets teacher education programs focusing on pre-service teachers, K-12 teachers, and college/university professors/lecturers. This can also include an update of the Banks' USA 2000 educational mandate survey.
- **Human rights education policy.** This third option targets educational administrators at every level and legislators who in some way influence educational policy in general (federal and state level) and in particular (district

and school level). The level of support of these stakeholders and gatekeepers is essential for the success of human rights education implementation. Targeting these gatekeepers / policy makers can provide valuable information to determine top-down barriers to the inclusion of HRE.

- **Community members.** Education takes place within a broader community of (extended) family, and civil, civic, and religious groups, all potential supporters of the inclusion of HRE in schools. A tactical map outlining the web of relationships may provide valuable information of key allies for change.

5.2 The Internet currently provides a wealth of information for educators to engage in HRE. We know from the other surveys that teachers lack sufficient training in HRE which effects their ability and confidence in teaching human rights through international human rights instruments and providing the human-rights based instruction that ties it to concepts that often fall under the category of school ethos or classroom behavior/management such as bullying, discrimination, and racism. The ability to make informed choices with regard to the choice and use of materials is an area of concern to be addressed.

5.3 HRE USA wants to make a difference. Several universities have expressed interest in carrying out surveys under the auspices of an HRE USA initiative. HRE USA's vision may better be served by determining how a survey will benefit its mission of lifelong learning, empowerment, and action. The information provided by surveys are top-down but offer no definite action plans. No evidence exists that the recommendations in any of the surveys were implemented. The conclusions provided by the surveys do not provide any information not already surmised. While a formal baseline or benchmark would be helpful, HRE USA may be better served by examining how the conclusions and recommendations of other surveys could be operationalized. In essence, there would be parallel projects: one engaged in rigorous, professional, academic surveying; the other exploring ways information already available can be used now for action.

Australia, 2011, Australian Human Rights Commission: Human rights education in the national school Curriculum: Position Paper of the Australian Human Rights Commission.

As this is a position paper, the Australian Human Rights Commission focuses on the importance of HRE and makes recommendations for integrating it into the – what at the time of the paper – was the development of a new national school Curriculum, mandated in 2008 for Foundation to Year 12.

On the importance of HRE:

- It has a positive impact on students and the school environment
- It creates a human rights respecting culture in Australia
- It fulfills on Australia's national and international commitments to HRE

On how HRE should be integrated into the Curriculum:

- Highly visible, cross-cutting element
- Integrated in meaningful and explicit way
- Core and cross-cutting ideas informing learning areas

Embedded in skills and attitudes

- Three interrelated elements of learning of human rights and Australian values:
- Understanding human rights principles and recognising human rights violations
- Demonstrating attitudes and behaviours that are consistent with human rights principles
- Skills in recognising human rights in different situations and taking action to address human rights concerns

Cross-curriculum priority on HR and Australian values:

- Building a culture of human rights - a culture which respects and appreciates diversity, values everyone as equals, and does not tolerate discrimination of any kind.

Canada, 2013, Canada Teachers' Federation: Human Rights Education in Canada: Results from a CTF Teacher Survey.

This survey does not present any conclusions beyond the analysis of results. In addition, there are no recommendations given except a general statement of the importance of HRE to meet “the challenges of an increasingly complex and diverse globalized world.” (p.21) HRE is important for “creating more equitable, empathetic and sustainable communities and societies.” (Ibid)

For CTF, human rights falls within the social justice framework. The online survey was sent to 2600 teachers in 8 of Canada's 10 provinces. The exact number of responses is not given.

Major findings:

Delivery of human rights education in schools:

Curriculum implementation	26%
Extra-curricular activities	6%
Both curriculum and extra-curricular activities	52%
Human rights education does not occur in my school	16% 20% Elementary; 10% Secondary

Curriculum areas with a human rights education component:

Social Science and Humanities; Religious Education	77%
English Language Arts	55%
Health and Physical Education	36%
Aboriginal Studies	30%
Arts	28%
Guidance and Career Education	24%

School-based human rights education projects:

Relationships - Treating others with respect and fostering a community in which everyone feels safe	79%
Social and Cultural inclusion - The value of living in an inclusive society	60%
Active and Participatory Citizenship - The value of engagement, expressing voice and action	56%
Environmental Sustainability - The value of living for today without compromising the needs of future generations	53%
Aboriginal Rights in Canada - Recognizing the unique rights of Aboriginal peoples in Canada	31%
Access - Overcoming social and economic barriers	29%

Value placed on human rights education (as answered by teachers):

By Teachers	92%
By School Administrators	84%
By Students	77%
By School Board Administrators	73%
By Ministry of Education	71%
By Community Members	69%

By Parents	68%
------------	-----

Availability of sufficient resources for human rights education:

Strongly Agree	40%
Somewhat Agree	8%
Somewhat Disagree	27%
Strongly Disagree	14%
Don't Know	11%

Denmark, 2013, The Danish Institute for Human Rights: Mapping Human Rights Education in Danish Schools.

The mapping survey sought to provide more reliable knowledge on HRE. In addition, it would offer information for visualizing Denmark's human rights obligations and lay the groundwork for the preparation and implementation of a government action plan. Finally, the survey would give municipalities and university colleges the tools to assess whether HRE envisaged in official curricula and implemented in practice is adequate or should be strengthened locally.

An expert reference group was consulted during preparation. The survey targeted primary and secondary schools, and teacher education programs. The survey had three components:

- A questionnaire: 1200 questionnaires sent out with 445 respondents
- 16 focus groups: 13 municipal focus groups with 50 teachers, 3 focus groups with 12 teacher trainers.
- A legislative analysis – documents regarding HR frameworks, official curricula.

Major findings:

- Arbitrary whether all pupils learn about rights of the child: only a minority of teachers prepared human rights lessons; most of the attention paid to human rights occurred spontaneously during open discussions.
- Human rights is not adequately incorporated in official curricula at schools and teacher university colleges. The subjects where human rights education has occurred are:

Danish	46%
History	34%
Social Studies	20%
Religion	16%
English	9%
Geography	7%
The class' time	7%
Spontaneous / different contexts	7%
Mathematics	7%
Other	18%

Response to whether in Denmark human rights are so universal, there is no need to pay special attention to them in teaching:

Entirely Agree	2%
Largely Agree	16%
Largely Disagree	34%
Entirely Disagree	42%
Don't Know	7%

- Additionally, there are insufficient frameworks and tools for creating quality HRE. HR taught indirectly.
- 75% of questionnaire respondents find that human rights should be given special attention in curriculum.
- The focus groups report human rights are not actually referred to when engaging in HRE. Teachers & teacher trainers lack knowledge of the theoretical basis for how to adapt HRE to different age levels.
- 87% of teachers say teacher education does not motivate them to teach HR.
- The teacher trainer focus group reported that human rights are generally regarded as a universal ethos. Several report some teachers do not accept human rights as a core value in school, society, and the world at large.

The Danish Institute for Human Rights made 8 recommendations:

1. National action plan for HRE and training to be drawn up by Danish State.
2. Human rights to be inscribed in the Preamble to the Act on Danish primary and lower secondary schools.
3. Human rights to be on equal terms with 'freedom of thought, equality, democracy;' integral to preparation of pupils for participation, joint responsibility, rights and duties based on fundamental freedoms and democracy.
4. Explicit learning objectives for human rights in primary and lower secondary schools. Explicit formulation of learning objectives w/in existing academic subjects and HRE as an interdisciplinary element in compulsory education.
5. Human rights in school policies and organizational plans with compliance monitored.
6. Explicit learning objectives for human rights in teacher education. Expressly in Bachelor of Ed, main subjects of social science and history, educational subjects of general educational theory and educational science.

7. Equal opportunities and non-discriminatory learning environments in Danish primary and lower secondary schools. Commitment to pupil welfare, learning environment, anti-bullying measures. Includes situation reports and other reporting procedures.
8. Equal opportunities and non-discriminatory learning environment at Danish university colleges. Incorporate into accreditation of degree programs.

Ireland, 2011, The Center for Human Rights and Citizenship Education: Teachers, Human Rights and Human Rights Education: Knowledge, Perspectives and Practices of Primary School Teachers in Ireland.

This report “aims to provide an overview of the current provision of human rights education and training across a diverse range of sectors: primary, post-primary, higher education, the civil and public service and legal profession and in the community and voluntary sector” (p.4). The report provides background information on current HRE components in curriculum, including in teacher training programs, and the other sectors covered by the report. Its goal is to provide recommendations for a National Action Plan and “the first national baseline data in relation to primary teachers’ understanding of human rights and HRE and contributes to the development of a research base on HRE in Ireland” (Ibid).

The survey assessed the level of awareness of, and attitudes towards, human rights and HRE of primary school teachers. In addition, it assessed the extent to which HRE is implemented in primary school; sought to identify challenges and opportunities, and the needs of teachers and schools in relation to the delivery of HRE; and the level of compliance of the Irish state with regard to its commitment to implement HRE in primary schools. Data collection took place in 2009.

The methodology:

- Structured questionnaire of 146 open and closed questions
- Distributed by post to 376 teachers in 188 primary schools, two teachers per school
- 152 teachers (40% response rate) from 110 schools (59% response rate) returned questionnaire
- 42 schools returned both questionnaires giving 38% of schools 2x the data

Overall conclusion:

“What emerged from the survey are the many examples of practices occurring in primary schools and classrooms which respond to human rights concerns and incorporate rights respecting approaches. However, these activities tend not to be connected explicitly to human rights language and principles. Furthermore, despite much of the literature reflecting the potential for HRE to provide transformative learning experiences and critique social injustices ... respondents’ conceptualisation of human rights tended to ignore hierarchical social structures, whilst their approach to HRE focused on improved social cohesion rather than empowerment” (p.4; italics mine)

This survey was divided into 7 sections:

A = demographic data (gender, position within school, teaching experience, country of origin, experience overseas, experience of HRE)

B = knowledge and understanding of HR instruments, programmes, institutions

C = identification of priority HR issues relating to adults and children at local, national and global level, and to identify appropriate age HRE should commence

D = data on HRE at whole-school and class level in relation to policy and practice

E = identification of barriers to HRE, supports needed in order to embed in primary education context

F = attitudes toward HR and HRE through Likert scale statements.

Finally = additional comments

Relevant findings:

Section B: Knowledge/Understanding of HRE institutions, programmes, instruments	Includes membership in organisation and personal estimates of understanding of HR + HRE Used a 4 point scale; in results collapsed to 2
Awareness of: Irish Human Rights Commission	Little and or none = 80% Familiar and/or very familiar = 18%
Awareness of: WPHRE	Little and/or none = 88% Familiar and/or very familiar = 10%
Awareness of: UN Decade for HRE	Little and/or none = 85% Familiar and/or very familiar = 13%
Awareness of: CRC	Little and/or none = 59% Familiar and/or very familiar = 38%
Awareness of: UDHR	Little and/or none = 64% Familiar and/or very familiar = 34%
Section C: Attitudes towards HR/HRE	
Age at which children should be made aware they have human rights	By age 11 = 97% 0-7 = 64% 12+ = 3%

<p>Attitudes towards HR/HRE Uses statements and Likert scale</p>	<p>No need to teach children their rights in primary school: Disagreed or strongly disagreed = 86% Rights recognised give children a more positive experience of school: Supported = 81% HRE has a positive impact on children's learning: Supported = 79%</p> <p>HR are aspirational and HR for all unrealistic expectation: Disagreed or strongly disagreed = 61%</p> <p>Too much emphasis on rights vs responsibilities: Agreed or strongly agreed = 31% Disagreed = 24% Neither = 40%</p>
--	---

<p>Section D: understanding HRE</p>	<p>What constitutes HRE Used open questions Understanding of HRE in terms of content, processes and aims</p>
<p>Overall</p>	<p>Understanding of HRE = 64% Content & processes = 51%</p>
<p>Aims of HRE</p>	<p>Vast majority - 73% - referred to awareness, understanding, respect for HR generally; learn about rights and responsibilities, behaviour towards others</p> <p>Empowerment, depending on how it is defined, can be read from the table to be 'being and/or becoming citizens/participating = 5%</p>

Content of HRE	Knowledge of rights instruments = 28 Awareness of HR problems = 24 Knowledge of basic needs & rights = 13 Rights of children = 14 Right to education = 15 Right to respect = 14 Equality & rights = 13 Diversity & rights = 10
Section D: whole school/class level	Implementation of any form of HRE HRE explicitly named in policy documents Own classroom practice
HRE implementation in school	Yes = 57% No = 20% Don't know = 18%
School motivation for HRE	Making children aware of HR abuses = 50% (20 responses) Part of the curriculum = 15 responses (SPHE & Religious Education) In school policy = 2 responses Need to respond to diverse background of pupils (disadvantage, nationality, disability) = 14 responses

Section E: barriers and supports	126 of 152 responded. Results are listed in the survey as a % of overall number of respondents (N=152) and as a % of those who responded (N=126)	
	Respondents	Overall
Time constraints	47%	39%
Overloaded curriculum	40%	34%
Inadequate resources	25%	20%
Inadequate training	11%	9%
Negative perceptions	7%	6%
There are no barriers	7%	6%

General conclusion:

With little or no explicit mention of human rights instruments in the Curriculum, the onus is on teacher to “create the space for HRE” (p. 54). This exacerbates the problem of lack of teacher training in and knowledge of human rights instruments. With lack of teacher knowledge, HRE is in a double bind in getting formally and explicitly embedded in schools and curricula: top-down initiatives are lacking and bottom-up - from teachers lacking sufficient knowledge and training - means human rights and HRE become the Cinderella before the ball. There is, however, opportunity to make human rights and HRE more explicit in policy and practice.

The Center for Human Rights and Citizenship Education made 7 recommendations:

1. To address the deficit in teacher awareness of human instruments: teacher education to incorporate HRE as a matter of priority; dedicated human rights modules in initial and post-graduate teacher training programmes; integrate HRE content, principles and pedagogies across all teacher education and curriculum areas; draw explicitly from human rights instruments and HRE literature.
2. Limited recognition of children, in educational system, as rights holders and teachers as duty bearers with regards to children’s rights needs to be addressed.
3. Primary curriculum implicitly supports HRE but the Curriculum does not offer direction to teach human rights standards and principles. There is need for more explicit inclusion of human rights content knowledge and HRE principles and pedagogies.
4. Support teachers in delivering education with a human rights focus. This revolves around materials so that they do not have to be independently produced.
5. Children’s participation rights: opportunities for children to participate in decision making processes at school, to have their voice heard; participation in school councils. “It is further recommended, that all state policies and documents be proofed to ensure that they fully realise the rights of the child and reflect a conceptualisation of children, including younger children, as social actors and rights holders.” (p. 56)
6. The lack of conceptual clarity regarding HRE both in policy and practice among teachers and education policy makers needs to be addressed: “This uncertainty suggests a need to raise public awareness of the Conventions so that the rhetoric of human rights is rooted in its political, historical and legal context. It also suggests a need for a clear and common understanding of HRE to be reflected in government policy, the Curriculum and wider related discourse.” (p. 56)
7. Good practice is not replicated consistently country-wide. Audit the primary education sector to identify and then showcase examples of good practice leading to mainstreaming in classrooms.

Scotland, 2013, BEMIS Scotland: A Review of Human Rights Education in Schools in Scotland.

Black and Ethnic Minority Infrastructure in Scotland (BEMIS) designed a mapping exercise to gauge teachers' attitudes, experiences and practice with regards to HRE in Scotland. This mapping exercise sought to ascertain the level of engagement with HRE within the school education sector in Scotland. It specifically looked at gaps; recommendations to influence policy; enhance delivery of Curriculum for Excellence; advance a Human Rights Based Approach; support government in reporting obligations.

The goals were to:

- Identify current HRE practice in schools across Scotland.
- Identify good practices.
- Consider gaps or perceived barriers.
- Identify Continued Professional Development needs for teachers and educators.
- Increase awareness amongst policy makers and educators of UNWPHRE.
- Deliver a set of recommendations to various stakeholders.

The survey (both open and closed questions) targeted teachers and was conducted in two stages:

1. BEMIS HRE survey link made available online to teachers and distributed in hard copy to 6 local authority areas chosen as representative geographical sample of urban and rural schools. 10 questions on knowledge of HRE; experiences of HRE in Continued Professional Development; self-assessed competency in incorporating HRE in teaching; attitudes towards HRE; current classroom practices re: HRE; perceived barriers to teaching HRE.
2. Focused interviews (16). Semi-structured interviews.

Major findings:

Questionnaire - 351 returned.

1. 47.9% primary school educators; 46.7% secondary school educators; 3.4% early years; 1.7% other.
2. UNWPHRE 2nd phase awareness: 36% aware; 64% not aware.
3. Attendance at HRE Continued Professional Development: 22% did; 78% did not.
4. Confidence to teach HRE: very 3.7%; fairly 50.1%; not confident 46.2%).
5. Curriculum for Excellence should enable understanding of and respect for HR: Strongly agree 59.4%; agree 37.1%; not sure 2.9%; disagree 0.6%; strongly disagree 0.0%.
6. Using learning contexts that incorporate human rights: Yes 54.9%; No 45.1%. Within subject areas: RMPS, Health & Wellbeing, Modern Studies, Social Subjects. Only 5% taught HRE as part of Global Citizenship. Examining themes.

7. Barriers experienced to teaching HRE: 12.9% have; 87.1% have not. Barriers listed: lack of knowledge and training (62%); dissuaded (16%); lack of time (16%); lack of resources (9%).
8. Good practices: about 10% offered examples.
9. Continued Professional Development on HRE helpful: 89.3% yes, 10.7 % no.

BEMIS made 5 recommendations:

1. The Scottish Government should strengthen its efforts to drive HRE across Scotland.
2. BEMIS strongly recommends that teacher engagement with human rights extends beyond the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
3. The Scottish Government should encourage HRE training across Scotland's diverse learning communities.
4. The Scottish Government and relevant key stakeholders should develop HRE across Scotland's public, private, and civil society sectors.
5. The Scottish Government and relevant key stakeholders should fund further research to extend knowledge and practice in HRE across Scotland.

USA, 2000, Dennis N. Banks, Ph.D.: Promises to Keep: Results of the National Survey of Human Rights Education 2000.

This report presents the results of a questionnaire developed by HRE specialists and sent to “a select sample of 120 knowledgeable persons in state education, asking them to respond to questions about the level of inclusion of human rights topics within their state policies.” The goal of the survey was to ascertain if HRE (or peace education) was considered important as reflected in state policy, standards, and curriculum in K-12 education, and to what extent states are in compliance. Key findings include problems of definition, vocabulary, enforcement, and assessment, and the crucial role the classroom teacher plays in the implementing mandates.

The main focus was on how HRE has been integrated into the K-12 curriculum in the US through an examination of the inclusion of human rights topics within state policies as integrated into statewide mandates, standards, and frameworks.

Methodology:

- A survey developed through consultation with HRE educators across the nation. It was modeled after National Survey of Economic Education, May 1999.
- A select sample of 120 knowledgeable persons was targeted: state education curriculum specialists and officers of state councils for the social studies.

Major findings:

- Mandates and standards: 40% of states indicate HRE is within state mandated curriculum. Terminology varies greatly.
- 5 states (10%) have legislative resolutions to include aspects of HR within the education law of the state. Legislation varies from broad scope of historical and behavior aspects to focused areas that focus primarily on history.
- Primarily Values and Awareness or Knowledge transmitting basic knowledge model (Tibbitts).
- States with mandates does not necessarily mean implementation is required. Seen as guidelines or suggestions. Left up to individual districts.
- 90% consider mandate extends to all grade levels.
- Developmental nature of HRE problematic for those surveyed. Mostly left unanswered.
- Specific curriculum topics: Holocaust, Irish Famine, genocide, slavery, and current issues.
- 50% indicate HR mandate reflected in statewide assessment structure.
- 30 states with no HR mandate: 60% also indicate no pattern of integration of HRE in schools. 40% integrated in social studies.

Key messages:

- Progress has been made.

- Issues raised: conflicting definitions and vocabulary, mandates, and assessments. No data on current practice in the classroom which is crucial.
- Human rights abuses occur here as well: racism, women's issues, children's rights, poverty, police brutality, international trade, unemployment, death penalty, gun control.
- Change the language to have people use 'human rights' in everyday life to become incorporated into culture and thoughts. Leads to problems seen as human rights issues.
- From "a legal and constitutional law culture" to a system of laws and a constitution based on human rights.