UNDERSTANDING WHAT WE DO: EMERGING MODELS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION

FELISA TIBBITTS

Abstract – The author presents three approaches to contemporary human rights education practice: the Values and Awareness Model, the Accountability Model and the Transformational Model. Each model is associated with particular target groups, contents and strategies. The author suggests that these models can lend themselves to theory development and research in what might be considered an emerging educational field. Human rights education can be further strengthened through the appropriate use of learning theory, as well as through the setting of standards for trainer preparation and program content, and through evaluating the impact of programs in terms of reaching learner goals (knowledge, values and skills) and contributing to social change.

Zusammenfassung – Der Autor stellt drei Ansätze zur gegenwärtigen Praxis der Menschenrechtserziehung vor: das Werte- und Bewusstseinsmodell, das Verantwortlichkeitsmodell, und das Transformationsmodell. Jedes Modell wird besonderen Zielgruppen, Strategien und Inhalten zugeordnet. Der Autor schlägt vor, dass diese Modelle für Theorie, Entwicklung und Forschung auf einem sich öffnenden Bildungsgebiet richtungsweisend sein sollten. Menschenrechtserziehung kann mittels angemessener Anwendung von Lerntheorien weiterhin gestärkt werden, sowie durch die Festlegung von Richtlinien zur Vorbereitung von Trainingspersonal und Programminhalten und durch die Bewertung des Einflusses von Programmen auf die Erreichung von Lernzielen. (Kenntnisse, Werte und Fähigkeiten) und den Beitrag zu einer sozialen Veränderung.

Résumé – L'auteure présente trois méthodes de la pratique contemporaine de l'éducation aux droits humains: le modèle de l'éducation aux valeurs et de la conscientisation, le modèle de la responsabilité et le modèle transformationnel. Chacune de ces méthodes est associée à des groupes cibles, des contenus et des stratégies spécifiques. L'auteure avance que ces modèles pourraient inspirer la conception de théories et la recherche dans ce que l'on peut considérer comme un domaine éducatif en émergence. L'éducation aux droits humains pourrait être consolidée par l'application appropriée des théories éducatives, la conception de requis pour la préparation des enseignants et le contenu des programmes, et par l'évaluation de l'impact des programmes en termes d'atteinte des objectifs pédagogiques (connaissances, valeurs et compétences) et de contribution à un changement social.

Resumen – La autora presenta tres enfoques de la educación contemporánea para una cultura de los derechos humanos: el Modelo de los Valores y la Conciencia, el Modelo de la Responsabilidad y el Modelo de la Transformación. Cada uno de los modelos está asociado con determinados grupos objetivo, contenidos y estrategias. La autora sugiere que estos modelos pueden prestarse para el desarrollo de teorías y para la investigación, en un tema de la educación que puede calificarse de emergente. La educación para los derechos humanos puede reforzarse, además, mediante el uso adecuado de teorías del aprendizaje y mediante la implantación de estándares para la

International Review of Education – Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft – Revue Internationale de l'Education **48**(3–4): 159–171, 2002.

preparación de los educadores y los contenidos del programa, así como mediante la evaluación del impacto que han producido estos programas en cuanto al logro de los objetivos del aprendizaje (conocimientos, valores y desempeño) y también en cuanto al aporte que presta al cambio social.

Резюме – Автор статьи описывает три подхода к обучению правам человека в современной практике: модель ценностей и сознания, модель ответственности и модель трансформации. Каждая модель связана с определенными целевыми группами, содержанием и стратегией. Автор предполагает, что эти модели могут истолковывать теорию развития и исследования относительно возникающего образовательного поля. Дальнейшее закрепление обучения правам человека может осуществляться путем соответствующего применения теории обучения наряду с установлением стандартов для подготовки тренеров и разработкой содержания программ, а также путем оценивания влияния этих программ на достижение целей обучающегося (знания, ценности, умения) и путем внесения вклада в процесс социальных перемен.

Human rights education as an emerging field of inquiry

Over the last 12 years, the term "human rights education" (HRE) has slipped into the language of Ministries of Education, educational non-profit organizations, human rights groups, and teachers – not to mention inter-governmental agencies such as the UN and regional agencies such as the Council of Europe, OSCE, OAS and ASEAN. The terms "democracy and human rights" appear to be joined at the hip, in terms of both diplomatic language and educational goals. The idea seems uncomplicated and attractive on the surface: to strengthen respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to ensure that respect in all societies.

Human rights education is not merely about valuing and respecting as we know, but also about advocacy to guarantee these conditions. Every society has human rights problems, and at the national levels we can observe quite different approaches to the use of human rights education in addressing these challenges. In developing countries, human rights education is often linked with economic and community development, and women's rights. In post-totalitarian or authoritarian countries, human rights education is commonly associated with the development of civil society and the infrastructures related to the rule of law and protection of individual and minority rights. In older democracies, human rights education is often conjoined favorably with the national power structure but geared towards reform in specific areas, such as penal reform, economic rights and refugee issues. Human rights education also seems to be playing a specialized role in post-conflict societies.

These examples focus on human rights problems and issues at the com-

munity level. Of course, human rights learning is necessarily focused on the individual – the knowledge, values and skills that pertain to application of the human rights value system in interpersonal relationships with family and community members. Some of these "human development" skills are recognizing one's own biases, accepting differences, taking responsibility for defending the rights of others, and mediation and conflict resolution (Flowers et al. 2000: 39).

These illustrations of human rights education practice raise fresh questions about the complex role of education in supporting social change and human development. It is my conviction that in order for human rights education – and human rights thinking – to be a lasting contribution to human rights cultures in our respective countries, we need to truly understand how individual programs are carried out by the lay educator. This article will attenpt to clarify distinct models of human rights education that we find in practice, and to clarify their use in association with particular target groups and societal change strategies.

Underlying this article is the belief that human rights educators and advocates – those who conduct trainings, develop materials and design programs – should benefit by re-examining their practice so that the field can be further professionalized and linked with effective change strategies. The author's working premise is that all HRE is ultimately about building human rights cultures in our own communities, and that such programming must be evaluated in part on its ability to contribute to this general goal. This paper is drawn from over ten years of personal experience in designing and implementing HRE programs in transitional democracies. This is limited experience, but hopefully sufficient for identifying some key questions for the field.

Human rights education and advocacy

Because every society struggles to better embody human rights principles, education about human rights implies education leading towards advocacy. But this idea is quite general. In terms of engendering social change, HRE would need to be strategically designed to reach and support individuals and groups that can work towards these goals. Thus, HRE with specific target groups would be related to the following social change framework:

Fostering and enhancing leadership

For the creation of a social movement to occur, it is necessary to have a group of participants who not only want to change things but who are also politically aware enough to see "the big picture." This group must be able to consider specific objectives and develop effective strategies for the political environment they are in.

Coalition and alliance development

Education can be a tool for preparing self-recognized individuals for their leadership responsibilities. Coalition and alliance development helps human rights activists to recognize how their mutual efforts can be successful in achieving social change goals.

Personal empowerment

The personal empowerment goal aims first at healing, then the development of community, and then social transformation. These dual and interrelated goals of personal empowerment and social change identify human rights education as unique as compared to other traditional educational programs (Neylon and Tibbitts 1999).

Despite this diverse social change framework, the language of human rights education is broad. The United Nations has elaborated a definition, which can be summarized as follows:

- the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity;
- the promotion of understanding and tolerance . . . among all nations and groups; and
- the enabling of all persons to participate effectively in a free society (General Assembly Resolution 1997).

In practice, we know that HRE program *content* minimally addresses the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), related key human rights documents, and monitoring and accountability systems. An important point is that although human rights education has moved beyond simply spreading information about human rights law, these instruments (and related mechanisms of protection) remain central to any program. Without reference to these mechanisms or instructions about their use, human rights education has trouble distinguishing itself from other fields such as peace education or global education.

HRE programming should also take on an *interactive pedagogical approach.* The language of HRE speaks of being relevant to daily life and to employing methodologies that engage participants in the development of skills and attitudes as well as knowledge. The participatory approach is viewed as motivating, humanizing and ultimately practical, since this form of learning is linked more strongly with attitudinal or behavioral change than with a pure lecturing approach.

Emerging typologies of HRE

I use the term typologies interchangeably with models to represent an idealized framework for understanding contemporary human rights education practice. The rationales for each model are linked implicitly with particular target groups and a strategy for social change and human development.

Because of the theoretical nature of the models, they are necessarily lacking in detail and depth. For example, I have made no distinction between formal, non-formal and informal approaches. The point of presenting these typologies, however, is to begin to classify the kinds of HRE practice that we do find in the field, to revisit their internal program logic and to clarify their external link with social change.

Model 1: values and awareness model

Overview:

- Philosophical-historical approach
- Means: formal schooling and public awareness campaigns
- Typical topics: information about the content and history of human rights documents, international court system, global human rights issues
- Common target audiences: general public, schools
- Strategy: socialization, cultural consensus, setting expectation for social change, legitimizing human rights framework

In the Values and Awareness Model, the main focus of human rights education is to transmit basic knowledge of human rights issues and to foster its integration into public values. Public education awareness campaigns and school-based curriculum typically fall within this model. It is not unusual for school curricula that include human rights, for example, to link this up with fundamental democratic values and practice (Tibbitts 1994). The goal is to pave the way for a world that respects human rights through an awareness of and commitment to the normative goals laid out in the Universal Declaration and other key documents. Human rights topics that would apply to this model include a history of human rights, information about key human rights instruments and mechanisms of protection, and international human rights concerns (e.g., child labor, trafficking, and genocide). The key pedagogical strategy is engagement: to attract the interest of the learner. These methods can be quite creative (for example, when using media campaigns or popular streetside education) but can also devolve into a lecture-oriented approach. This model places relatively little emphasis on the development of skills – such as those related to communication, conflict-resolution and activism.

The implicit strategy is that mass support for human rights will continue to bring pressure upon authorities to protect human rights. This approach typically also fosters critical thinking among learners and the ability to apply a human rights framework when analyzing policy issues. Thus, learners

are made to be "critical consumers" of human rights. It is unclear if the knowledge and awareness approach does build to a "critical human rights consciousness" although this would presumably be a goal of such a program. Critical human rights consciousness might have the following criteria:

(1) the ability of students to recognize the human rights dimensions of, and their relationship to, a given conflict- or problem-oriented exercise;
(2) an expression of awareness and concern about their role in the protection or promotion of these rights;
(3) a critical evaluation of the potential responses that may be offered;
(4) an attempt to identify or create new responses;
(5) a judgment or decision about which choice is most appropriate;
(6) an expression of confidence and a recognition of responsibility and influence in both the decision and its impact (Meintjes 1997: 68).

The Values and Awareness Model could be linked with the social change framework of leadership development, coalition building and personal empowerment, but the link is somewhat weak. This model of HRE is less dependent upon pedagogical approaches and specialized target audiences, than upon the "serendipity" of having learners predisposed towards the message that HRE brings. Within this approach, therefore, the framework goals are not likely to be directly reached, but certain individuals may become "primed" for advocacy.

Some readers may have difficulty with the proposition that the values and awareness model is focused primarily on content knowledge and thinking skills, and does not directly relate to empowerment. Most human rights educators I know want their programs to address all possible learner outcomes: content, critical thinking, values, and social action. However, unless an HRE program organized for the general public or in schools has extended contact hours, sequenced learning experiences and a developmentally appropriate design intended to affect attitudes and skills, it is unlikely that the program will affect the learner beyond content knowledge.

A key challenge for this model is how human rights educators working in schools and other public awareness settings can avoid the "banking" model of education warned of by Freire.[1] This model takes the risk of offering a superficial exposure to the human rights field which, in the worst case, can be experienced as primarily ideological.

Some examples of the Values and Awareness Model are inclusion of human rights-related lessons within citizenship, history, social science and law-related education classes in schools, and infusion of human rights-related themes into both formal and informal youth programming (e.g., the arts, Human Rights Day, debate clubs). Public awareness campaigns involving public art and advertising, media coverage, and community events may also be classified under this model.

Model 2: accountability model

Overview:

- Legal/political approach
- Means: trainings and networking
- Typical topics: procedures for monitoring, court cases, codes of ethics, dealing with the media, public awareness
- Common audiences: lawyers, human rights advocates and monitors, professional groups working with vulnerable populations, civil servants, medical professionals, journalists
- Strategy: human rights laws and codes as tools for structural/law-based social justice and social change, fostering and enhancing leadership, alliance development within certain professions and target groups
- Related to problematic relationship between the individual and the State/authorities

Under the Accountability Model, learners are already expected to be directly or indirectly associated with the guarantee of human rights through their professional roles. Human rights education with these target groups focuses on the ways in which their professional responsibilities involve either (a) directly monitoring human rights violations and advocating with the necessary authorities; or (b) taking special care to protect the rights of people (especially vulnerable populations) for which they have some responsibility.

Within this model, the assumption of all educational programming is that the learners will be directly involved in the protection of individual and group rights. The violation of rights, therefore, is seen as inherent to their work. For advocates, the challenge is to understand human rights law, mechanisms of protection, and lobbying and advocacy skills. For other professional groups, educational programs sensitize them about the nature of human rights violations and potentials within their professional role, not only to prevent abuses but to promote respect for human dignity. Human rights trainings and topics are geared towards these specialized areas, and learner outcomes are geared towards content as well as skill-development.

Examples of programs falling under the Accountability Model are the training of human rights and community activists on techniques for monitoring and documenting human rights abuses and procedures for registering grievances with appropriate national and international bodies. Also falling within this classification are pre-service and in-service trainings for lawyers, prosecutors, judges, police officers and the military, that may include information about relevant constitutional and international law, professional codes of conduct, supervisory and grievance mechanisms, and consequences of violations. Professional groups, such as health and social service workers, that service vulnerable groups are also the recipients of HRE programming aimed at accountability, as are journalists and other members of the media.

Within the Accountability Model, personal change is not an explicit goal, since it assumes that professional responsibility is sufficient for the individual having an interest in applying a human rights framework. The model does, however, have the goal of structurally-based, and legally guaranteed, norms and practices related to human rights. It is given within this model, that social change is necessary, and that community-based, national and regional targets for reform can be identified.

Model 3: transformational model

Overview:

- Psychological-sociological approach
- Means: informal, non-formal and popular education and self-help
- Typical topics: human rights as part of women's development, community development, economic development, and minority rights
- Common audiences: vulnerable populations, victims of abuse and trauma, post-conflict societies
- Strategy: personal empowerment leading towards activism for change (personal, community, societal), creation of activists, leadership development
- Focuses on healing and transformation, the role of the individual and community-building

In the Transformational Model, human rights education programming is geared towards empowering the individual to both recognize human rights abuses and to commit to their prevention. In some cases, whole communities – not just the individual – are treated as the target audience. This model involves pedagogical techniques (based partly on developmental psychology) that involve self-reflection and support within the community of learners. A formal focus on human rights is only one component of this model. The complete program may also include leadership development, conflict-resolution training, vocational training, work, and informal fellowship.

This model assumes that the learner has had personal experiences that can be seen as human rights violations (the program may assist in this recognition) and that they are therefore predisposed to become promoters of human rights. This model treats the individual more holistically, but it is therefore more challenging in its design and application.

The Transformational Model can be found in programs operating in refugee camps, in post-conflict societies, with victims of domestic abuse, and with groups serving the poor. There are examples of "human rights communities," where governing bodies, local groups and citizens "examine traditional beliefs, collective memory and aspirations as related to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights" (Koenig 2000). In some cases, this model can be found in school settings, where an in-depth case study on a human rights violation (such as the Holocaust and genocide) can serve as an affective catalyst for exam-

ining human rights violations. In some sophisticated programs, learners are asked to consider the ways in which they and others have both been victims and perpetrators of human rights abuses, thus using psychological techniques to overcome the "we" versus "they" mentality that one can find in life, as well as the human rights field. Graduates of such programs are positioned to recognize and protect their own rights and those of their primary reference group.

Even in schools, it is possible to attempt a transformational model of HRE, if links are made between school and family life.

Should the school chose to do so, the agenda is extensive: the curriculum should include participation in family decision-making; respect for parents but rejection of family violence, particularly mother (wife) battery; equality of parents within their home; and consideration of sexuality as a form of social relations rather than as a manifestation of man's nature (Stromquist 1999: 412, as quoted in Tibbitts and Torney-Purta: 68).

All empowerment models are dependent upon sustained community supports of some kind (whether these supports are peers, family members or others). An educational empowerment model has these supports built in through the design of the program – supports provided on an ongoing basis by the teachers/facilitators or sustained contact among the learners. Thus, these models are the most difficult to implement.

Further analysis of HRE models and other change movements

The discrete human rights education models presented above can be compiled into an adapted version of the "learning pyramid." At the large base, we would find the Values and Awareness Models, in the middle the Accountability Model, and at the narrow top the Transformational Model. The placement of the HRE models in these positions reflects not only the size of the target populations they each deal with (from educating the general public all the way up to creating new advocates) but also the degree of difficulty for each of the educational programs. Mass public education programs are about dissemination of programming, whereas the creation and capacity-building of activists require more complex and reciprocal longer-term commitments from all involved. All the levels are mutually reinforcing, but certain models are obviously more essential to promoting social change – depending upon the status of a human rights movement within a particular community. A social reform program needs strong leadership that is focused on institutional and legal reform. However, a movement also needs grassroots support, where the focus is on the individual and community supports.

A reference to the advocacy leadership structure of the US women's movement may shed some light on the role of education within contemporary social change movements. Jo Freeman's analysis of the 1960s–1970s women's movement pointed out that there were two levels of participants at

the origins of the movement. At the "macro" level, the mostly white, well-educated middle-class women tended to develop national structures and political associations, and organize for the purpose of changing laws and other social structures that discriminated against women. Younger women developed an informal, decentralized network of autonomous groups and individuals on the "micro" level. They organized for the purpose of women's consciousness-raising and personal transformation. The goal of the first level of women was to change institutions, and the goal of the second was to change people (Zald and McCarthy 1979).[2] Both levels employed relevant educational models for preparing women advocates and the goals they served.

The Accountability Model for HRE is similar to preparing leadership for the "macro" level of the US women's movement, where the results might be new legislation, and changes in rules and social structures. The Transformational Model focuses on the "micro" level, where social change is intended to influence the way people think about themselves, as well as their roles in families and personal relationships. The reason for referring to the US women's movement is to show that a national social change movement will also incorporate different leadership, constituents and supportive educational models. It behooves human rights educators to conduct a similar analysis for the local and national environments in which they are working.

In designing their programming, therefore, human rights educators need to take into account both need and opportunity. The educator may decide to implement a program solely based on their personal values, experiences, resources and position in their society. However, the educator might also consider how the educational program he or she is planning to implement relates to the HRE models introduced in this article, and how likely the program will support a movement towards a more fully realized human rights culture in the particular community or society.

Strengthening and professionalizing the human rights education field

This article has focused on the elaboration of human rights education typologies as a tool for classifying educational programs, clarifying their target groups and requiring us to consider their link with the overall goal of human development and social change. Hopefully, these typologies will lend themselves both to reflective program design as well as to further work in the area of theory-development and research.

There are other ways that human rights educators can take steps to further programming. If human rights education is to become a genuine field, then we are challenged to become more coherent (even among our diversity of models), to be unique (offering value and outcomes that other educational programs cannot), and to be able to replicate ourselves.

In order for human rights education to become more qualified as a field, there are several criteria that we can begin to explore and document:

a) core body of knowledge;
b) clear goals for learners;
c) pedagogy built on sound knowledge of learner, learning theory, taking into account developmental theory;
d) documentation of success, and sharing of best practice – with sensitivity to culture;
e) preparation of trainers;
f) recognition and integration of the field within educating organizations.

I will highlight just a few areas that I consider to be of high priority. We need detailed examples within the human rights education field – perhaps along the lines of the models* that illustrate the careful use of learning theory appropriate to the context of the program. For example, adult education programs should have designs (not just training agendas) that take into account the learning process of mature learners. School-based programs should be age- and developmentally appropriate. Programs designed for special populations, such as refugees or victims of abuse, should also have pedagogies that reflect the necessary sensitivities.

Increasingly, there is training available for those interested in human rights education, but there is as yet no clear standard for what constitutes a human rights education trainer. At the moment, human rights education trainings are practitioner-based. That is, those who have experience with human rights education train others to do this. However, there is no national or international certificate to demonstrate that these trainers are competent: no clear standards for study or practice. Standards both for the field, as well as its trainers, might further its status as a legitimate field, and also spark healthy conversation about its content and purpose.

The human rights education field needs evidence of having successfully achieved learner goals, for all models. We need to know which programs have been successful, and why. Such evidence is necessary not only for funders, but for ourselves. Professional evaluations and case study documentation is used in other educational fields to help further their development. Why not with human rights education?[3]

Conclusion

Human rights education has the prospect of evolving into a full-fledged field – both within human rights and within education. In its current state, it is a collection of interesting and discrete programs. The idealized typologies presented here are important because they carry with them distinct strategies for helping to realize human rights cultures in our communities and countries. We can probably agree that we would want all three models represented in each of our societies, since they complement each other in promoting a dynamic human rights infrastructure. However, as individual educators, we

need to make wise choices about where to invest our energies, and to be proactive in creating these opportunities within our societies.

If the models proposed in this article have any credibility, they can be tested and clarified through program evaluation. These studies would evaluate the programs both on the basis of meeting learner goals in the areas of knowledge, values and skills (as appropriate) and also on the basis of contributing directly to advocacy and social change. Such research, I believe, could not only enhance the quality of the educational programming, but help to substantiate what is now primarily intuition about the importance of education within the human rights field.

We are at an exciting time of enhanced public awareness and interest in human rights. We must not lose our chance to help make human rights education a critical approach to examining and building our just societies.

Notes

1. "In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing . . . a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as a process of inquiry." (Freire 1990: 59 as quoted by Meintjes 1997: 78)
2. This leadership structure is drawn from Jo Freeman's analysis of the US women's movement (Zald and McCarthy 1979 as quoted in Neylon and Tibbitts, 1999: 5–6).
3. Guidelines that have been developed specifically for the field of human rights education are in Marcia Bernbaum, "Evaluating Human Rights Programs" in *The Human Rights Education Handbook*, pp. 135–154; and Felisa Tibbitts, *Evaluation in the Human Rights Education Field: Getting Started* (The Hague: Netherlands Helsinki Committee/HREA, 1997). Available on-line at www.hrea.org.

References

Bernbaum, Marcia. 1997. Evaluating Human Rights Programs. In: *The Human Rights Education Handbook* (135–154).

Flowers, Nancy, Bernbaum, Marcia, Rudelius-Palmer, Kristi and Tolman, Joel. 2000. *The Human Rights Education Handbook.* Minneapolis: Human Rights Resource Center, University of Minnesota.

Freire, Paolo. 1990. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/52/469/Add.1, 20 October 1997.

Koenig, Shulamith. 2000. Message to On-Line Forum "Mid-Term Review of UNDecade for Human Rights Education" July 21, 2000, hosted by Human Rights Education Associates (HREA).

Meintjes, Garth. 1997. Human Rights Education as Empowerment: Reflections on Pedagogy. In: George J. Andreopoulos and Richard Pierre Claude, eds., *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-first Century.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Neylon, Lyn B. and Tibbitts, Felisa. 1999. Strategizing for a Human Rights Movement in the US. In: *Evaluation of Human Rights USA: Final Summative Report*, prepared for the Ford Foundation, New York.

Stromquist, Nelly B. 1999. Gender Delusions and Exclusions in the Democratization of Schooling in Latin America. *Comparative Education Review* 40(4).

Tibbitts, Felisa and Torney-Purta, Judith. 1999.*Citizenship Education in Latin America: Preparing for the Future*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

Tibbitts, Felisa. 1997. *Evaluation in the Human Rights Education Field: Getting Started*. The Hague: Netherlands Helsinki Committee/HREA. Available on-line at www.hrea.org.

Tibbitts, Felisa. 1994. Human Rights Education in Schools in the Post-Communist Context. *European Journal of Education* 29(4): 363–376.

Zald, M. N. and McCarthy, J. D., eds. 1979. *The Dynamics of Social Movements*. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

The author

Felisa Tibbitts is Co-Founder and Executive Director of Human Rights Education Associates. She has been working since 1991 in the transitional democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, where she developed national human rights education programs in schools in eight countries. She has also contributed to the development of programming in law schools, juvenile justice, and anti-corruption areas throughout the region. She has published numerous articles on the subject, and consults with the UN Centre for Human Rights, the Council of Europe, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Ford Foundation and the Open Society Institute Network in policy, program design and evaluation. She was trained in educational policy and research at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government (M.P.P. '87) and Harvard's Graduate School of Education (M.Ed. '91).

Contact address: Felisa Tibbitts, P.O. Box 382396, Cambridge, MA 02238-2396 USA. E-mail: ftibbitts@hrea.org, Web: www.hrea.org