Conceiving a local Human Rights Education Programme

- the Lisbon case of "SOMOS" -

Sergio Xavier*

| Abstract |

   SOMOS is an innovative local Programme of Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights prepared from scratch along one year and launched by the Lisbon City Council at 10 December 2015. SOMOS costs only 100.000€, reaching directly 2000 people per year. It aims to develop a shared culture of Human Rights and Democracy in the city through training and awareness-raising initiatives.

   From within the City Council staff to a wide scope of target groups in the city, it provides free training in 23 available themes, involving a broad diversity of partner organisations and institutions. It grants intensive training to multipliers in the city and promotes awareness-raising campaigns tackling human rights in general and discrimination in concrete, fostering social reflection and debate.

SOMOS captivated attention from the Council of Europe and the Inclusive Cities Observatory from the UCLG - United Cities and Local Governments, due to its potential for inspiring other cities to develop similar programmes. One of the main interests in the Programme is about the challenges of its conception and implementation, including lack of references, stakeholders' articulation, monitoring and evaluation, assessing and communicating results, internal collaboration, co-management, sustainability, quality and coherence, continuous learning processes.

Having a direct experience with SOMOS, as its co-designer and coordinator at Lisbon City Council (2015-2017), I am developing my PhD thesis having the Programme as the central case study.

This proposal of presentation focus in the challenges of conception and early-implementation of SOMOS, considering its inspirational potential beyond Lisbon and the possibilities of multiplication in other cities in the World.

Key words : human rights education, local education policies, policy conception, Lisbon City Council, challenges within institutions

This essay results from the personal experience of the author working as policy advisor in the Lisbon City Council between 2013 and 2017, assigned with the responsibility of conceiving and coordinating the Lisbon Programme for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (SOMOS) from 2015 to 2017. It summarizes a process of conceiving – and early implementing – a local human rights education policy, from the analytical perspective of a former professional at the Lisbon City Council. While respecting the determined institutional

confidentiality, this essay comes from a non-institutional stand, assumed as a core epistemological value. The author is studying SOMOS as a central case study in the framework of his PhD thesis.

The first part essentially characterizes SOMOS regarding aims, methodological approaches institutional structure, actors and inspirational practices. The second part is a narrative account of the author's experience facing challenges along the SOMOS conception process, particularly within the Lisbon City Council. The third part draws conclusions and points out possibilities for further research.

I. SOMOS

The Lisbon City Governmental Programme 2013-2017, which earned the most votes in the 2013 local elections, was pointing to a renewal on the Social Rights policies in the city, by referring intentions such as to promote "effective access to social rights" and the "elimination of the causes of exclusion and discrimination". SOMOS was the framework Programme designed to respond to such political intentions.

SOMOS was publically announced on 10th December 2015, commemorating the International Human Rights day, as the first Lisbon Programme of Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights. It was set to "develop a universal culture of Human Rights and Democracy in Lisbon through training addressing citizens and organisations". SOMOS objectives included raising awareness of the

population for Human Rights and democratic citizenship; to establish a training framework available for residents and organisations; to develop capacities in the topic within and beyond the City Council; to foster the participation of organisations in the programme implementation; to train trainers dedicated to the topic; to reach directly at least 2000 people per year; to establish a permanent public communication channel; to establish a regular event for the discussion of the topic.

The Programme was structured in two dimensions, "continuous awareness raising" – encompassing public campaigns, initiatives branding or conference events – and "training", targeting internal and external publics, engaging a non-formal education[1] approach. The main activities include:

- the "SOMOS os Direitos que Temos" [We are the rights we have] campaign, featuring city individuals transmitting awareness-raising messages, disseminated along the city through posters ;
- the "Os Direitos Humanos estão nas nossas mãos" [Human Rights are in our hands] campaign, featuring images of hands and awareness-raising messages, disseminated along the city through mupi posters;
- the "Escola SOMOS" [SOMOS School], non-residential, week-long processes, hosting different parallel training courses and other

---

1) As Coombs, Prosser & Ahmed defined it, "any organized educational activity outside the established formal system – whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity – that is intended to serve identifiable learning clienteles and learning objectives". Pinto provides an insightful and more updated analysis of non-formal education in the Portuguese context.

activities in a common programme, targeting publics external to the City Council;

- the municipality "Plano de Formação Anual" [Training Annual Plan] addressing internal staff, includes different training courses directly articulated with SOMOS;
- the "Sensibilização Externa" [External Awareness Raising], 3,5-7 hours workshops addressing civil society under a system of non-paid requisition, where organisations choose and customize from 23 possible themes[2].

SOMOS had an inter-departmental implementation, being the core management a responsibility of one of the City Council departments. The external awareness raising workshops were managed by a civil society organisation, chosen through a tender procedure. This organisation was mainly responsible to co-manage SOMOS website, collect and respond to workshop requisitions, coordinate the SOMOS multipliers pool[3] and implement and evaluate the requested workshops. The City Council progressively shared ownership of SOMOS Schools with partner organisations, namely by hosting and supporting training

---

2) The themes include: Introduction to Human Rights, Democratic Citizenship and Rights of the Child, Youth and Children Participation, Racism and intercultural dialogue, interreligious dialogue, LGBTi Rights, structural and institutional discrimination, ageism and intergenerational dialogue, disablism, Human Rights Education, Education for Democratic Citizenship, gender equality, gender identity, Human Rights and media, Bullying, gender violence, Homeless people, drug users, prostitution, remembrance and Human Rights, health.

3) The SOMOS multipliers pool was composed by 41 former participants and educators involved in the dedicated training courses that took place in SOMOS Schools or in the City Council Internal Training Plan SOMOS courses.

courses promoted by them.

With a budget of 100.000€ per year[4]), SOMOS was directly reaching more than 2000 people, through more than 100 educational activities involving a broad diversity of 30 partner organisations and institutions.

SOMOS Conception Process

SOMOS was conceived along one year, while initiating its early-implementation. The buildup of the political argument was parallel to the internal preparation, in a continuous effort to adjust policy, needs, capacity and opportunities. The lack of references[5]) of similar local Programmes conferred a triple innovation process. Firstly, SOMOS was a new proposal in Lisbon social policy, demanding the invention and adjustment of practices and approaches from the City Council, spanning collaborators skills, formal procedures, conceptual understandings or attitudes. Secondly, since Lisbon policies are prone to be multiplied in other Portuguese cities, SOMOS could pilot the mainstreaming of human rights education in Portuguese local policies[6]). Thirdly, SOMOS could inspire cities beyond Portugal, which eventually happened later on with the interest coming from the Council of Europe and from the Inclusive Cities Observatory from the UCLG

---

4) This value represents about 0,01% of the Lisbon City Council global budget.
5) A simple benchmarking process took place, but was rather unsuccessful on identifying local public policies on democratic citizenship and human rights education, having inquiring entities such as the Council of Europe.
6) In its early stage, SOMOS captivated interest from different Portuguese cities, being disseminated through public presentations (e.g. VII Palmela Social Forum) or through articles such as in the Portuguese Network of Education Cities.

- United Cities and Local Governments.

The following sections elaborate on how the unique character of SOMOS was handled, while detailing the different dimensions of its conception process: political change, internal change, inspiring practices, challenges and surprising episodes along the early implementation.

Building the political argument

Following the Lisbon elections 2013, the Social Rights portfolio went through a process of renewal, being the Social Rights Action Plan 2014-17 an important outcome. In September 2014, this document was presented in the Lisbon Parliament, as the first Social Rights plan ever produced by the City Council. This was a game changer for two reasons. Firstly, it further asserted an interruption with the previous narrative and practice of "Social Development", more concerned with continuous assistance services and their strengthening. Secondly, because it consolidated a clear renewed approach to the social policies in Lisbon, prioritizing conditions for people empowerment, civil society engagement, de-stigmatization of excluded social groups and the celebration of rights.

Together with the Lisbon City Governmental Programme 2013-2017, the Social Rights Action Plan 2014-17 was a fundamental instrument on building the political argument for the creation of a Human Rights education Programme, which could articulate the renewed political intentions with the institutional everyday practice. From the mapping of the total 249 actions entailed in the Social Rights Plan, 55 were

identified to have a direct relation with Human Rights Education.

The political argument behind SOMOS went beyond the internal affairs of the City Council, seeking support in intergovernmental instruments such as the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights[7] or the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education[8]. The existing European Union data on discrimination and knowledge of rights in Portugal[9] was a key on connecting the political argument with the actual needs of the context.

The proposal for the creation of SOMOS[10] was formally presented for deliberation in the chamber meeting on the 8 December of 2015, being approved unanimously by the 17 elected members of the City Council executive – including opposing parties representatives – in less than 30 seconds, without questions or reservations. The first local public policy in Portugal dedicated to deploy human rights education on the ground was created.

---

7) In particular, the article 26 mentions that "Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms", leading to the idea that Human Rights Education is a Human Right.

8) Particularly in the article 13, suggesting that education is a way to "combat all forms of discrimination and violence" and the article 5, urging for Human Rights Education mainstreaming in policies and practices.

9) The Eurobarometer on discrimination in the EU in 2015, concludes that only 42% of Portuguese people have knowledge of their rights, only 18% state that the efforts made to combat discrimination are effective and only 15% think that there's no need to introduce new measures of protection from discrimination.

10) The proposal for the creation of SOMOS did not included any budget provision at that stage, which certainly facilitated a unanimous approval from the executive body.

Building internal capacity and understanding

The process of conceiving a broad programme such as SOMOS involved the efforts of several collaborators from the City Council, in order to develop a common ground of intentions and understanding, while articulating its early implementation. Since an initial stage, there was a concern regarding the educational approach to SOMOS, considering that the core educational activities promoted by the Lisbon City Council were falling under the vocational training, hence guided by rigid competence frameworks, in line with the corporate and professional market needs. SOMOS was seeking to be something different. Principles such as flexibility, learner-centeredness and horizontality were seen as important in this Human Rights education project, following the enthusiastic discussions during the several meetings with officers from different departments, which occurred early in the conception phase.

Supported by existing literature on the topic[11], the collective reflection about the – as they were called – "non-formal education principles" led to two main outcomes. The first one was a comprehensive document with a common ground of understanding on why – and how – non-formal education was an important practice for SOMOS. This document sets a comparison between formal, non-formal and informal learning, and establishes a relation between the Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning Domains, competences related with Human

---

11) For example, in "Compass – Manual for Human Rights Education with Young People".

Rights and Kolb's experiential learning theory. The second outcome were two introductory training courses[12] addressing 40 potential SOMOS multipliers within the City Council staff, that could be involved in the implementation of the following steps of the Programme. These training courses were implemented by external trainers experienced with non-formal education and human rights education.

The educational approach concern led to the concern of what would – and what would not – be realistic to be made by the City Council internal resources. As a principle, SOMOS was designed in a way that it was not only requesting efforts from the internal services, but also responding to their needs. For example, for the training department it was important to keep a level of bureaucratic procedures[13] in order to keep accountable in possible external audits. Even though these procedures were not particularly useful for SOMOS objectives, they were continuously carried through, making possible, for example, formal certification of the learners[14]. Several similar negotiation processes followed, including other services such as the ones from the social and the communication departments. These negotiations were important in shaping the details of the Programme, working on the desirable internal coherence on implementing it, assuring that

---

12) The titles of these training courses were "Training of Trainers on Social Rights Education" and "Training of Facilitators of Consultation Processes".

13) For example, every participant of a training course needed to fill a specific form provided by the Department and every training team needed to produce a "Course Manual" before the implementation of the corresponding training course.

14) The relevance of formal certification in SOMOS was widely discussed, and even if appreciated by a part of the learners, stills an unclear and debatable option.

the existent services and resources were not overloaded with new tasks. Nevertheless, the whole initial process of discussing the Programme was primordially useful on identifying what could not be done by the City Council.

Since early, the ideas of "external expertize", "partnership" and "co-management" came up in the different meetings, perhaps inspired by a certain 'culture of working together' that was being followed in the Programme conception process. These discussions were relevant because they brought ‒ not only the need ‒ the legitimacy of seeking external expertize and structuring it in SOMOS design. Once the tasks to be done or co-managed externally were identified, the City Council services initiated they preparation and readiness for cooperation, which was not necessarily a departure expectation for all. This surely displayed and avoided some challenging situations that could come in the future, but certainly not permanently.

Inspiring practices

Even though SOMOS was found to be a quite unique initiative with no clear references, many practices were inspiring along its conception. The Programme is also an articulated puzzle of adapted practices, coming from different contexts.

The model of the Universities on Youth and Development, promoted by the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, encompasses a series of parallel activities[15] hosted in the same venue. About 200

---

15) Training courses, seminars and other meetings.

participants with converging interests[16] get to know each other and learn together along one residential week. The activities are promoted by different partners in cooperation with the North-South Centre. This model was inspirational to the SOMOS schools design which, even not being residential, is also a week long process with parallel activities hosted in the same venue.

In 2006, the Portuguese High Commission for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities (ACIME)[17] created a co-managed pool of trainers for the provision of training in themes of their institutional scope. Either private or public organizations from the whole national territory could place a request for training sessions, which were previously structured in terms of content, leading to learners formal certification. The ACIME model was inspirational to the mechanism behind SOMOS workshops provision, which had a co-managing dimension, a pool of trainers, different themes to choose from and were free of cost. Adaptations of this practice to the local reality of Lisbon included the possibility for informal groups to request workshops. In an attempt to better respond to SOMOS objectives, the workshops had not a pre-structured programme with content, because this content was essentially responding to each group contextual needs. This was possible because formal certification of the learners was not seen as a priority in the case of SOMOS workshops.

Both Living Library and Anti-rumors practices were inspirational for the "SOMOS os Direitos que Temos" campaign, sharing a common

---

16) Such as youth work, human rights, cooperation or democracy.
17) Presently designated as the "High Commission for Migrations".

objective – to challenge stereotypes and prejudices identified in a context. As Living Library, SOMOS campaign invited individuals to share a part of their story, but in this case, mainly through short messages in photo posters along the main city avenues and waypoints, instead of being a part of small group conversations[18]. As in the Anti-rumors methodology, SOMOS campaign started by identifying existent prejudices in the city, progressively developing an informal network of individuals directly affected by those. The campaign protagonists were committed on dispelling myths and misconceptions experienced by LGBTI+, Roma and black communities, or by groups dealing with homelessness, poverty and disabilities.

II. Challenges from within

According to the latest prospective data, the Lisbon City Council hosts and provides income to a growing number of 7.479 workers. In 2018, only 270 (3.61% of the total workers) interrupted their activity in the City Council, or retired, or died. A total of 3.196 workers (42.73%) hold positions entitled with some sort of hierarchic power such as directors, "superior" officers, coordinators and commissioners. Regarding the prediction of new workers, there are 334 low income new positions such as cleaning personnel, gravediggers and animal caretakers. Only 19 places are reserved for other positions and open

---

18) Eventually, during the programme of the III SOMOS School, an actual Living Library took place with the individuals featured earlier in the city posters.

for external candidates. 84 new positions are reserved exclusively for internal promotions.

One conclusion that can be extracted from this basic data is that a great majority of the City Council workers has invested in a long-term professional commitment, valuing their career progress as public servants. Another simple conclusion is that the City Council is almost impermeable to new people that could, for example, compensate resources lacking internally. This raises a series of questions: if existent workers don't fulfil a desirable technical – and non-technical – profile for new demands, and considering the improbability of external recruitment, how flat turns out the selection criteria for the new tasks? What kind of factors weight in the internal competition? What is the role of accumulated power and decision-making positions on assigning – or auto assigning – tasks perceived as attractive? What's the accountability for performance? How far this background goes beyond Lisbon local government?

The attempt to answer to these questions have no place on this essay. Nevertheless, this hardcoded institutional background certainly contextualize many of the challenges faced along the conception and early-implementation of SOMOS and the new tasks it demanded.

Unaware and (mostly) unnoticed

Giving the importance of a solid conceptual understanding of the Programme, the lack of internal know-how rendered incoherence, such as: demanding – not necessarily needed – data from – not necessarily documented – migrants, as condition to issue their learner's certificate

after participating in a human rights training course; not providing convenient vegetarian lunches to vegetarians during a week-long human rights education process; or bringing biased discourse to meetings with human rights education partners. Either the learning required for SOMOS coherence didn't't happen as optimistically expected, or SOMOS one year preparatory development was not efficient enough. A solid conceptual understanding of the Programme was a continuous challenge, as well it was the management of its coherence.

Power-driven – profile less – assignments make it, somehow, difficult for the assigned to assume the lack of conceptual understanding and, therefore, to learn. The acceptance of the assignment implies the acceptance of the system of the assignment, a kind of Bourdieusian *habitus*, where personal resources are reduced to power relations and career progression. Time and resilience may become more reliable than learning. A self-indulging *no apologies* policy may be naturalized, making a discrete statement regarding the achieved position of power and, perhaps, a reminder about the dominance this power can produce. Instead of promoting learning, unawareness could stimulate counter-productive defence and power dispute. Instead of progressive conceptual understanding, the elasticity required for new tasks may result in undermining from within.

If someone "external" collaborates close to the Programme, this someone may be read as a menace. This is not necessarily due to the possible diversity of approaches or eventual competing professional streams. By working in the Lisbon City Council, soon becomes very clear the division between "people working at the municipality" and

the others. The assimilation process only progresses as the acceptation of the institutional habitus also develops in the "external" individual. In the ‒ perhaps puzzling ‒ situation that the "external" collaborator does not find interest on embodying or practicing the institutional habitus or does not share the same career aspirations, this individual may be continuously perceived as possibly compromising for certain, independently of any proven professional capacities or trusty intentions. Facing the lack of a clear power system to control the "external" unpredictability, the possible unawareness from the ones assigned with power becomes noticeable. In addition to the persistent lack of know how faced along SOMOS conception, a manifestation of puzzled leadership power was through undermining or *blaming* the Programme and its "externality".

50 shades of undermining

Scepticism may be regarded as a common feeling towards new ideas, such as human rights education policies. But SOMOS was somehow surprising on this regard. The elected decision-makers with the role of approving the Programme' creation have not raised any obstacle, swiftly supporting an unanimous deliberation. The deputy mayor responsible for Social Rights was as engaged as possible in SOMOS daily progress. Some of the City Council departments managed the preparatory process with encouragement, allocating enthusiastic workers for reflection meetings along months. Concepts such as "Rights", "Democracy", "non-formal education" or "experiential learning" overflowed the meeting spaces, populating corridor

discussions and home readings. One of the department directors was supportive at the extent of formally committing efforts to involve thousands of City Council workers in human rights education every year.

In spite of all the good surprises, the coming of a new Programme was not appreciated by all, particularly by the ones that would be impacted in their daily work routine by SOMOS. A kind of sceptical resistance from some of the closest workers built since the early stages, being consolidated as undermining afterwards. The initial issues included priority downgrading, precarious assiduity to development meetings with colleagues, unresponsiveness or weak responses. The medium stage of the escalation process involved an episode of not showing up in a seminar with key partner institutions, arranged with anticipation by the City Council. In other circumstance, an anticipated request was made for a venue delivery of about 100 manuals to be provided to potential multipliers participating in City Council week-long training courses. The manuals were produced by the City Council having this purpose in mind, but the answer given was that it would not be possible because the manuals were "heavy". When requesting to a different department, the solution was promptly given.

The undermining from within reached the stage of personalisation, continuously challenging the coordination of the programme. These events included impolite phone hanging, personalized attacks during meetings with partners, humiliating emails, name calling, scapegoating, and communication blackout. The critical stand towards SOMOS, has grown fast within the most impacted department. A particular

event further illustrates the reached level on entropy. When all the departments were requested to contribute to SOMOS design, a department requested a meeting with the Programme coordinator in order to discuss the document he was producing, based in the ongoing contributions from the different City Council teams. At the meeting, there was the director of the department, the head of a division deeply involved in SOMOS and, surprisingly, a jurist. The meeting started with the jurist shaking the referred document in hands and addressing the following words to SOMOS coordinator: "Sometimes, we just write shit". The words were only followed by a supportive silence on the table. This was just the beginning of the meeting.

A public institution or just an institution?

Many of the initial critics addressing SOMOS – and its coordination – were related with working with civil society. One example involved a call for tenders to co-implement one of SOMOS activities. An issue has been raised by a department regarding the desired profile of trainers in the tender, which their experience working with human rights education was being more valued than their formal certification as trainers[19]. Uncertified potential trainers coming from civil society

---

19) In Portugal, trainers working in authorized training centres, are requested to possess a certification ("Certificate of Pedagogical Competences"). While this is a way of controlling quality of the training at national level, the training course of trainers behind the certification neither addresses nor represents any human rights education practice. At local level human rights education, this "quality control" has the effect of recruiting the ones that not necessarily have human rights education experience and excluding the ones that have it, but not

were called "biscateiros", which is a derogative Portuguese word, used in this case to relegate the professionalism of – uncertified – human rights educators. This episode included biased expressions such as "I do have a gipsy friend that tows walls better and cheaper than many contractors".

Instead of fostering interaction, the juridicist approach turned out as an obstacle on cooperating with civil society. The co-managed dimension of SOMOS – involving the workshops management and implementation – was widely debated, until the last minutes. The initial argument against was that such a partner for SOMOS co-management was unlikely to exist or to be available for the task. At a later level, the argument shifted to the one stating that the City Council did not needed partners, because the Programme could be managed only by the internal services. Given the fact that this co-managed dimension would reach the majority of SOMOS learners all over the city, a possible interpretation for the raised argumentation is that it had less to do with careful planning than it had to do with unwillingness to cooperate with partner organisations. Sharing power, particularly in the co-management dimension, was simultaneously an aim of SOMOS, but also a constant source of internal irritation. The partner could have "more visibility" than the City Council, or was too "demanding", even "disrespectful", when coordinating activities, or was "untrustable" in the fulfilment of their tasks.

The tendency to centralize all the power of public policies in the

---

necessarily could, or wanted to, access the training certification.

City Council can lead to paradoxical questions such as why a public institution find it difficult to trust in the public? What is a public institution deflated of the involvement of its public? Is the centralization of institutional powers the most efficient safeguard from instrumentality of public policies? How the binary representative democracy/ participatory democracy favours institutional authoritarianism?

During a monitoring meeting with a department director and a team with responsibilities in SOMOS implementation, it was asked what the Programme could bring to these team members. The concrete possibilities suggested were related to travel opportunities, which could "keep the team motivated". It became evident in that moment that personal interest was stepping over the public interest advocated by SOMOS. In other occasion, a department director clearly stated to be against the decision of sending one of the department workers to a seminar abroad, representing SOMOS programme. The department director was claiming that another person was more "entitled to that right", because the other one was travelling abroad recently for another representation. The criteria was neither the profile of the representative, nor what resources the representative had to achieve the objective of the mission. Personal interest seems so naturalized that the choice of a representative in a public mission could be a decision based in distribution of "motivation". As Bourdieu well puts it, "every established order tends to produce the naturalization of its own arbitrariness".

The Lisbon City Council has a policy of remunerating trainers from their internal pool, in the case they implement training courses.

This remuneration is added to the usual monthly income of the workers. While this policy works in a way to compensate unbalanced wages, it also creates a source of intermediary power for the ones profiling trainer positions. Since the elections of 2017, it was decided to totally centralize SOMOS management in the City Council, which has brought more powers to the ones working within the Programme, including trainer positions. A certain challenge for the current state is how to balance the power on assigning training missions, in order to prevent an instrumental approach to SOMOS.

A colleague assigned with the responsibility of setting a human rights campaign suggested at some point that SOMOS slogan "We are the rights we have" could be used in the campaign, except it should not be associated with SOMOS communication strategy. Another form of instrumentality featuring SOMOS, as in this innocent suggestion, was a sort of naturalized cannibalization of what the Programme was successfully achieving.

Concluding remarks

This essay exposed a personal experience on conceiving and early-implementing a public human rights education Programme in Lisbon. Even though SOMOS had remarkable successes, it presented many challenges such as lack of internal know-how, unwillingness to cooperate – and share power – with civil society, personalization, internal undermining, instrumentality serving personal interests. The main challenges on creating SOMOS deployed and developed from within the City Council.

Possible challenges for the future of the Programme relate with the recent political option of totally centralizing SOMOS management in the City Council. For example, regarding the sustainability of the moral stand of a public institution individualistically acting towards the promotion of change in the status quo.

The difficulties on conceiving and implementing SOMOS raise a series of possibilities for further research, particularly in comparing the Lisbon case with similar human rights education Programmes in other cities and in other regions of the world. Another possible exploration could be to deepen the understanding of how public institutions, as primary guarantors of human rights, could further facilitate the conceiving of human rights education Programmes.

A final remark goes to the difficulties in clearly understanding the highly codified agencies and the obscure structures of power behind what happens inside scaled public institutions. This essay was written almost one year after the experience working at the Lisbon City Council and, for different reasons, it would not be possible to write it if the author was still working there.

I would like to thank you Teresa for the invaluable support you gave me before and during the writing of this article. Thank you.

References

Barderi, D. d. (2018). *Antirumours Handbook 2018*. Council of Europe. Retrieved 09 26, 2018, from http://rm.coe.int/anti-rumours-handbook-a-standardised-methodology-for-cities-2018-/168077351c

Bloom, B., Engelhart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W., & Krathwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. (B. Bloom, Ed.) New York: David McKay Co Inc.

Bourdieu, P. (1995). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Coombs, P., Prosser, R., & Ahmed, M. (1973). *New Paths to Learning for rural children and youth*. New York: International Council for Educational Development.

Council of Europe. (2010). *Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/16803034e5

Council of Europe. (2012). *Compass - Manual for human rights education with young people*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/eycb/Source/Compass_2012_FINAL.pdf

Council of Europe. (2018). *University on Youth and Development*. Retrieved 09 25, 2018, from Council of Europe: https://www.coe.int/en/web/north-south-centre/university-on-youth-and-development

European Comission. (2015). *EUROBAROMETER - Discrimination in the EU in 2015, Portugal Factsheet*. Brussels: European Comission. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/ResultDoc/download/DocumentKy/68087

Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization*, *46*(1), 1-35.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning*

and development(Vol.1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Little, N., Nemutlu, G., Magic, J., & Molnár, B. (2011). *Don't judge a book by its cover! - The Living Library Organiser's Guide 2011*. Budapest: Council of Europe - Youth Department. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/eycb/Source/EYCB%20Living%20Library. pdf

Municipality of Lisbon. (2013). *Programa de Governo da Cidade de Lisboa 2013-2017*. Lisbon: Municipality of Lisbon. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yc2vpbfv

Municipality of Lisbon. (2014). *Plano de Acção dos Direitos Sociais 2014-2017 [Social Rights Action Plan 2014-17]*. Lisbon: Municipality of Lisbon. Retrieved 09 24, 2018, from http://lisboasolidaria.cm-lisboa.pt/ documentos/1422547210W1vZN0ou3Wu74CY0.pdf

Municipality of Lisbon. (2015a). *"SOMOS" assinala Dia Internacional dos Direitos Humanos [SOMOS celebrates the International Human Rights Day]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from Câmara Municipal de Lisboa: http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/no_cache/noticias/detalhe/article/somos-assi nala-dia-internacional-dos-direitos-humanos

Municipality of Lisbon. (2015b). *SOMOS - Programa Municipal de Educação para a Cidadania Democrática e Direitos Humanos [SOMOS - Lisbon Programme for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education]*. Lisbon: Municipality of Lisbon. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/42455b_720245ad55ae47e193dfeddc7 76ca5bb.pdf

Municipality of Lisbon. (2016a). *A Campanha SOMOS [The SOMOS Campaign]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www. programasomos.pt/a-campanha

Municipality of Lisbon. (2016b). *As Escolas SOMOS [The SOMOS Schools]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www.programasomos.pt/

as-escolas-somos

Municipality of Lisbon. (2016c). *O Programa SOMOS na cidade [SOMOS Programme in the city]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www.programasomos.pt/o-somos-na-cidade

Municipality of Lisbon. (2016d). *Os Temas [The themes]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www.programasomos.pt/temas

Municipality of Lisbon. (2016e). *A Bolsa de Multiplicadores e Multiplicadoras SOMOS [SOMOS Pool of Multipliers]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www.programasomos.pt/a-bolsa

Municipality of Lisbon. (2016f). *O vídeo do Programa SOMOS [SOMOS Programme video]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www.programasomos.pt/single-post/2017/10/17/O-v%C3%ADdeo-do-Programa-SOMOS

Municipality of Lisbon. (2017). *III Escola SOMOS - dia 4 [III SOMOS School - day 4]*. Retrieved 09 26, 2018, from SOMOS: http://www.programasomos.pt/single-post/2017/07/14/III-Escola-SOMOS-dia-4

Municipality of Lisbon. (2018a). *Formação Profissional [Vocational Training]*. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from Municipality of Lisbon: http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/municipio/camara-municipal/recursos-humanos/formacao

Municipality of Lisbon. (2018b). *Proposta de Mapa de Pessoal para 2018 [Proposal of Staff Map 2018]*. Municipality of Lisbon. Retrieved 09 26, 2018, from www.cm-lisboa.pt/fileadmin/MUNICIPIO/Camara_Municipal/Recursos_Humanos/Mapa_de_Pessoal/Sumario_Executivo_mapa_de_pessoal_2018.pdf

Pinto, L. C. (2007). *Educação Não-Formal - um contributo para a compreensão do conceito e das práticas em Portugal*. Lisboa: ISCTE.

RTPCE. (2017). *Boletim 29*. Rede Territorial Portuguesa de Cidades Educadoras. Retrieved 09 25, 2018, from http://www.edcities.org/

rede-portuguesa/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2017/04/boletim_29.pdf

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations.

Xavier, S. (2016). *Porquê Educação não-Formal no SOMOS? [Why non-formal education in SOMOS?]*. Municipality of Lisbon. Retrieved 09 25, 2018, from http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/42455b_d3ae15a086db4d5 eaaab8fa0fe8c7762.pdf

Xavier, S. (2017). *SOMOS − Lisbon Programme on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights*. United Cities and Local Governments - Inclusive Cities Observatory. Retrieved 09 23, 2018, from https://www.uclg-cisdp.org/en/observatory/somos-lisbon-aims-devel oping-human-rights-culture-and-democratic-citizenship-through

Xavier, S., & Oliveira, D. (2017). SOMOS Lisbon Programme for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education. *Coyote Magazine*. Retrieved 09 25, 2018, from Coyote Magazine: https://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/ coyote-magazine/somos

〈초록〉

지방 인권 교육 프로그램의 구상
- 리스본의 '소모스(SOMOS)' 사례 -

세르지오 자비에*

리스본 시의회에서 1년 동안 처음부터 준비하여 2015년 12월 10일 출범시킨 SOMOS는 민주 시민권 및 인권을 위한 혁신적 지역 교육 프로그램입니다. SOMOS는 겨우 100,000 유로의 비용으로 연간 2000명을 대상으로 하고 있다. 교육 및 인식 제고를 통해 도시에서의 인권 및 민주주의의 공유 문화를 함양하는 것을 목표로 합니다.

시의회 내 직원부터 도시의 광범위한 대상 그룹에 이르기까지, 다양한 파트너 조직과 기관을 포함한 23개 테마에 대한 무료 교육을 제공한다. 도시의 승수에 집중 교육을 실시하고, 인권 전반과 차별에 대처하고 사회적 성찰과 토론을 양성하는 의식 향상 캠페인을 전개한다.

SOMOS는 UCLG - United City and Local Governments 유럽 의회와 통합 도시 전망대의 관심을 끌었다. 다른 도시들이 유사한 프로그램을 개발하도록 영감을 줄 수 있는 잠재력이 있기 때문이다. 주요 관심사는 구상 및 실행의 도전과제이다. 즉, 참고자료의 부족과 이해관계자의 표현, 감시와 평가, 결과 평가와 소통, 내부 협업, 공동 관리, 지속가능성, 품질과 일관성, 지속적인 학습 과정 등이 포함된다.

리스본 시의회의 공동 디자이너이자 코디네이터(2015-2017)인 본 저자는 SOMOS와의 직접적인 경험을 바탕으로 본 프로그램을 중심 사례로 삼아 PhD 논문을 쓰고 있다. 이 발표 제안은 SOMOS의 개념과 조기 구현에 대한 도전 과제에 집중하고 있으며, 리스본을 뛰어 넘는 영감의 잠재력과 세

---

* CES-코임브라 대학, 포르투갈

계의 다른 도시에서도 적용 가능성이 크다는 것도 고려하고 있다.

주제어 : 인권교육, 지방교육정책, 정책 개념, 리스본 시의회, 기관 내의 도전