



DFD-YD/ETD (2025) 58

Strasbourg, 17 March 2025

COMPASS

Training Courses on Human Rights Education
with Young People

ANALYTICAL REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION IN 2024



LEARNING EQUALITY,
LIVING DIGNITY.



The views expressed in the analytical review are the sole responsibility of their author and shall not be considered as constituting the official position or opinion of the Council of Europe.

This analytical review has been prepared by Barbara Santibanez, Consultant with the Youth Department of the Council of Europe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. BACKGROUND	6
1.1. Aim and scope of the review.....	7
1.2. Research Design	7
2. MAIN FINDINGS	9
2.1. Quality of context/structures.....	9
2.2. Quality of processes.....	11
2.3. Quality of outcomes.....	14
2.4. Strengthening the added value of the Compass NRTCs (and addressing potential challenges)	16
3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
3.1. Recommendations to the Council of Europe Youth Department.....	19
3.2. Recommendations for national partners	20
3.3. Recommendations for implementing organisations and national actors	20
4. REFERENCES	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This analytical review evaluates the Compass National and Regional Training Courses (NRTCs) implemented in 2024 under the Council of Europe Youth Department's Human Rights Education Youth Programme. It was carried out upon a decision of the Joint Council on Youth to support the monitoring of the implementation of the [Roadmap for education for democratic citizenship and human rights education with young people](#) (2024-2028)

The programme of Compass NRTCs 2024 resulted in 12 activities implemented in member states, namely in Albania, Andorra, France, Greece, Italy and Switzerland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, North Macedonia, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Ukraine and the United Kingdom. The target groups and outreach of the activities were different from one country to another, but all served the purpose to train multipliers and promote Human Rights Education using the *Compass* manual. The programme of activities has been overall very successful and a unique contribution to support human rights with young people in the member states according to the [Roadmap for education for democratic citizenship and human rights education with young people](#) (2024-2028), adopted by the Joint Council on Youth in October 2023. Key results are listed below:

- **12** activities covered **13** member states and involved **541** participants and team members.
- Two additional activities complemented the programmes of Compass NRTCs: [a launch event of the Lithuanian edition of Compass](#) at the Human Rights Film Festival "Inconvenient Films" in Vilnius on October 24, 2024, within the programme of the [Presidency of Lithuania of Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe](#); an [exhibition marking the 75th anniversary of the Council of Europe](#) "Human rights passwords" on October 2, 2024, in the Brent Museum and Archives, London.
- **2** youth centres with the Council of Europe **Quality Label** hosted the training courses: Marienthal Youth Centre in Luxembourg and Braga Youth Centre in Portugal.

Some of the key results and achievements that improved the quality and visibility of the Compass NRTCs 2024, along with the diversity of partnering member states, are listed below:

- In most of the activities the Council of Europe presence was ensured by the representation of either secretariat members, field offices staff or the members of the statutory bodies of the youth sector.
- Some of the training courses were initiated by former participants of the TOTHRE courses (Training of Trainers in Human Rights Education), including those from 2023 and previous years, contributing to the standards of learning processes and demonstrating the sustainability of continuous efforts under the HREY programme.
- Liaising the variety of projects and programmes of the Council of Europe with the Compass NRTCs: the Youth for Democracy in Ukraine project, Youth Revitalising Democracy project, as well as the joint EU and Council of Europe ROMACTED Phase II Programme on "Promoting good governance and Roma empowerment at local level", the Recommendation CM/Rec(2023)4 on Roma Youth Participation and the Reykjavík Principles for Democracy. Cooperation with the field offices in Kyiv, Tirana and Skopje.
- New developments regarding the translated versions of the Compass manual into Lithuanian and Portuguese were applied in the training programmes.

The key findings of this review are listed below:

- **In terms of quality of context/structures**, the strong institutional backing from the Council of Europe contributed to an overall perception of success even in cases where financial constraints and rising costs posed challenges for some implementing partners. The presence of trainers from the Council of Europe enhanced the quality of training. The availability of translated Compass manuals (e.g., Lithuanian, Portuguese) and other resources provided by the Youth Department have significantly improved training effectiveness.
- **In terms of quality of processes**, while most training courses stated to have achieved their objectives, some observations were made in terms of the scope. Training courses added extra elements such as hackathons (France), Living Library events (Greece), and political discussions with local representatives (Andorra). While participant feedback was positive, there was a lack of structured evaluation and long-term follow-up to assess the continued impact of the training courses. However, some partner implemented strong follow-up mechanisms (e.g., six-month post-training meetings, online project-sharing platform) that could inspire future implementation of the NRTCs. Networking opportunities emerged to connect youth organisations, political representatives, and formal education institutions, which were highly appreciated by participants and could foster long-term cooperation.
- **In terms of quality of outcomes/impact**, many implementing organisations planned follow-up initiatives, such as mentoring, networking, and project support, but the extent to which these initiatives were carried out is unknown. Generally, participants gained knowledge and skills about human rights education. However, a more structured assessment would be needed to measure competence development over time. The courses represent an important contribution to the EDC/HRE Charter implementation even if its practical application is sometimes unclear. The training courses certainly enhance awareness about the importance of continuing this type of activities in the long run, encouraging a more strategic approach to increase the capacity of young people to access their rights and advocate for human rights education.

This report is organised around the three following sections. The first section describes the background of this review, the aims and scope, as well as the research guiding questions, and data collection methods. The second section discusses the main findings categorised into three main areas: quality of context/structures, quality of processes, and quality of outcomes/impact, followed by a discussion of key enablers/opportunities and hindering factors/areas for improvement. Finally, the third section provides the main recommendations emerging from the analysis addressed to the Council of Europe Youth Department, national partners, and implementing organisations to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of Compass NRTCs.

1. BACKGROUND

The Council of Europe Youth Department work on human rights education (HRE) with and by young people is contribution to a core mission of the institution in promoting a culture of human rights through the implementation of the [Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education](#). The EDC/HRE Charter emphasises the role of member states of the Council of Europe in making human rights education a reality for every person in Europe and the importance of quality education to promote human rights, democracy and rule of law, the core values of the institution.

For more than 20 years the Youth Department has carried out the [Human Rights Education Youth Programme](#) that currently plays a central role in the [Strategy 2030](#) of the youth sector Priority 2 “young people’s access to rights” (see Box 1), through its key features among which is the cooperation with multipliers and advocates for human rights education through the Compass national and regional training courses (hereafter, Compass NRTCs).

The [Human Rights Education Youth Programme](#) of the Council of Europe Youth provides a unique opportunity for organisations in the non-formal education and youth sectors to implement projects and activities with multipliers and advocates for human rights education through the Compass NRTCs. These training courses are expected “to contribute to processes and initiatives for human rights education at national level and to promote the role of non-governmental youth organisations as actors in the implementation of [the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education](#).”¹

Box 1: Strategic Priority 2 - Young people’s access to rights

Young people and youth organisations have increased their capacity to access their rights and advocate for human rights and citizenship education.

Young people’s access to rights depends on their capacity to exercise them, which presupposes knowledge of them gained through awareness raising and capacity building. The promotion of access to rights for all young people, including from minority groups and people with disabilities, will be pursued with member States and youth organisations through measures to support the implementation (at local, regional, national and European levels) of the Committee of Ministers’ recommendations CM/Rec(2016)7 on young people’s access to rights and CM/Rec(2015)3 on the access of young people from disadvantaged neighbourhoods to social rights, following on from the reviews of implementation of these texts. Special attention will be paid to the continuation of the Human Rights Education Youth Programme – both on- and offline, the follow-up to the review of the implementation of the EDC/HRE Charter and to the Turin Forum, as well as any evaluation of and latest developments by the Council of Europe in the Internet and media literacy fields.

Programme orientations:

- Implementing the roadmap on the dissemination of Committee of Ministers’ Recommendation CM/Rec(2016)7 on young people’s access to rights and follow-up of its first five-year review;
- Implementing support measures to member States, local authorities and youth organisations to promote the access of young people from disadvantaged neighbourhoods to social rights (ENTER! Recommendation);

¹ <https://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-education-youth/national-training-courses-in-human-rights-education>

- Continuing the Human Rights Education Youth Programme, and follow-up to the review of the implementation of the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education and the Turin Forum;
- Supporting young people's right to information by developing sources of knowledge, data and media literacy with and for children and young people;
- Increasing the understanding of the Covid-19 pandemic and other important challenges facing young people, such as the health, economic and other crises, and addressing their impact on youth and their exercise of social rights;
- Further introducing rights-based approaches into youth policies, programmes and projects;
- Ensuring an increased focus on mental health and mental well-being, including the provision of accessible and free mental health services, taking an intersectional approach;
- Exploring and reinforcing the Youth Department's work on the sustainable development of youth mobility schemes in Europe, especially their economic, environmental and social aspects;
- Supporting young people's rights to live in sustainable societies and to benefit from a healthy environment which are intrinsically linked to their well-being.

Source: 2024-2027 Priorities of the Council of Europe youth sector
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/youth/priorities>

The following section describes the aim, scope, and methods employed to conduct the analytical review that is the subject of this report.

1.1. Aim and scope of the review

The present review aims at assessing the Compass NRTCs added value and contribution to the core mission of the Council of Europe to promote and protect human rights, including good practices/lessons learned identified in the training courses, as well as recommendations for the future work of the Council of Europe Youth Department in supporting the COMPASS NRTCs.

This review takes into consideration the following strategic documents: the [Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education](#) of the Council of Europe (hereafter, "the EDC/HRE Charter"); the [Roadmap for education for democratic citizenship and human rights](#) education with young people (2024-2028), adopted by the Joint Council on Youth in October 2023; and the aims of the [Human Rights Education Youth Programme](#) as a direct contribution to the core mission of the organisation to promote and protect human rights.

1.2. Research Design

This analytical review was designed keeping in mind the aims set forth by the Council of Youth Department, as well as the data made available to conduct the review. In order to keep the review process clear and straightforward, two guiding questions were identified in agreement with the Youth Department, as follows:

- How are the Compass NRTCs contributing to the core mission of the Council of Europe Youth Department to promote and protect human rights through human rights education?
- What are the main factors that strengthen the Compass NRTCs added value? What needs to be improved and what factors could positively influence this process?

These questions seek to highlight the importance of the strategic documents mentioned above, in particular the EDC/HRE Charter, in an effort to identify what factors could facilitate/hinder the realisation of the Charter principles into practice.

Data collection: the primary source of information were 1) Twelve (12) narrative reports prepared by implementing organisations, 2) Six (6) evaluation forms prepared by trainers of the Council of Europe Youth Department that supported the implementation of the Compass NRTCs, and 3) Three (3) feedback forms prepared by consultants.

Additional data were collected during two online focus groups organised with the coordinators of the training courses, of one hour each. The purpose was to obtain further information about the following points: 1) How were the [Quality criteria and standards in education and training activities of the Youth Department of the Council of Europe \(2016\)](#) (see Box 2) integrated in the training implementation; 2) Key takeaways of the implementation process; and 3) Recommendations for future implementation of the Compass NRTCs according to their contexts.

Secondary sources of data include literature related to quality of non-formal education and youth work, such as the works of Fennes and Otten (2008) and O'Donovan (2020), as well as documents from the European Commission related to the quality of youth work (European Commission, 2015).

Box 2: Quality criteria and standards in education and training activities, Council of Europe Youth Department

1. A relevant needs assessment
2. Concrete, achievable and assessable objectives
3. The definition of competences addressed and learning outcomes for the participants
4. The relevance to the Council of Europe programme and YD priorities
5. An adequate and timely preparation process
6. A competent team of trainers and facilitators
7. An integrated approach to intercultural learning, participation, and human rights education
8. Adequate recruitment and selection of participants
9. A consistent practice of non-formal education principles and approaches
10. Adequate, accessible, and timely documentation
11. A thorough and open process of evaluation
12. Optimal working conditions and environment
13. Adequate institutional support and an integrated follow-up
14. Relevant visibility and communication
15. Concern for innovation and research.

Data analysis: In order to answer the guiding questions, data were analysed using the Qualitative Content Analysis method (Schreier, 2012), supported by the Lumivero NVivo software. This method is appropriate when there is a need to focus on certain aspects of the data, trying to understand 'what is written between the lines'. Some of the strengths of this method are that it offers a systematic approach to data analysis, allowing for data reduction according to the topics of interest (Schreier, 2012). A limitation of this method is that is not suitable to generate theoretical propositions or causal explanations, which are out of the scope of this review anyway.

2. MAIN FINDINGS

As seen in the previous section, the Council of Europe Youth Department (hereby, YD) developed an extensive list of quality criteria and standards (2016), which should be an integral component of Compass NRTCs so as to contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights through HRE. Moreover, contributions to the development of quality criteria and standards for non-formal education and youth work highlight three main areas: quality of structures, quality of processes, and quality of outcomes/impact (Fennes & Otten, 2008). As described by Fennes and Otten (2008), these three areas encompass the following:

- **Quality of structures (also referred to as “quality of context”):** general conditions under which educational institutions and organisations are working (legal, organisational, and social context); human resources, including competences of teachers/trainers and training of staff; educational, financial, infrastructure, technical and other resources, etc.
- **Quality of processes:** the way in which educational organisations try to achieve their objectives – selection, design and organisation of contents and methods, consideration of the learners’ needs, guidance of learners, relation between teachers/trainers and learners, etc.
- **Quality of outcomes/impact:** the impact of the educational processes, such as the acquisition and development of knowledge, competences, motivation, attitudes, values etc. as well as the capacity, motivation, and commitment to apply the competences acquired in future learning and work (Fennes and Otten, 2008).

These three areas, along with the Quality criteria and standards of the Youth Department (2016), were crucial to answer the guiding questions of this review. Hence, the results presented in the following pages are organised as follows: first, a discussion of the findings by area of relevance (context/structures, processes, and outcomes/impact); second, a discussion of potential enablers and opportunities to strengthen the added value of the NRTCs, and of potential hindering factors and areas for improvement identified in the analysis.

2.1. Quality of context/structures

With regards to the quality of structures and context, there are several factors that come into play, from the broader context in which the training courses take place (e.g. social, political, economic, etc.), to the specific institutions that operate for the training to happen. For the purpose of this review, we have focused our analysis on three main aspects: **institutional context; resources (e.g. technical and financial); and training staff.**

Based on the data collected, the strong institutional context is a crucial aspect for the success of the Compass NRTCs. On the one hand, there is the institutional support provided by the YD as well as other Council of Europe bodies (including country-level offices, national or regional pilot programmes, etc.). Some examples from implementing organisations highlight the importance of “having the Council of Europe logo” to promote and disseminate the training courses; the one-to-one meetings held during the preparatory phase with a YD officer; the possibility to request a trainer to the YD; and the participation of Council of Europe representatives in their training courses – such as country representatives of the CDEJ (e.g. Italy, Portugal), the Head of the YD, YD programme officers, etc.

Further, the institutional support received by implementing organisations came not only from the YD, but also from local, regional, and national authorities. In some training courses, representatives of the Ministry of Youth and Sports held a session during the training course (Ukraine) or participated in the organisation of it (France). In others, local authorities took part in the activities (e.g. Andorra, United Kingdom). As stated in the narrative reports, for implementing organisations having a political or policy representative in addition of the Council of Europe representation was a way to enhance the credibility of the training course.

It's worth noting that connecting the training courses with their local context also gave implementing partners a sense of long-term perspective for future replication. In cases where this was the first Compass NRTC (e.g. Albania), the training course opened avenues for partnering with other civil society organisations and higher education institutions. In Andorra, city councils expressed an interest in increasing youth participation, which was reflected in the participation from representatives of seven Andorran city councils in their training course – and one of the city councils implemented a Youth Council for the first time after it. And in the United Kingdom, the Brent Council “intends to implement the Enter! Recommendation as it is very close to the everyday rights explored during the course.”

The second aspect analysed in terms of quality of context/structure are the resources (e.g. technical and financial) at disposal of the implementing organisations. The financial and educational resources are highly valued and considered as fundamental for the successful implementation of training courses, as noted in the narrative reports submitted to the YD and confirmed in the focus groups discussions held with organisers of the Compass NRTCs.

Although many reports stressed the need for an increased financial support in future implementation of the NRTCs, funding was acknowledged as a key resource provided by the YD. In particular, for organisations that implemented the Compass NRTC for the first time it was essential (e.g. Albania, Greece), while others could ensure accessibility to all participants (e.g. Italy, Slovakia). Some implementing partners expressed a concern for the rising cost of living in their specific context, which could influence their ability to implement future NRTCs.

In terms of technical resources (i.e. Compass manuals and other YD publications), the availability of materials in the national language of the implementing organisations was highly appreciated. In Lithuania and Portugal, the translated versions of the Compass manual were also available. Some additional publications used in NRTCs were *Compasito* (Greece, Lithuania,); *Gender Matters* (Greece, Luxembourg, Portugal); *Bookmarks* (Greece, Portugal); and *Mirrors* (Lithuania, North Macedonia).

The third aspect related to quality of context/structure analysed in this review is trainers' competences, understood in terms of the support provided by trainers from the YD trainers' pool and the team of trainers that delivered the NRTCs. On the one hand, the support of a Council of Europe trainer was deemed quite useful, especially for implementing organisations that were doing a Compass training course for the first time. It's worth noting that having an assigned trainer from the YD helped to ensure the integration of the Quality criteria and standards (2016) in the preparation, implementation, and evaluation phase.

On the other hand, there were variations across teams of trainers formed to deliver the NRTCs. This variation could be attributed to 1) that the team involved trainers with previous experiences of cooperation with the YD, as it was the case in Andorra, Italy-Switzerland, and the United Kingdom; and 2) that some organisations implemented a NRTC for the first time and recruited the training staff based on their background in non-formal education, which is not necessarily similar to the human rights education approach in all aspects.

Nonetheless, where a Council of Europe trainer was part of the team there was an increased perception of the overall success of the training course – notably in combination with the technical resources offered by the YD. As noted in the narrative reports,

"The CoE's provision of materials and logistics, combined with the expertise of a highly professional trainer from the pool of trainers, were crucial to the overall success of the course activities."

"The provision of a high-quality trainer who supported the participants and the team throughout the week. The practical elements related to the activities of the EDH, as well as the fundamental principles of the EDH Charter, were able to be presented and discussed in great detail with the participants thanks to this involvement."

The different levels of competence observed across trainer teams in relation to non-formal and human rights education should be a point of attention for future implementation of the Compass NRTCs.

2.2. Quality of processes

According to Fennes and Otten (2008), quality of processes in non-formal education and youth work is connected to the way in which organisations try to fulfil their objectives, including the selection of content and methods, learners' needs assessment, relational aspects, etc. This section will focus on the following aspects of the implementation process of Compass NRTCs: **aims and objectives; contents and methods; implementation of the training course (i.e. preparation, selection of participants, evaluation, follow up, etc.)**. In addition, we will discuss the **relational aspect** transversal to the training course implementation.

Across the NRTCs organised in 2024, **aims and objectives** stated in the narrative reports range from a general approach to raising awareness about human rights and HRE using the Compass manual to more specific goals that reveal distinct needs at the local level. Some examples of specific objectives include:

- developing a network of human rights educators (e.g. France)
- strengthening cooperation between formal and non-formal education actors (Italy-Switzerland, Ukraine)
- introducing a newly translated edition of Compass (Lithuania)
- developing competences among trainers or multipliers for human rights education and antigypsyism in the context of national or local training courses by using COMPASS and Mirrors (Albania and North Macedonia).
- raising awareness about the online and offline forms of phobias related to the recent UK "Illegal Immigrant Act" (UK).

In this regard, it would be worth further exploring the relationship between more specific, context-driven objectives and the perception of overall success among organisers and participants to the training courses.

Based on the narrative reports collected by the YD, a majority of implementing organisations and trainers from the Council of Europe believe that the objectives set for the training courses were achieved to a large extent. However, more detailed accounts would be needed (including what *didn't* work and what was challenging in the implementation) to better grasp what is understood by *successfully* attaining the aims and objectives of a Compass NRTC. For example, the narrative reports point to positive evaluation results (from participants), including feedback on the content, methods, and the training team. Yet it's interesting to note that in most of the training courses, the participants highly appreciated other aspects not directly related to the content, such as "the group dynamics", the "value of sharing different experiences", "the opportunity to network", "having a safe learning space", etc.

With regards to **contents and methods** and keeping in mind the different levels of competence of the teams of trainers discussed in the previous section, a majority of the implementing organisations showed an awareness about the importance of non-formal and human rights education methodologies. The focus on human rights education contents (facilitated by the use of Compass manual) allowed organisers to deliver interactive, reflexion-based, and learner-centred activities throughout the training programme. Some specific examples of adaptation to the context and the learning needs identified by the organisers include:

- contextualising the importance of HRE with concrete case studies examples (Albania, Luxembourg)
- use of innovative methods to address HRE issues : in France, the implementing partners organised a Hackathon to encourage participants in creating digital projects integrating HRE.
- a Living Library event to challenge stereotypes about the subjects of HRE and activism and empower participants (Greece)
- facilitating a "work meeting" between participants and local elected officials responsible for youth or participation from city councils (Andorra).

In terms of the **implementation of the training course** (encompassing the preparation, the selection process, evaluation, and follow up), the narrative reports and the evaluation forms collected by the YD provide an overall picture of the process unfolded in each country. Some clear trends emerged from the data in relation to key areas of implementation, which are discussed below.

Preparation phase

- In most NRTCs the support from the Council of Europe (including the trainer assigned) helped implementing organisations to put in motion a structured approach towards the design, implementation, and evaluation of the training course.
- The preparatory phase in close contact with the YD is considered extremely useful by organisers, in particular by those less experienced in implementing human rights education activities.
- Trainers from the Council of Europe, besides their educational support on content and methodology, declared that sometimes their role went beyond this scope. Some of the examples cited include having to advise on organisational issues, the selection of participants, and also stepping in as a main trainer (to replace a trainer that stepped down).
- In cases where the training course was connected to a previous human rights education activity, this seemed to give a sense of "continuity" to the HRE work in the country.

Selection of participants

- The selection of participants was one of the areas in which some concerns were raised by organisers and trainers: for example, the difficulty in recruiting people out of the city where the training was organised (due to the costs associated) and the last-minute dropouts.
- As for target groups, there were a variety of audiences included in the calls for applications (e.g. police officers, lawyers, social workers, psychologists, etc.), allowing organisers to expand beyond the “youth work bubble,” as some of them shared. In several cases, having diverse backgrounds in the participants group made the learning experience richer. Nonetheless, it’s important to keep this diversity in mind when conducting the needs assessment so that the objectives reflect the learning needs of all audiences targeted.
- In almost all training courses there were a majority of female participants (representing more than 60% of the total), which was underlined by a trainer as a point of attention in terms of gender mainstreaming – to be considered in future implementation.

Evaluation

- As noted previously, implementing partners point to positive evaluation results from participants with regards to the content, methods, and the training team.
- It would be useful to have a more detailed reporting of the evaluation methods employed in the training courses, as well as an extensive analysis of the results. In particular, because a majority of the implementing organisations reported that participants highly appreciated other outcomes not related to competence development (e.g. group dynamics, having a safe space to learn, sharing different experiences with people they don’t usually meet, etc.)

Follow up

- When it comes to follow up, all implementing organisations reported having foreseen a series of actions to keep participants engaged – which is key for the development of competences of multipliers for human rights education with young people.
- The extent to which some or all of these follow up activities were realised after the Compass training course is unknown. It would be advisable to have a follow up meeting with implementing partners some months after the training course to assess in turn to what extent they have been able to follow up with participants.
- Based on the narrative reports submitted by the implementing organisations, the following actions were foreseen:
 - Assisting with project proposals from participants (Albania, Italy-Switzerland, Slovakia, Ukraine)
 - Offering mentoring and supervisory support to participants that would like to implement activities (Albania)
 - Opening a Moodle/Padlet for participants to share their projects, resources, and other related materials (France, Greece).
 - Participation of training course organisers (Greece) in other YD activities (e.g. Living Compass)
 - Conduct follow up meetings 2, 3, and 6 months after the training course to evaluate what has changed for participants and to provide feedback on potential projects (Andorra, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, United Kingdom)
 - Organising awareness raising campaigns around specific topics (e.g. domestic violence against Roma women and girls in North Macedonia).

As mentioned earlier, the **relational component** is transversal to the implementation of the Compass NRTCs. A central element to ensure the quality of processes, relations and exchanges developed

between counterparts seem to have a great influence on the organisation's ability to successfully implement a training course.

Besides the networking aspect discussed previously – participants and organisations alike appreciated opportunities to meet other professionals and potential partners in the HRE field – connections are established at different levels: between the YD and implementing partners; between YD representatives, trainers, and organisers; between trainers and learners; between implementing organisations and other institutions; etc. Across all these connections, *trust from each counterpart* is crucial to ensure that the training course goes smoothly – in particular if there are no Council of Europe trainers supporting the process.

Below are some relevant observations about the relationships developed emerged from the data collected, to keep into consideration:

- A good relationship between trainers from the YD and implementing organisations appears to foster an alignment with requirements of the YD in terms of objectives, content and methods, as well as of the quality criteria and standards.
- Having the support of a trainer from the YD allowed some implementing partners to solve unexpected issues that cropped up; there is a rather high trust on the trainer's capacity to help.
- Trainers from the YD that submitted evaluation forms reported an overall good experience working with the implementing organisations, although their roles varied (as discussed earlier). These evaluation forms are of great value to provide a more complete view of the different phases of the training course, including the difficulties encountered during the process.
- In cases where implementing organisations worked with other local/international partners (e.g. France, Greece, Italy-Switzerland, North Macedonia), it appeared to facilitate the inclusion of external experts/guest lecturers.
- When staff or trainers from implementing partners have participated in previous Council of Europe activities (e.g. Living Compass training or TOTHRE), it appears to enhance the interest in implementing a Compass NRTC.

This last point – that some training courses were initiated by participants of TOTHRE – connects also to the quality of outcomes and impact, which is the third area discussed in this section. As noted in the preliminary analysis conducted by the YD, it also contributes to the standards of learning processes and demonstrating the sustainability of continuous efforts under the HREY programme.

2.3. Quality of outcomes

For the purpose of this review, the quality of outcomes/impact is linked to the development of competences (i.e. knowledge, skills, and attitudes) and values of multipliers for human rights education with young people. Moreover, we have included in this area the contribution of the Compass NRTCs to the implementation of the EDC/HRE Charter, a key driver of the programme.

As it is the case with the aims and objectives, the competences that implementing partners expected to help learners develop ranged from general competences needed for non-formal education work (e.g. critical thinking, analytical skills, team work, creativity, active listening, adaptability, etc.) to other more specific to human rights education. Based on the narrative reports submitted by implementing organisations, the most cited competences related to human rights education were the following:

Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Rights key concepts (definitions, values, historical development) • International/regional/national framework, existing supporting and protecting mechanisms • Inter-relations of Human Rights and their relevance for young people's lives • Current trends and challenges in Human Rights protection • The work of the Council of Europe and the EDC/HRE Charter implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential skills to design and implement HRE activities • Essential facilitation and training skills • Ability to recognise and address Human Rights violations at local and regional levels • Ability to act for Human Rights support and protection at local and regional levels. • Chose, adapt, and apply activities from Compass in daily educational practice, by adjusting them to the local context and needs of the learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of justice and responsibility • Sense of human dignity • Open mindedness and appreciation of diversity • Empathy and mutual solidarity

Some outstanding competences that were not common across training courses were:

- Knowledge about key concepts on decolonisation and localisation of Human theories and practices (Italy-Switzerland)
- Use of digital tools to raise awareness about human rights (France)

Nonetheless, the narrative reports lack a clear discussion/explanation about whether there was a change in competence development between the beginning and the end of the training course. This is an important element to analyse as it could influence the way in which follow up activities are structured.

Regarding the contribution of the NRTC to implementing the EDC/HRE Charter, the shared perception of implementing partners is that the training courses did give prominence to this instrument. In the narrative reports there aren't enough data to confirm this claim, due to the lack of information as of *how* the training concretely contributed to the implementation of the EDC/HRE Charter. However, it is possible to draw some observations from the available data: in general, there is a tendency to include the presentation of the EDC/HRE Charter in the training programme, along with other Council of Europe instruments and publications; numerous training courses included "understand/know about the EDC/HRE Charter" as an objective; and several set this knowledge as a key competence to develop.

One question worth asking in future discussions about the Compass NRTCs is how different stakeholders (i.e. the Council of Europe, the trainers, the implementing organisations) visualise a concrete contribution to implementing the EDC/HRE Charter. Also, it would be useful to have more information about how the Charter is presented and promoted among participants (e.g. using what methods, for what purpose, etc.). This could help facilitate the task for implementing partners, especially those who

are new to the human rights education field. If organisers are not 'well-versed', further support about the implementation of the Charter would be needed.

2.4. Strengthening the added value of the Compass NRTCs (and addressing potential challenges)

Keeping in mind the different areas of quality discussed above, this section offers a discussion on the one hand, about enablers and opportunities to strengthen the added value of the NRTCs; and on the other, of hindering factors/areas for improvement that were identified in the analysis. It's important to note that there seem to be more enablers and opportunities than obstructions to the added value and long-term impact of the Compass NRTCs.

Enablers and opportunities

- **Strong institutional presence:** Having the official support of the Council of Europe is considered of high value, especially to reach to local policy/political representatives and local antennae of international organisations. Moreover, the Compass NRTC is considered as a "high-level training" in EDC/HRE among some organisers. Leveraging this perception would be beneficial to the future implementation of the NRTCs, in particular to encourage organisers to develop regional and national networks of human rights educators.
- **Resources provided by the YD:** as stated in one of the reports, input provided in terms of communication and visibility, provision of certificates for the participants and the trainers, Compass manual print copies, Council of Europe publications, etc. were essential for the success of the training. Further, support provided in terms of project management (e.g. budget, logistics, timeline, etc.) and training in HRE (i.e. contents and methods) is a key aspect for success as well, especially for newcomers.
- **Influence of the 'Council of Europe link':** keeping a steady link with alumnae from training courses organised by the YD could enhance the quality of future Compass NRTCs, as they become organisers or trainers themselves. An example from Greece depicts the importance of this "link" with the Council of Europe: "one of the most active participants of the 2022 Compass NRTC is someone from Crete, who not only continued their engagement with the Council of Europe, but also took part in the TOTHRE 2023, and then joined the national team of the No Hate Speech network."
- **Central role of the Council of Europe trainers:** as explained before, trainers from the YD sometimes stepped in to ensure a smooth implementation, beyond their responsibility as educational support. Importantly, these trainers bring the Council of Europe standards into focus "ensuring that the training aligned with HRE guidelines and objectives", as stated in a report.
- **Networking within and outside the training course:** A key preliminary finding was that in the Compass NRTCs organised in 2024, there was a liaison with a variety of projects and programmes of the Council of Europe. This finding echoes the analysis presented in this review – participants as well as implementing partners greatly appreciated the possibility of meeting new people and organisations. In some cases, there was a clear intention of creating a network of human rights educators (e.g. France) and in others, of connecting youth workers with political representatives (e.g. Andorra), and connecting actors from formal and non-formal

education (e.g. Italy, Lithuania, Slovakia). It could be argued that the inclusion of networking activities could enhance the attractiveness of the training courses.

- **Increased diversity of target groups:** as mentioned before, some implementing partners aimed at including diverse audiences in their training courses – for instance, in Albania and North Macedonia young Roma participants were actively involved: “this diversity not only contributed to the formation of a new network but also fostered a sense of community”, explained the report from Albania. In other training courses there were participants coming from other countries (France), which contributed to sharing diverse lived experiences. Further, in some training courses there were participants significantly older to their peers (Ukraine), which was also seen as an added value in terms of the diversity of experiences.
- **A structured follow up approach:** although all training courses included follow up actions (as discussed in the previous section), there were some outstanding examples from specific training courses. In Andorra, participants were invited to meet six months after the training to present their actions to promote youth participation in decision-making. In France, online meetings should take place every semester so that participants can present their human rights education projects, with a Moodle support developed by the organisers to centralise the information shared. In Portugal, the Compass manual translated in Portuguese should allow participants to implement their human rights education activities. In the United Kingdom, a direct connection with the Deputy Leader of the Brent Council should facilitate the awareness raising activities about human rights; the Council also showed an interest in implementing the Enter! recommendation locally.
- **Impacting the broader context:** some organisers expressed their enthusiasm about the possibility of organising Compass NRTCs in their communities, as this represents “a seed of hope” given the current political situation. As noted in one of the narrative reports, “the representative of the Ministry took an active part in a part of the training course and was genuinely surprised by its approach and the quality.” Leveraging this opportunity for future implementation of NRTCs in other cities could give a sense of continuity to the human rights education work done locally.

Hindering factors/areas for improvement

- **Managing expectations about objectives, contents, and methods:** according to the data collected, some issues still persist in terms of managing objectives (and by extension, the content and methods) so that these are actually achievable within the requirements of the YD. As declared in some narrative reports, some programmes were “overambitious, without a clear scope”; others included a variety of topics that had to be narrowed down with the help of the YD; others realised that more sessions around Compass were needed to put all participants on the same page about how to use the manual. Moreover, when a majority of participants are new to the topic of human rights education, it could become difficult to address too many other themes (e.g. migration, cyberbullying, gender mainstreaming, etc.). A relevant suggestion coming from the organisers is to “include a preliminary session or materials to introduce foundational ideas before the training.”
- **Not enough experience with human rights education projects:** as it has been discussed in the previous sections, some implementing organisations were doing a Compass NRTC for the first time. The support received from the YD and the assigned trainers was helpful and allowed them to navigate the implementation smoothly, but there were some issues related to

project management that emerged, in particular about time management. This point is closely linked to the point above: if there are too many objectives or a variety of contents to be addressed throughout the training, time will be not enough. This reflection stems from the insights shared by the implementing partners and the trainers of the YD.

- **Sometimes, there is not enough diversity:** in several narrative reports and evaluation forms from trainers the issue of “homogeneity” of the participants’ groups was raised. As it was noted in the previous section, there was an overwhelming majority of female participants in the NRTCs organised in 2024, which is something that can be addressed by the implementing partners to a certain extent in the recruitment process. Other concerns shared pointed to the need of including more participants from rural and peripheral areas, which could be difficult if there is not the infrastructure and the funding to cover the boarding and accommodation for all participants. However, a more targeted approach to the objectives and content could help tackle this perceived homogeneity, as seen in some training courses that addressed specific approaches to young people’s rights (e.g. in North Macedonia they worked with Roma youth).
- **Structural issues:** even though the financial, educational, and institutional support provided by the YD is crucial for implementing the Compass NRTCs, some structural issues could hinder to a certain extent the success of the training courses. In some cases, implementing partners decided to go for a non-residential training, which prevented a greater development of group dynamics among participants. In others, costs of boarding and accommodation were only partially covered, which resulted in selected participants declining due to lack of funding. And finally, in some cases the trainer assigned by the YD got involved at a later stage in the preparation phase, which delayed to some extent the alignment between the YD requirements and the programme’s objectives. Nonetheless, these limitations were acknowledged by the implementing partners, which enhances the possibility of improving future editions of the Compass NRTCs.

The discussion presented in this section aimed to provide a clear overview of the added value of the Compass NRTCs, as well as the key factors that will enable an improvement of the quality in future editions. The following section will address the main recommendations stemming from the analysis, to be considered along this overview.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The two questions guiding this analysis sought to understand the added value of the Compass NRTCs and the main factors that are enabling or hindering the process. As it was discussed in the main findings section, there are some clear patterns stemming from the analysis. First, the strong institutional context (quality of context/structure) provided by the YD appears to have a positive impact on the training implementation. This is enhanced by the resources provided – not only financial, but also educational and technical – and the structured approach to the preparation of the training courses. There are some issues to address regarding the diversity of the target groups (in particular in terms of gender mainstreaming) and the follow up with implementing organisations and participants.

A second pattern is the influence of the 'Council of Europe' link, that in the long term seems to favour a continuity in the implementation of human rights education activities across countries. Coupled with the networking opportunities that emerged within and outside the training course, the Compass NRTCs are a reference in terms of promoting human rights through human rights education. Leveraging on the motivation shown by implementing organisations to organise future NRTCs in other cities/regions could enhance this sense of continuity. Moreover, training courses seem to enhance awareness about the importance of providing access to these activities in the long run, encouraging a more strategic approach to increase the capacity of young people to access their rights and advocate for human rights education.

The third pattern observed is that implementing organisations require support in specific areas of project management, in particular if they are new to the NRTCs. This would help them manage their expectations about objectives, contents, and methods; better evaluate and report the outcomes of the training course; and organise a structured follow up process. Another area where organisations clearly require support is related to the contribution of the NRTCs to implementing the EDC/HRE Charter. Although the shared perception of implementing partners is that the training courses did give prominence to this instrument, is not clear *how* the training concretely contribute to the implementation of the EDC/HRE Charter. More guidance from the YD could facilitate this task.

The recommendations below address the different actors involved in the implementation of the Compass NRTCs, including the Council of Europe Youth Department, national partners (ministries of youth and/or ministries of education, CDEJ members), as well as other local or national actors involved in human rights education with young people.

3.1. Recommendations to the Council of Europe Youth Department

- **Strengthen the support for implementing partners regarding the Quality criteria and standards to ensure that these are met.** The preparatory phase is a key moment to confirm that all partners are on the same page regarding the quality criteria and standards, and trainers from the Council of Europe play an important role in guiding the project coordinators to navigate them.
- **Ensure that support is available from early in the process.** Several narrative reports stated that an early involvement of the YD and/or the trainer from the Council of Europe would have benefited the implementation of the training course. Some suggestions include “providing a clear outline of the Council of Europe expert’s role from the start, ensuring both the trainers and participants understand their involvement and contributions”; “review and give feedback on preparatory materials to ensure they align with the YD standards and fully support the

training's objectives"; "more presence in promoting the training could enhance the training course reach and impact".

- **Develop a structured approach to evaluation and follow up.** In order to better understand whether the training courses are up to the criteria and standards set by the Youth Department, more details about the evaluation process and the follow up could be requested in advance so as to make sure that implementing organisations ensure the coherence between objectives, contents, and methods. Also, this would help address self-reporting bias so as to have a more accurate idea of the results and outcomes of the training courses. Further, the extent to which some or all of the planned follow up activities were realised after the Compass NRTCs is unknown. A more structured follow up was suggested by implementing organisations in their narrative reports.
- **Reinforce the link of the NRTCs with the implementation of the EDC/HRE Charter.** As noted in the main findings, if implementing organisations are not well versed about the Charter, there will be a need for a more specific support to help them develop concrete approaches. Provide examples of how the NRTCs contribute to the Charter implementation by choosing priority areas, priority actions, etc. could strengthen this link.
- **Develop a Compass NRTC alumnae network.** There is a trend among participants to TOTHE or Compass trainings as initiators of Compass NRTCs, which is a precious resource for the continuation of the programme. Alumnae (including participants to the Compass NRTCs) could be connected through an online platform so as to enhance the cooperation/networking at the local level.
- **Consider the utility of impact evaluations.** Conducting follow up evaluations with organisers and/or participants of the NRTCs after 6 months or a year could help to develop "impact stories" to be shared, so as to inspire other organisations or participants to become multipliers of human rights education with young people.

3.2. Recommendations for national partners

- **Offer concrete support to implementing organisations.** As it has been discussed in this review, the involvement of Ministry representatives, the CDEJ, and other political/policy bodies was highly valuable for the project coordinators. This not only appears to increase the credibility of the training course, but it opens avenues for networking with other local partners.
- **Foster collaboration across non-formal and formal education actors.** Following the point above, the diversity of backgrounds in terms of educational actors opened the possibility of having a richer exchange about implementing human rights education with young people across learning environments. This could also support more specific, context-driven training courses, that would encourage a more holistic approach to human rights education.

3.3. Recommendations for implementing organisations and national actors

- **Apply an intersectional lens to the selection process,** so as to avoid a high group homogeneity. It's also crucial to keep in mind gender mainstreaming issues, in order to ensure that there is a more balanced composition of the participant's group.

- **Self-assess the trainer's team in relation to human rights education,** and request more targeted support if needed.
- **Report not only what worked, but what was difficult to achieve.**_More detailed accounts would be helpful to better grasp what is understood by successfully attaining the aims and objectives of a Compass NRTC, as well as what areas require further support.

4. REFERENCES

- European Commission. (2015). Quality Youth Work: A common framework for the further development of youth work. Report from the Expert Group on Youth Work Quality Systems in the EU Member States. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture
- Fennes, H., & Otten, H. (2008). Quality in non-formal education and training in the field of European youth work (p. 53). Council of Europe.
- O'Donovan, J. (2020). Promoting quality in youth work practice in Europe. Youth Partnership European Commission - Council of Europe. <https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/42128013/47262613/Promoting-quality-in-youth-work-practice-in-Europe.pdf>
- Schreier, M. (2012). Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529682571>