



## **SUMMARY REPORT**

**Expert meeting on education to combat anti-Semitism**

**Warsaw, Poland**

**7-8 May 2013**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Executive Summary .....	3
I. Introduction .....	4
II. Summary of the sessions .....	4
<i>Part I: Presentation and analysis of teaching materials on anti-Semitism.....</i>	4
Working Session 1: Presentation of new country versions .....	4
Working Session 2: Reflection on the experience of 15 countries .....	6
<i>Part II: Looking at challenges and good practices related to mainstreaming materials .....</i>	9
Working Session 3: Working with teachers – recent experiences .....	9
<i>Part III: Looking forward .....</i>	12
Annexes .....	13

## Executive Summary

The expert meeting on education to combat anti-Semitism took place in Warsaw on 7-8 May 2013. It was organized by the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR). The expert meeting offered a forum for an exchange of ideas about challenges and good practices on education to combat anti-Semitism, in particular in relation to ODIHR's joint project with the Anne Frank House to develop teaching materials on anti-Semitism.

In the **opening session**, Mr. Douglas Wake, the First Deputy Director of ODIHR, welcomed the participants and recalled the 2004 Berlin Conference on anti-Semitism which led to the development of OSCE commitments in this area. He stressed that combating anti-Semitism remains a priority for ODIHR and expressed appreciation for the work undertaken by the Anne Frank House and partner organizations in different OSCE participating States.

During **Working Session I**, the Finnish adaptation and the English translation of the Austrian teaching materials on anti-Semitism were presented. The ensuing discussion focused on co-operation with teachers and government authorities. It was also debated to what extent anti-Semitic images should feature in the materials. Close attention was paid to sensitizing teachers and students to offensive language. The experts also explored whether or not and to what extent teaching materials on anti-Semitism are designed to change attitudes. Finally, it was discussed how best to motivate teachers to teach about anti-Semitism.

**Working Session II** was an opportunity for the experts to reflect on the experiences made and the educational insights gained when working on educational materials on anti-Semitism in different countries. It was explored which educational ideas have worked particularly well. A number of challenges that have been identified when working with the materials were also presented. Reviewing the experiences made, the experts also explored when and how the impact of educational efforts to combat anti-Semitism could be evaluated. The session was completed by a presentation about an educational web tool project about anti-Semitism, which builds on the experiences made and the insights gained when the teaching materials on anti-Semitism were developed.

During **Working Session III**, the experts were invited to share recent experiences of working with teachers. The discussions focused on teacher trainings that were recently organized in Sweden and Hungary as well as on a new Danish project to develop tools that assist teachers in addressing classroom manifestations of intolerance. In the discussion, the question of how broad the focus should be and how other manifestations of intolerance should feature in trainings as well as materials was explored.

During the **closing session**, it was discussed that facts and insights should be gathered in order to develop a small publication that would inform governments and relevant stakeholders how the teaching materials on anti-Semitism have been implemented in different OSCE participating States.

## I. Introduction

In 2004, OSCE participating States committed themselves to commemorating the Holocaust and to developing educational materials on anti-Semitism. In order to assist the participating States with the implementation of their commitments, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has jointly developed tools with the Anne Frank House as well as with Yad Vashem. Within the framework of ODIHR's joint project with the Anne Frank House, teaching materials on anti-Semitism were developed by partner organizations in 15 OSCE participating States. The template teaching materials on anti-Semitism consist of three themes, with first focusing on historical manifestations of anti-Semitism, second focusing on contemporary manifestations of anti-Semitism, and third addressing manifestations of intolerance and discrimination in general. They have been adapted to the specific national context of each country.

On 7-8 May, ODIHR organized an international expert meeting on the teaching materials on anti-Semitism. Eighteen experts from twelve OSCE participating States took part in the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Present recently finalized teaching materials and facilitate a discussion on the educational insights gained when combating anti-Semitism through education;
- Exchange experiences related to teacher trainings and take stock of challenges faced by experts in the process of implementing the teaching materials;
- Connect all the experts involved in the project with a view to discussing how best to secure and document the achievements of this multilateral project.

The meeting consisted of three parts. Part I included the presentation of recently finalized adaptation of the ODIHR/Anne Frank House teaching materials on anti-Semitism as well as a general discussion about some of the educational insights gained when working with such materials in 15 OSCE participating States<sup>1</sup>. A general discussion of key questions related to evaluation also formed part of the exchange of ideas. The second part of the meeting was designed to present recent experiences of working with teachers, especially in the context of teacher trainings. The final part of the meeting was forward-looking, with ODIHR sharing plans about a forthcoming brochure to provide background information about the implementation of the project in different countries. The meeting was concluded by a joint visit of the newly opened Museum of the History of Polish Jews.

## II. Summary of the sessions

### *Part I: Presentation and analysis of teaching materials on anti-Semitism*

#### Working Session 1: Presentation of new country versions

On behalf of the Peace Education Institute, Ms. Saara Launio presented the Finnish adaptation of the teaching materials as well as the English translation of the table of content. She explained that 2,000 copies of the two booklets have been published, thanks to a grant by the Ministry of Education. The booklets, which are also available online, were developed in co-operation with Helsinki University and its *Cultures of Silence* research project on how narratives about Finland's association with Nazi Germany have evolved since 1945. The first booklet deals with the persecution of Jews over the centuries. While the Swedish and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Germany, Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Spain, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Ukraine.

Austrian teaching materials served as a source of inspiration, there is also a strong focus on how anti-Semitism manifested itself in the Finnish society in the 1930s. The situation of Romani people and Ingrian Finns is also addressed. The second booklet, entitled *Prejudiced – me?*, touches on racism and discrimination and pays close attention to the diverse roots of Finnish culture.

The Peace Education Institute intends to circulate the materials through its network of history and civics teachers as well as among teachers who teach about religion(s), ethics and human rights. Ms. Launio stressed that both the Holocaust and human rights are part of the Finnish curriculum. It was suggested to also consider approaching teachers focusing on media and psychology, seeing that the booklet also contains a chapter on identity. The discussion focused on whether Finnish teachers are still influenced by the prevalent historical narrative examined by the *Cultures of Silence* project. Furthermore, the discussion focused on whether a teachers' guide would be necessary, in particular with regard to some of the assignments proposed in the materials. Participants also explored how the Peace Education Institute co-operates with the authorities. In particular, it was suggested that the Ministry of Education could formally recommend the materials to teachers, which has worked well in other countries. Ms. Launio explained that Finnish teachers are free to use any teaching material, noting at the same time that it would be very useful to co-operate with the National Board of Education in training teachers and disseminating the materials. She also stressed that her NGO hopes to receive a government grant to provide for a large-scale promotion.

Representing NGO *Erinnern.at*, Dr. Maria Ecker presented the Austrian version of the teaching materials. Prior to the meeting, ODIHR had provided for an English translation of the Austrian teaching materials. By May 2013, some 2,900 copies of the Austrian materials had been distributed; eleven teacher trainings targeting 220 teachers had been conducted. The materials are distributed during trainings, but they can also be ordered online. Dr. Ecker presented her NGO's website, which, rather than providing a teachers' guide, responds to current affairs and offers opportunities for interaction with teachers. As an example, she presented a recent anti-Semitic cartoon published by an Austrian politician, which was addressed by providing supplementary materials for teachers online. Dr. Ecker noted that the Austrian materials' focus on racism and anti-Semitism as closely related forms of prejudice has received positive feedback from teachers and criticism from academics. The materials, she explained, are structured thematically rather than chronologically, while close attention is being paid to the historical context of anti-Semitism in Austria as well as to the experience of a diverse group of young people that features prominently in the materials. The Austrian experts had spent an entire year conducting meetings with youth groups to discuss issues related to anti-Semitism and racism before developing the materials. Departing from the approach taken in other countries, the materials first explore the question "Who am I?".

The subsequent discussion focused on the Austrian experts' approach towards anti-Semitic images. Dr. Ecker noted that historical propaganda images are only included in the materials, if there is a satirical layer that breaks them down right away. She conceded that this approach may not be effective with younger students, while another participant noted that it may be too difficult for students to decode different historical layers. It was discussed whether it is important for students to be able to decode anti-Semitic images, with some stressing that students have a right to learn about anti-Semitic pictures. Others underlined the danger of perpetuating stereotypes by introducing them to students who may not have been aware of them. The experts also engaged with the Austrian materials' focus on the topic, *When language hurts*. Dr. Ecker explained that this topic is regularly chosen in trainings due to its universal relevance. It was discussed why the Austrian materials only ask whether the

students have experienced abuse rather than asking them to reflect on whether they have themselves abused others. Several experts suggested that teacher trainings should include modules in which the teachers try out the assignments, including those that draw on interactive concepts such as the *freeze frame* suggested in the Austrian chapter on language.

Following the plenary session, two specific topics were selected for an expert discussion. Firstly, the discussion focused on the question of whether or not the teaching materials on anti-Semitism were designed to change attitudes. Different perspectives on why teachers teach about the Holocaust in different countries were put forward. Several experts suggested that while some teachers may focus on the facts only, others may indeed focus on (changing) behaviours. With regard to the materials on anti-Semitism, some experts stressed that the materials should focus on changing attitudes rather than providing knowledge. Others expressed concern about attempts to change attitudes, as this may lead to backlashes, and preferred to think of the materials as a tool that teaches critical thinking based on sound knowledge. Several participants stressed that the ability to think critically and to filter and process information will lead to behavior changes. It was also pointed out that there is a risk of demotivating teachers by presenting them with too many demands related to what is, for many of them, a new topic. Another participant pointed out that, given that it is not systematically known who uses the materials, it is difficult to claim that they lead to behavioral changes. There may, he pointed out, be teachers who feel that the materials are there to teach positive stereotypes about Jews. Others stressed the importance of knowledge and suggested that the materials and related trainings would indeed fill knowledge gaps.

The challenge, one expert claimed, was to get teachers to overcome existing obstacles and work with the materials. This led to the discussion of a second topic: how best to motivate teachers. It was noted that it is difficult to assess whether or not and how teachers work with the materials. Some may use them all the time without reporting back – others use them once and provide negative feedback. Some participants stressed that teachers who participated in activities related to Holocaust education had proved to be very interested in the materials; others stressed the importance of reaching out to teachers who do not usually participate in tolerance-related activities. It was suggested that teachers may be more open to discussing anti-Semitism if the debate also touches on racism and other forms of intolerance. Some participants suggested that systematically working with the authorities as well as with universities may serve as a long-term strategy to reach teachers. Several participants shared views on why teachers were interested in the materials, recalling that educators mention their experiences with anti-Semitism in the classroom and the attractive and unusual design of the materials as pull-factors. One participant stressed the critical importance of successful teacher trainings in nice settings to ensure that the trained teachers become multipliers.

#### Working Session 2: Reflection on the experience of 15 countries

During this session, the participants split up into groups to jointly reflect on the experiences of developing teaching materials on anti-Semitism in different countries. They were asked to answer four different questions, focusing, as a starting point, on the question of why there is a need for education on anti-Semitism. In addition to its historical significance, it was noted, anti-Semitism remains visible in today's society. One expert stressed that every student has a right to understand anti-Semitism, because it is impossible to understand the world without understanding anti-Semitism. Another participant added that it is important to establish education on anti-Semitism as a field separate from Holocaust education. Some experts underscored that combating anti-Semitism through education is a way of fighting any form of discrimination and prejudice. Another group suggested that teaching about anti-Semitism is a way of explaining scapegoating and stereotyping. One group specifically linked education on

anti-Semitism to the standard that democracies should counter intolerance and protect minorities.

When asked which educational ideas have worked particularly well, it was stressed that the materials promote critical thinking. Some also mentioned the way in which the tool touches on questions of identity and initiates reflections about group dynamics. Others stressed that the concept of peer education and the prominent role of youth in the material worked very well. In particular, it was found that the idea of using youngsters' opinions on how to deal with anti-Semitism worked well as a tool to activate students to think critically. It was also noted that the combination of brief texts, exercises, tasks and thought-provoking pictures could be considered a strength of the tool. The fact that the teaching materials engage with the issue of language and encourage language sensitivity among students was also mentioned. Another group stressed that theme 3, which touches on other forms of discrimination and intolerance, has proven to be popular, with several experts reporting that they had used third theme as a starting point. One expert stressed that the international perspective was one of the strengths of the teaching materials.

The groups were also asked to identify the main conceptual challenges that had presented themselves when working with the materials. In this regard, it was noted that one of the difficulties lies in finding the balance between national and international approaches to teaching about anti-Semitism as well as between the historical and pedagogical content appropriate for each country. Several experts stressed the importance of the international dimension in that it provides a broader scope of information on anti-Semitism as an international problem, which also provides for a bridge between Eastern and Western Europe. Another expert stressed the importance of the materials as part of an international exchange of ideas and good practices on how to deal with anti-Semitism. The Finnish expert noted that there are difficulties related to using the European perspective in Finland, precisely because of the hitherto prevalent point of view amongst the Finnish population that Finland was neutral in World War II. In that sense, focusing on the Finnish perspective to challenge such views rather than on the European dimension was, she noted, important in this particular case.

Another group felt that trying not to reinforce stereotypes turned out to be one of the challenges, while touching on the Israel-Palestine conflict and making students aware of the difference between the Holocaust and the present-day politics of Israel were found to be equally difficult. The same group singled out the challenge of teaching teachers on this issue, since many showed a certain degree of reluctance to new approaches and materials. Other experts came to the conclusion that keeping and identifying the focus of the materials was difficult. These experts also stressed that views might differ, including among teachers and students, about what constitutes an attractive design. The final group stated that having to reach a diverse audience composed of teachers and students was very challenging. These experts also suggested that balancing the historical with the present-day elements was not an easy task, bearing in mind the need to find an appropriate starting point and to identify issues that are relevant for today's youth. Touching on an earlier discussion, this group alluded to the tension between teaching knowledge and trying to change attitudes as one of the challenges encountered when working with the materials.

Reflecting on new ideas that have emerged in the process of working with the materials, one group of experts suggested that it had become clear that the Internet is a new and effective vehicle to discuss the issue of anti-Semitism and to promote such materials among teachers. Another group suggested that education on anti-Semitism should only be applied to contexts where it is needed so as not to introduce stereotypes. Others mentioned that focusing on

teachers' education as a new idea that has emerged from the experience of working with the teaching materials. The possibility of not following a certain chronology, but rather a set of topics when presenting this issue was listed as one of the lessons learned – as was the inclusion of humour and satire, good examples and positive aspects. Another group stressed that working with youth right from the start of developing the teaching materials was an important new idea that emerged. Finally, it was mentioned that the need to distinguish more clearly between Jewish history and anti-Semitism is one of the insights gained.

Looking back at the experience of developing and implementing teaching materials in 15 OSCE participating States also raises the question of evaluation. The German experts gave a quick overview of the evaluation that was undertaken in Germany by, *inter alia*, the Technical University of Dresden. ODIHR recalled that an external evaluator had evaluated the project in 2011. At the time, questionnaires were also distributed among a select number of teachers and students in some of the countries involved. The questionnaire used at the time was presented to the experts as a basis for further group work on four general questions related to evaluation, focusing on why there is a need to evaluate, what should be evaluated, when and how. The participants split up into four groups to explore these questions. It was noted that evaluation is important in order to formulate new projects in the future. The experts distinguished between qualitative and quantitative approaches to evaluation, stressing the need to integrate the two effectively. With regard to the qualitative dimension, it was emphasized that it is important to hear back from the users whether the initial objectives have been met and there is a system of using the materials, but also to get new ideas and gain insights as to which parts have proven to be effective and whether the materials evoke any emotions.

Focusing on the question of what should be evaluated, a second group identified different target groups. With regard to teachers, this group claimed, it would be most important to find out: what content is (not) used and why; what motivates the teacher; how much time teachers spend working with the materials and how they are linked to the curriculum. It was suggested that it would also be interesting to learn from teachers whether they have in the past attended a teacher training and if they would require further information. One participant noted that it would be worth evaluating to what extent the teachers' guides that have been developed in some countries have actually been used. The group would also like to learn from teachers what support they got from schools, colleagues and parents in teaching about anti-Semitism. Possible questions to teachers also evolve around preferred learning styles and aspects that were found to be controversial and interesting. Finally, this group suggested exploring with teachers how they evaluate the results of their teaching. Several participants suggested that it may be important to evaluate the attitude of parents. The experts reported that even if the educational design is effective, students often go back to their families and are presented with conflicting attitudes that hinder the learning process.

When addressing students, it was suggested that it would be interesting to assess if their attitudes have changed, their skills have improved and if they have gained knowledge. Furthermore, it was suggested to ask students whether they like to work with the materials. Several recommendations were made as to how evaluations could be carried out. It was suggested, *inter alia*, to adapt evaluation forms to national settings rather than working with a universal evaluation form. Working with the institutions that developed the materials, evaluation forms could be incorporated in the materials or distributed via the Internet. In the discussion, it was explored what incentives could be offered to ensure that those who should provide feedback comply. It was noted that students tend to like the fact that their opinions are sought. Regarding teachers, it was suggested to provide them with incentives such as inviting them to special seminars. One expert added that teachers may feel they need to report



positively or under scrutiny, fearing that they have to evaluate their own skills. It was recommended to conduct in-classroom evaluations and to approach teachers with open questions. As to the timing of evaluations, the experts suggested that teachers should be approached once before and once after training, while a pilot program could be set up for students, evaluating their thoughts and knowledge before the pilot, immediately thereafter and six weeks later to monitor the change of attitudes.

In the ensuing discussion, one expert shared his experience and noted that the most negative reactions had come from parents who feared that their children were being influenced. The questionnaire that was used in the context of the evaluation commissioned by ODIHR was deemed to be general and unable to measure whether the use of the material had had an impact. One participant identified a representative study and an in-depth analysis drawing on smaller samples as two options, suggesting that the latter would be more instructive. She also suggested that it would be interesting to find out who is not using the materials and why not. Several experts agreed that they would form an informal working group to assess whether an in-depth analysis would be possible in some countries.

The working session was concluded with Ms. Karen Polak's presentation about the new web tool on anti-Semitism on which the Anne Frank House and partners are currently working. The idea to develop a web tool emerged from the experiences gained when developing teaching materials on anti-Semitism in 15 countries. She also introduced plans to gather policy makers from the 13 countries where the materials have been printed at a forthcoming meeting in Berlin. In the ensuing discussion, Ms. Polak stressed the need to involve young people in the development. Their role may even go as far as providing actual content. In the discussion, it was suggested to get in touch with teacher training universities. A good practice from Denmark was mentioned – a free research-based website that students can turn to when trying to understand concepts such as Holocaust denial and genocide. The question of how to make the web tool on anti-Semitism accessible to students in different countries was also discussed. In this regard, it was suggested to develop the prototype version in English.

## *Part II: Looking at challenges and good practices related to mainstreaming materials*

### Working Session 3: Working with teachers – recent experiences

The final working session offered an opportunity for the experts to present and discuss recent experiences of working with teachers in different OSCE participating States.

Focusing on her recent experiences in Sweden, Ms. Lena Jersenius introduced the work of her organization, the Swedish Committee against Anti-Semitism (SKMA). Ms. Jersenius recalled that the Swedish version of the teaching materials touches not only on anti-Semitism, but also on Islamophobia, intolerance against Roma and Sinti and discrimination against the Sami people. To prepare teachers to use the materials, the SKMA tries to provide them with a deeper knowledge and important facts about the phenomena addressed. Academic experts were therefore asked to write articles about anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, intolerance against Roma and Sinti as well as about the Sami people which are shared with teachers. The SKMA conducts three types of seminars, ranging from an afternoon to two-day seminars. Most notably, the SKMA co-operated with the local authorities in the Malmö region, a region particularly affected by hate crime, to organize teacher training seminars that were also supported by the Ministry of Integration and Employment. The translation of a letter by Minister Erik Ullenhag which encouraged teachers to participate was circulated among the participants. The three one-day seminars that took place in the Malmö region targeted teachers in lower secondary schools – approximately 500 teachers participated.

Ms. Jersenius stressed that the training contained general lectures on stereotyping as well as specific lectures on anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. The lectures were followed by workshops in which the participants split up into smaller groups and specially trained seminar leaders presented the teaching materials. Participants tested exercises from the teaching materials and shared experiences. In addition to these seminars, the SKMA conducted several two-day seminars in different Swedish regions, co-operating with the local authorities in Malmö, Stockholm and Gothenburg as well as with a teachers college. Alongside teachers, local councilors dealing with education were among the 750 participants that attended these trainings. The seminars dealt with how to deal with anti-Semitism in the classroom, and involved lectures about right-wing extremism, hate crime and Holocaust denial. Due to the co-operation with the local authorities, it is possible for the teachers who attend the seminars to pick up the teaching materials from the local authorities. The SKMA also organizes afternoon meetings in which the materials are presented and introduced through a lecture.

Ms. Jersenius shared her perception that many officials in local government appeared to be more concerned with Islamophobia than with anti-Semitism, which is why this issue was also addressed in the seminars organized by the SKMA, including by translating parts of the ODIHR/CoE/UNESCO *Guidelines for Educators on Countering Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims: Addressing Islamophobia through Education*. She stressed the importance of drawing a link between different types of intolerance and stressed the need to focus on the phenomena rather than the groups. Ms. Jersenius noted that her organization is interested in evaluating the results of these trainings. Returning to the discussion about how to motivate teachers, she noted that the teachers they have worked with so far can serve as resources in their schools and as multipliers for their colleagues.

Ms. Andrea Szönyi and Dr. Monika Kovacs introduced the participants to the teacher trainings organized by the Zachor Foundation that had taken place in the Central European University in Budapest, noting that the Hungarian teaching materials also come with a teachers' guide, which is available online. The trainings took place in December 2011 and in February 2013. They were attended by 47 mainly high school teachers with different specializations from different parts of Hungary, including from Budapest. Sixteen of the 23 teachers that took part in the second training were new to the topic. Ms. Szönyi and Dr. Kovacs informed the participants that the trainings are designed to strike a balance between theory and practice, providing both a theoretical foundation of the major concepts as well as practical ideas that relate directly to the teaching materials, with enough time reserved for discussion and reflection. They explained that one of the challenges they faced was the question of how much theory was really needed to convey this topic to teachers. The second training, they noted, was built on the feedback received from the first training and concluded by a special expert discussion on anti-Semitism.

In order to attract teachers, outreach activities were conducted through the Zachor Foundation's website and newsletter as well as via Facebook. In both cases, more teachers had applied to take part in the training than could be admitted. Most participants were described to be experienced educators, with some noting in their application form that they were motivated by manifestations of anti-Semitism, racism and intolerance in school. Apart from asking for immediate feedback, the Hungarian experts followed up with the teachers through an online questionnaire. They also tried to trace the usage of the materials by sending follow-up emails to the participants, who were invited to take copies of the materials with them after the training. Ms. Szönyi noted that the teachers who participated in the trainings had praised the creative dimension of the materials and the new methodological approach.

She stressed that most teachers reported back that they started to work with part three, which attracted more interest than the historical aspects covered in the material. The fact that a Ukrainian expert, Mr. Sasha Voytenko, had taken part in the recent Hungarian teacher training to share his experiences was received well, especially the fact that he could draw on in-depth classroom experience. The Hungarian experts expressed concern about the fact that only a few copies are left and noted that the school administration had mentioned the materials in a letter.

Ms. Tine Brøndum's presentation, delivered on behalf of the Danish Institute for International Studies, focused on the issue of how best to reach out to teachers. The starting point for the new project was, she noted, the question of how the teaching materials on anti-Semitism which were developed within the framework of the ODIHR/Anne Frank House project are used, which aspects worked well and what could be improved. She stressed that the available information suggests theme 3, which deals with intolerance and discrimination in general, was used the most and that most teachers thought that it was difficult to focus exclusively on anti-Semitism. Therefore, the current project sets out to address intolerance towards different groups in Danish society in a broader perspective, while at the same time being aware of the fact that different manifestations of intolerance have different historical roots. The aim of the current project is to address problems of intolerance towards different groups by providing teachers and students with background knowledge and concrete tools to work with when countering manifestations of intolerance in the classroom.

Ms. Brøndum noted that such a broad perspective implies that the tool will be less concrete than if it only dealt with anti-Semitism and noted that one of the challenges was to identify the focus of the material. She stressed the importance of reaching out to students and teachers to find out what their thoughts are and what they might need. For this, interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with teachers and students on whether they experience intolerance or prejudices. The survey also set out to find out who was victimized in these instances, how intolerance manifested itself and how educators teach about this subject. The materials will touch on categories such as gender, human rights, stereotypes and conspiracy theories, with a focus on anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and prejudice towards Roma. She stressed that an important focus in the discussion with students was on how people stereotype and use language and conspiracy theories rather than on showing how people are. One of the recommendations that has emerged from the project is to adopt a norm-critical approach that questions how norms are used to mark what is understood to constitute the normal. Other elements include working with a horizontal perspective on intolerance, encouraging students to take the perspective of others and connecting personal stories with the bigger picture through case studies. Some of the principles discussed with the students are the mechanisms of stereotyping, social dynamics in class and human rights. The materials, which will be ready in early 2014, will be disseminated to teachers through teacher training seminars, colleges of education as well as online. They will also be disseminated on Auschwitz Day.

The ensuing expert discussion focused on different issues, including conspiracy theories. Several experts expressed an interest in further discussions on how best to challenge conspiracy theories, and whether such a discussion should be specifically linked to anti-Semitism. Other topics raised included the relationship between education to confront anti-Semitism and intolerance and forms of bullying in the classroom, with some claiming that bullying was a separate matter to be addressed through separate tools and others claiming that this is where interventions should be targeted, because minorities are more vulnerable in the classroom.

The experts also explored how it works to introduce the issue of Islamophobia in teacher trainings focusing on anti-Semitism. Ms. Jersenius stated that this is not a problem, because the Swedish teaching materials also specifically address Islamophobia. She stressed that teachers would not attend the trainings if the seminars were announced to focus exclusively on anti-Semitism, emphasizing that more people could be reached by connecting both topics, especially because both stereotypes are prevalent. One participant added that there are pedagogical reasons to teach about both anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, because teachers and students do not know much about the roots of these problems and that knowledge gap needs to be filled.

In Hungary, by contrast, teachers claim that they want more materials on anti-Semitism and have consciously signed up for trainings that deal with anti-Semitism – no teacher, the Hungarian experts reported, questioned whether there was a need for the materials and the training, displaying awareness of the fact that Holocaust education does not specifically help to address contemporary expressions of anti-Semitism. In Denmark, Ms. Brøndum reported, there are teachers who respond in a hostile way to teaching that focuses only on anti-Semitism. At the same time, she reported, there will be a specific chapter on anti-Semitism in the materials currently under development, due to the historical importance of anti-Semitism. The discussion then turned to the question of what the teaching materials should focus on, while some emphasized that it was important to include other forms of intolerance and stereotyping, while others noted that this may lead to a denial of the actual problem, which is anti-Semitism. It was noted that this is also of interest to the development of the web tool – whereas it may be crucial for the word anti-Semitism to be in the title of some of the country versions, it may be better for the titles to differ depending on the context of the country in question.

Mr. Patrick Siegele, the moderator, also focused the discussion on the different approaches to teachers and their roles. In some countries, he noted, they appeared to be regarded as part of the problem; in other contexts they are seen as multipliers and ambassadors. Several participants stressed the importance of providing teachers with a forum for exchange. It was also noted that most teachers and educational officials were in need of awareness-raising on anti-Semitism and intolerance. One idea put forward was to focus on different schools and the local context, i.e., rather than empowering individual teachers, it may be worth targeting specific schools when conducting activities so as to have a larger impact. Others drew on their experience and underscored that individual teachers that are motivated to teach about anti-Semitism can make a difference in their schools and motivate others.

### *Part III: Looking forward*

Ms. Anne Giebel presented the idea for ODIHR to develop a small brochure to mark the tenth anniversary of the formulation of OSCE commitments on anti-Semitism. The envisaged brochure would consist of both select case studies about the development of the teaching materials in different OSCE participating States, present some good practices of governments supporting the implementation of the project and provide some facts and figures about the project. The target group would be the governments of OSCE participating States, relevant stakeholders and experts. For the purpose of the brochure, a questionnaire was developed which was distributed to the participants. The results will be shared once all questionnaires have been received. The experts expressed an interest in continuing with the exchange of ideas and experiences, including by organizing more such meetings. It was recommended to use such meetings to present and, if possible, translate modules and educational ideas that are used when implementing the teaching materials on anti-Semitism.

## Annexes



### **Expert meeting on education to combat anti-Semitism**

**OSCE/ODIHR, ul. Miodowa 10, Warsaw, Poland  
Helsinki Room`  
7-8 May 2013**

#### **Final Agenda**

In 2004, OSCE participating States committed themselves to commemorating the Holocaust and to establishing educational programs designed to combat anti-Semitism. With a view to assisting participating States with the implementation of their commitments, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) partnered with the Anne Frank House and Yad Vashem to develop innovative tools for teachers and students. Within the framework of ODIHR's joint project with the Anne Frank House, teaching materials on anti-Semitism were developed by partner organizations in 15 OSCE participating States.

One year before the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Berlin Declaration, ODIHR sets out to organize an international expert meeting in Warsaw. The meeting will gather experts that have cooperated with ODIHR and the Anne Frank House in developing innovative teaching tools to combat anti-Semitism. ODIHR will also invite experts who have expressed an interest in the teaching materials and may wish to adapt them to their national context in the future.

The purpose of the meeting is threefold: it will

- Present recently finalized teaching materials and facilitate a discussion on the educational insights gained when combating anti-Semitism through education in 15 countries;
- Exchange experiences related to teacher trainings and take stock of challenges faced by experts in the process of implementing the teaching materials.
- Connect all the experts involved in the project with a view to discussing how best to secure and document the achievements of this multilateral project.

## **Tuesday, 07 May 2013**

- 09:00 Arrival of the participants and coffee
- 09:15 Welcome remarks by Douglas Wake, First Deputy Director of the OSCE/ODIHR, introduction of the participants, quick *tour de table* on the status of the project in each of the countries

### ***Part I: Presentation and analysis of teaching materials on anti-Semitism***

#### **Working Session 1: Presentation of new country versions**

- 09:45 *Presentation and discussion of new versions of the teaching materials*
- Presentation and discussion of the Finnish teaching materials, Saara Launio, Peace Education Institute
  - Presentation and discussion of the English version of the Austrian teaching materials, Dr. Maria Ecker, Erinnern.at

*Plenary discussion:* Following these two presentations, the participants will have the opportunity to select one or two topics for an expert debate on teaching materials on anti-Semitism. This discussion will be facilitated by Karen Polak, Anne Frank House.

- 11.15 Coffee break
- 11:30 *Plenary discussion (continued)*
- 12:30 Lunch break followed by coffee

#### **Working Session 2: Reflection on the experience of 15 countries**

- 14:00 *Working group discussion*, facilitated by Anne Giebel, OSCE/ODIHR. The goal of this discussion is to reflect on the experience of developing teaching materials on anti-Semitism in 15 OSCE participating States: What are the main educational insights?
- Why is there a need for education to combat anti-Semitism?
  - Which educational ideas have worked particularly well? How do we know that?
  - What were some of the main conceptual challenges that presented themselves when working on the materials?
  - Which new ideas and approaches have been identified in the process?
- 15:30 Coffee break
- 15:45 *Discussion in pairs, followed by plenary discussion on the role of evaluation*, facilitated by Anne Giebel, OSCE/ODIHR – Dr. Isabel Enzenbach will provide input on the German experience. Questions to be discussed:
- Why should we evaluate?
  - What should be evaluated?
  - How should we evaluate?
  - When should we evaluate?
- 17:15 Coffee break
- 17:30 Presentation by the Anne Frank House: Moving on to the webtool project
- 18:00 Joint evening activity, followed by dinner

## Wednesday, 8 May 2013

### ***Part II: Looking at challenges and good practices related to mainstreaming the materials***

#### **Working Session 3: Working with teachers – recent experiences**

- 09:00      *Presenting approaches and experiences from different countries*
- Presentation of the Swedish approach and experience with teacher trainings, Lena Jersenius, Swedish Committee Against Anti-Semitism
  - Presentation of the Hungarian approach and experience with teacher trainings, Andrea Szonyi, Zachor Foundation, and Monika Kovacs, Eötvös Loránd University Budapest
  - Developing background material for teachers on prejudice and intolerance. Challenges and current approach in Denmark, Tine Brøndum, University of Southern Denmark

*Plenary discussion*, facilitated by Patrick Siegele, Anne Frank Centre, about challenges and good practices related to teacher trainings. The experts are invited to explore challenges, develop ideas and exchange good practices related to mainstreaming the use of the teaching materials.

11:00      Coffee break

### ***Part III: Looking forward***

11:15      *ODIHR presentation, followed by discussion*: Thinking about how best to document the achievements of the project

12:15      Lunch break

13:00      Wrap-up, feedback and discussion of next steps

### ***Excursion***

13:40      Walk to the Museum of the History of Polish Jews

14:00      Guided tour of the Museum of the History of Polish Jews

14:45      End of the meeting

## List of participants

1. Mr. Stefan Andersson, Sweden, Living History Forum, stefan.andersson@levandehistoria.se
2. Ms. Solvej Berlau, Denmark, Danish Institute for International Studies, sbr@diis.dk
3. Mr. Vitaly Bobrov, Ukraine, Ukrainian Center for Holocaust Studies, vitalii.bobrov@gmail.com
4. Ms. Tine Brøndum, Denmark, University of Southern Denmark, tbroendum@sdu.dk
5. Dr. Maria Ecker, Austria, Erinnern.at, maria.ecker@erinnern.at
6. Dr. Isabel Enzenbach, Germany, Center for Research on Antisemitism, enzenbach@mail.tu-berlin.de
7. Mr. Guido Gerrichhauzen, the Netherlands, Anne Frank House, g.gerrichhauzen@annefrank.nl
8. Dr. Monika Kovacs, Hungary, Eötvös Loránd University Budapest, moka5@t-online.hu
9. Ms. Saara Launio, Finland, Peace Education Institute, info@rauhankasvatus.fi
10. Ms. Lena Jersenius, Sweden, Swedish Committee against Antisemitism, lena.jersenius@skma.se
11. Ms. Karen Polak, the Netherlands, Anne Frank House, k.polak@annefrank.nl
12. Ms. Ruta Puisyte, Lithuania, Yiddish Institute, Vilnius University, rutapuisyte@judaicvilnius.com
13. Ms. Dace Saleniece, Latvia, Tolerance Center, dace.saleniece@gmail.com
14. Mr. Patrick Siegele, Germany, Anne Frank Zentrum, siegele@annefrank.de
15. Ms. Tereza Štěpková, Czech Republic, Terezin Initiative Institute, tereza.stepkova@terezinstudies.cz
16. Ms. Andrea Szönyi, Hungary, Zachor Foundation, andrea.szonyi@gmail.com
17. Dr. Piotr Trojanski, Poland, Pedagogical University, Cracow, ptrojans@ap.krakow.pl, trojanski@interia.eu
18. Mr. Sasha Voytenko, Ukraine, Nova Doba Association, ovoitenko@gmail.com



### **List of supplementary materials**

The following supplementary materials were distributed during the meeting and are available upon request:

1. Newsletter about recent developments in the project, developed by the Anne Frank House
2. Translation of the table of content of the Finnish adaptation of the ODIHR/Anne Frank House teaching materials on anti-Semitism developed by the Peace Education Institute.
3. Translation of the Austrian teaching materials on anti-Semitism developed by Erinnern.at
4. Translation of supplementary materials presented on the website of Erinnern.at on the issue of *When language hurts*
5. Evaluation of teachers' feedback on the teaching materials on combating anti-Semitism
6. Questionnaire for students developed by the external evaluator commissioned by ODIHR
7. Questionnaire for teachers developed by the external evaluator commissioned by ODIHR
8. Translation of a letter sent by Minister Erik Ullenhag to headmasters in the Skåne region of Sweden, dated 19 October 2012
9. OSCE/ODIHR, UNESCO, Council of Europe: *Guidelines for Educators on Countering Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims: Addressing Islamophobia through Education*
10. Questionnaire about the implementation of the teaching materials on anti-Semitism *Gathering the facts – telling the story*

## Evaluation of the meeting

Number of participants who evaluated the training: 17

1. What do you take from this expert meeting with regard to your work? Was it helpful?

Yes – 17 No – 0

If yes, please specify:

- Showed which problems are widespread
- Learned about the challenges other countries are facing
- New ideas for teacher training seminars
- Possibility to see a broader European picture
- The diversity
- Some important ideas about evaluations
- Contacts with colleagues
- Important discussion about the experiences of other countries
- It gave me new input on the process of the project and its international outreach.
- It was inspiring

2. Such an expert meeting would be more useful if ...

- It included external expert response on how things have been evaluated so far and what can be done in the future.
- We should focus on less topics and become more concrete. Good example: Vienna Meeting 2012 where we only focused on the Austrian materials.
- A few cases could be discussed more extensively.
- Create 'working groups' who are responsible for certain aspects within the project.
- I needed more time.
- Some discussions could have been more focused and structured.
- We could have more direct information about the content of each material.
- Some short information beforehand would have been good to know where we are now.
- It seems as if some of the topics and discussions were recurring.

*Please rate the statements below using the following classification:*

3. The expert meeting met your overall expectations.

*Strongly Agree – 3 Agree – 10 Neutral – 4 Disagree – 0 Strongly Disagree – 0*

4. The duration of the meeting was appropriate.

*Strongly Agree – 1 Agree – 13 Neutral – 3 Disagree – 0 Strongly Disagree – 0*

5. The content of the meeting, in terms of substance, was appropriate.

*Strongly Agree – 3 Agree – 7 Neutral – 5 Disagree – 2 Strongly Disagree – 0*

6. The content of the meeting was relevant to your work.

*Strongly Agree – 7 Agree – 9 Neutral – 1 Disagree – 0 Strongly Disagree – 0*

7. The format of the meeting (group work, exercises, presentations, etc.) was appropriate.

*Strongly Agree – 7 Agree – 3 Neutral – 4 Disagree – 0 Strongly Disagree – 0 (3 did not answer)*

8. The opportunities for interaction with fellow participants were adequate.  
*Strongly Agree – 4 Agree – 7 Neutral – 3 Disagree – Strongly Disagree – 0 (3 did not answer)*

9. The opportunities to share my experiences were adequate.  
*Strongly Agree – 4 Agree – 8 Neutral – 2 Disagree – 0 Strongly Disagree – 0 (3 did not answer)*

10. Please identify 3 key strengths of the expert meeting:

- The experts themselves
- The open discussion and respectfulness of the participants
- Atmosphere
- Productivity
- Interaction
- Sharing of experiences
- The organization
- Workshops
- Good discussion topics
- Good representation of countries
- The time to discuss the challenges
- Relevance of the discussion topics
- Discussion in pairs on session 2
- Good balance between presentations and exercises
- Informal and relaxed atmosphere

11. Please identify 3 key weaknesses (areas you would propose for further improvement/revision) of the expert meeting:

- Choice of participants may be reconsidered
- Discussion on evaluations was too vague
- Sometimes too general
- Different levels of participants
- More time for discussion of web tools
- Some unfocused discussions
- Vague aims
- More examples of best practices

12. Please rate the different sessions of the expert meeting:

Welcome remarks and introduction

*Excellent – 3 Very Good – 7 Good – 2 Weak – 0 Very Weak – 0 (5 did not answer)*

Presentation of new country versions

*Excellent – 0 Very Good – 8 Good – 3 Weak – 0 Very Weak – 0 (6 did not answer)*

Plenary debate about two topics that have come up in the presentations

*Excellent – 0 Very Good – 5 Good – 6 Weak – 1 Very Weak – 0 (5 did not answer)*

Group work on four general questions related to the materials

*Excellent – 1 Very Good – 7 Good – 4 Weak – 0 Very Weak – 0 (5 did not answer)*

Group work on evaluation

*Excellent – 0 Very Good – 2 Good – 7 Weak – 3 Very Weak – 0 (5 did not answer)*

Webtool presentation

*Excellent – 1 Very Good – 4 Good – 10 Weak – 0 Very Weak – 0 (2 did not answer)*

Working with teachers – recent experiences

*Excellent – 6 Very Good – 9 Good – 2 Weak – 0 Very Weak – 0*

Gathering facts and stories

*Excellent – 0 Very Good – 7 Good – 7 Weak – 1 Very Weak – 0 (2 did not answer)*

Wrap-up and feedback

*Excellent – 0 Very Good – 9 Good – 3 Weak – 0 Very Weak – 0 (5 did not answer)*

13. Would you be interested in attending similar expert meetings in the future?

*Yes – 17 No – 0*