STICHTING CWM EDUCATION

# The Quality Framework

How we hold our own work to the standard we ask of the field

Board document

# Contents

1. Purpose and Scope
2. Identity Anchor
3. Definitions
4. The Quality Table
5. Methods We Currently Stand Behind
6. Two Modes, Always Labelled — Delivery and Lab
7. The Human Rights Test
8. Review Rhythm and Named Ownership
9. What “Evidence” Means Here
10. How This Connects to the Rest of CWM
11. The Framework's Own Roadmap, 2026–2036
12. Invitation to Practitioners and Researchers

# 1 Purpose and Scope

This document sets out how Stichting CWM Education designs, reviews, and stands behind its own work. It is the internal standard behind the public Quality Framework page, and it governs every session delivered under the CWM name: youth workshops, professional trainings, and the Rights in the Room corporate offer alike. There is one Quality Framework, not a softer version for paying corporate clients and a stricter version for youth work.

**Governing rule:** if a design cannot fill the Quality Table in Section 4, it does not go out under our name.

# 2 Identity Anchor

> *Stichting CWM Education is a human rights education foundation. Since 2015, we have used theatre, storytelling and non-formal education methods to teach and practise human rights with young people and adults across 28 countries, building inclusive societies that celebrate diversity — and we advocate, alongside the young people and communities we work with, for the policies that make that possible.*

This Quality Framework exists to keep that sentence checkable, session by session, as the organisation grows beyond what its founders can personally review.

# 3 Definitions

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| Delivery core | The set of named CWM methods that have passed lab review and are delivered to Framework standard by trained facilitators. |
| Lab / pilot | A new method, format, or adaptation that has not yet passed lab review. Always labelled “pilot,” never presented as an established CWM method. |
| Graduation | The formal act of moving a pilot from the Lab into the Delivery core, decided at monthly lab review on the basis of logged evidence, not enthusiasm. |
| Debrief | A short, written record completed after every delivery, moving meaning from experience to understanding to possible action (see Section 4). |
| Peer review | Structured review of a session design or method by someone other than its designer, before delivery (internal) or, annually, by an external practitioner (Section 8). |
| Named owner | A specific person, not a role description, accountable for a review meeting actually happening and being logged. |

## 4 The Quality Table

Quality is visible in the design, not in the adjective. Before something goes out under our name, it must be able to fill this table. This is the exact table published publicly on the Quality Framework page.

| Element | We can answer… |
|---|---|
| Purpose | What rights, power, or participation question this session explores |
| People | Who it is for, and who it is not for |
| Method | Which named method(s), and why these and not a lecture |
| Conditions | Time, group size, space, language, access |
| Consent | How people opt in, pass, or stop |
| Debrief | How meaning moves from experience to understanding to possible action |
| Risk | What power dynamic, disclosure, or harm we are watching for |
| After | What is recorded, what is returned to participants, what is not extracted |

**If a design cannot fill this table, it does not go out under our name.**

## 5 Methods We Currently Stand Behind

These are the exploit / delivery core. Each will get its own short page on the website, cross-referenced to its rights cluster and legal instrument as set out in the Human Rights Education Framework, Section 7.

- Theatre of the Oppressed (including Image Theatre and Forum Theatre)
- Playback Theatre
- Biographical Theatre
- Improvisation
- Embodied storytelling and embodied learning

**Lab / explore** (named as pilots until review): digital and hybrid formats, new corporate adaptations, new documentation tools.

## 6 Two Modes, Always Labelled

This is the same exploit/explore discipline set out in the Vision, Mission & Ten-Year KPI Framework. It applies without exception, including to Rights in the Room: corporate adaptations stay labelled *pilot* until they pass the same monthly lab review as any youth-work method.

| | Delivery | Lab |
|---|---|---|
| What it is | Proven method, trained facilitator, Framework standard | New format or new context |
| How it is named | “CWM method” | “Pilot” |
| What is logged | Delivery debrief | Outcome, including failure, with no penalty |
| When it moves | Stays in the core until evidence says otherwise | Graduates only after lab review |

## 7 The Human Rights Test

Before a workshop, training, or corporate session is published, someone must answer — this is the identical test used to qualify every Rights in the Room engagement, applied here to all CWM offers without distinction:

- Which human right or participation principle is being practised, not only mentioned?
- Who has the power to change the plan?
- What would make this inaccessible, and what have we changed?
- What will we refuse to extract from participants for a report or a feed?

If a request fails this test, it is a no.

## 8 Review Rhythm and Named Ownership

This is the part that makes the document real rather than aspirational.

| Cadence | What happens | Named owner |
|---|---|---|
| After each delivery | Short debrief | Facilitator who led the session |
| Monthly | Lab review — what was piloted, what is logged, what may enter the Framework | Named lab owner |
| Quarterly | Founders check that delivery work has not eaten the lab (the drift check) | Founders / Board |
| Annually | One method is reviewed with an external peer | Named review coordinator |

> ***Honesty clause.*** *Until each of these four meetings has a specifically named owner (a person, not a role) and a written note from its first occurrence, this section is an intention, not a completed practice. The Board should assign owners at the meeting where this document is approved, and the first logged review of each type should be dated on the public Quality Framework page as it happens — not backdated, not implied.*

## 9 What “Evidence” Means Here

| | Detail |
|---|---|
| Allowed as proof | Participant numbers and countries already published (1,357 participants, 28 countries, workshop hours since 2015); named funders (Erasmus+, British Council, Robert Bosch Stiftung, Goethe-Institut); named methods; anonymised or consented field notes; partner names with permission. |
| Not allowed as proof | Adjectives; stock photos of “inclusion”; youth quotes used as decoration; outcomes we did not measure. |

## 10 How This Connects to the Rest of CWM

| Where | How this Framework governs it |
|---|---|
| Website Methodologies page | This framework, plus one page per method |
| Substack Method Room | The public teaching of designs that already pass the table |
| Trainings page | Professional offer built only from delivery-core methods |
| Rights in the Room (Corporate & DEI) | Same table, same Human Rights Test; new adaptations labelled pilot |
| Advocacy & Youth Voice page | Honest about current mechanisms; no invented youth board |

| Where | How this Framework governs it |
| --- | --- |
| Human Rights Education Framework | Provides the legal architecture and rights-to-method mapping this document assumes |

## 11 The Framework's Own Roadmap, 2026–2036

Matching the Knowledge and Authority scorecard in the Vision, Mission & Ten-Year KPI Framework:

| Indicator | 2027 | 2031 | 2036 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quality Framework version | v1 public (this document) | v2, after peer input | Cited outside CWM |
| Method pages published | 4+ | Full set + adaptations | Full set + translations of core pages |
| External peer review | Planned | Completed | Second cycle |
| Rights-mapping on method pages | In progress | Complete for delivery core | Standard for every published method |

## 12 Invitation to Practitioners and Researchers

Practitioners and researchers who want to look at a method with us: write to cultureworldme@gmail.com with the method and the question you want to test. Collaboration is part of how a method actually improves — bring a real group and a real question, not only a hypothesis. This is also the front door to the annual external peer review described in Section 8.