STICHTING CWM EDUCATION

Culture.World.Me

Vision, Mission & Ten-Year KPI Framework

Human rights education through theatre, storytelling and non-formal learning

Board document — for approval and signature

Prepared for the Board of Stichting CWM Education · Amsterdam
Version 1.0 · 2026

This document is the internal reference behind the public Vision & Mission page at cultureworldme.com/ourvision. The short public sentences are quoted here exactly as published; everything else — the ten-year horizons, the KPI architecture, and the operating principles — is the working document the board approves and the organisation is held to.

1 Who We Are

Legal name: Stichting CWM Education

Vision as published today

> *“An inclusive society, where respect and understanding between different individuals and cultures prevails.”*
>
> *“Through our work we create inclusive spaces for learning and dialogue to inspire meaningful collaboration, critical thought and celebration of our shared humanity.”*

Identity statement

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.

On the founding story, stated precisely

The organisation's focus moved over time from teaching human rights as content toward exploring shared humanity, because the team noticed the methods were doing more than educating: they were transforming and healing people in the room. This is not a move away from human rights. It is what happens when human rights education is done through the body, not only through content.

One-line public tagline: Theatre, storytelling, and education for a more inclusive world.
One-line operational tagline (internal): We treat the workshop as a rehearsal for a world people can actually live in.

2 The Problem We Exist to Work On

Human rights are often taught as content. Inclusion is often announced as a feeling. Youth participation is often printed on a poster after the agenda is already fixed. Rooms fill. Photographs look diverse. Reports say “young people were consulted.” Power does not move.

CWM exists because rights become real only when they change a room: who can enter, who can speak, who can stay silent, who can disagree, and who can change what happens next. That is why we work in the body, in story, and in facilitation, not only in statements.

3 Vision — 2036

By 2036, Culture.World.Me is the European reference point for theatre-based human rights education: the place practitioners, institutions, and young people come when they need methods that work, language that tells the truth about power, and proof that participation can change decisions.

We see a field in which:

- Human rights education is embodied, not lectured.
- Youth participation is judged by who can change the plan, not by who was invited to speak.

- Theatre of the Oppressed, Playback, Biographical Theatre, improvisation and storytelling are treated as serious pedagogy, with published standards and evidence.
- Young people and communities we work with are named as co-authors of the advocacy that follows the workshop.

The world does not become fair because we imagined it so. It becomes more habitable because thousands of rooms rehearsed a different arrangement of power and then took that rehearsal into policy, schools, youth work, and public life.

In ten years we want CWM cited, copied, partnered with,
and held to account as the organisation that made theatre-based human rights education impossible to treat as an extra.

4 Mission or What We Do Now

We design and run theatre, storytelling, and non-formal education programmes with young people and adults; we train educators, youth workers, and facilitators in those methods; we publish the methods and the difficult field lessons in public; we build partnerships that turn practice into funded, multi-year work; and we advocate, with the people in the room, for the policies that make inclusion a condition rather than a performance.

We do this in at least eight working languages, across youth work, education, and community settings, and where it stays faithful to the same human rights core in organisational and corporate learning through DEI "The Rights in the Room" offer.

Mission test: if an activity does not help someone practise a right, see power more clearly, or change how a room is designed, it is not CWM work. It is activity.

How vision and mission lock together

Dimension	Vision	Mission
Time	2036 society and field	What we do this week
Scale	Rooms, systems, policy, reputation	Workshops, trainings, publications, partnerships, advocacy notes
Proof	Cited methods, youth voice with power, durable funding mix	Named methods, named partners, hours, countries, published frameworks
Risk if we drift	We become a generic “inclusion” brand	We become a delivery agency with no public mind

Culture.World.Me is the public rehearsal space. Stichting CWM Education is the institution that must still be standing when the rehearsal becomes policy.

5 Long-Term Picture. Three Horizons

The next 10 years.

Horizon A: 2026–2027 · Make the house visible

- Website is the institutional home; Substack is the living method room.
- Quality Framework v1 published and kept current as a living document.
- Culture statement published: how we work, how people participate, what we refuse.
- Advocacy page introduces current mechanisms and names what is still being built.
- Corporate DEI offer exists without swallowing the human rights core.
- Community pathways exist: mailing list, form, “work with us / join us.”

Success looks like: a stranger can understand who we are in two minutes, and a practitioner can use something we published the same week.

Horizon B: 2028–2031 · Become the reference

- CWM methods appear even more frequently in other people's toolkits, KA2 designs, and trainer curricula.
- A youth advisory / co-authorship mechanism exists and produces visible output.
- Corporate DEI is clearly a human-rights-grounded alternative, with scholarships funding youth participation.
- Monthly donors and institutional supporters are a real second revenue line.
- One methodology receives external peer review.
- Salto and networks send partners who want documented human rights education expertise.

Success looks like: people search “theatre human rights education Europe” and find us because others cited us.

Horizon C: 2032–2036 · Hold the centre of the field

- Culture.World.Me is a living reference library: methods, field notes, policy notes, quality standards.
- A trainer pathway exists: associate → CWM trainer → mentor. “Trained in our methodology” is a checkable claim.
- Alumni and partner trainers carry the work beyond the founders without flattening it.
- Youth voice is structurally present in advocacy products.
- At least one certification or recognised professional pathway is real or we have publicly decided not to build one, and said why.
- The organisation can survive founder-intensity: delivery core and lab both exist, with protected time for each.

Success looks like: CWM is a house other houses borrow from.

6 What “In Front” Actually Means

Not: the biggest NGO, the most followers, the most countries added for the sake of a map. **In front means first in usefulness and first in honesty in our specific field.** By 2036 we want to be the organisation that:

- Practitioners open first when they need a method that will survive a real group.

- Funders and KA2 consortia name first when they need human rights education that is embodied and documented.
- Young people can point to when they ask whether participation changed a decision.
- Researchers and institutes cite when they write about theatre, non-formal education, and rights.
- Other inclusion programmes measure themselves against, because our Quality Framework made vague claims harder to hide.

If we are “in front” and cannot show youth co-authorship, published methods, and a culture that logs failure as well as success, we are only loud. Loud is not the goal.

7 Principles for Every KPI

Use these rules when the board argues numbers.

- **Count what we can stand behind.** No vanity metrics that cannot survive a question.
- **Pair reach with power.** Participants without evidence of voice is an attendance stat.
- **Pair delivery with learning.** Hours delivered without a logged debrief is extraction from the team.
- **Protect the human rights core.** If corporate or "inclusion" numbers grow while human rights education language shrinks, the KPI has failed.
- **Name the lag.** Some of the most important results such as citation, policy change, a working youth mechanism arrive late. Track leading indicators now.
- **Publish a few, hold the rest.** Public KPIs should be few and true. Internal KPIs can be sharper.

Public scoreboard, always on the site: participants · countries · workshop hours · languages · named methods · named partners. Update them. Do not leave zeros.

Current baseline to keep visible: 1,357 participants · 28 countries · ~285,000 workshop hours · since 2015 · partners including Erasmus+, British Council, Robert Bosch Stiftung, Goethe-Institut.

8 KPI Architecture — Four Scorecards

A. Practice and people (the work in the room)

Indicator	Baseline	2027	2031	2036
People in CWM workshops/trainings (cumulative)	1,357	2,000	4,000	8,000
Countries of work (cumulative)	28	30	35	40
Workshop hours (cumulative)	~285,000	annual hours public	annual hours public	annual hours + access notes public
Working languages used in delivery	8	8 maintained	8–10	8–10, access adaptations documented
% programmes with written debrief logged	unknown/informal	80%	95%	100% of core delivery
% programmes with more than one way to contribute	not yet measured	measured + 70%	90%	standard in Quality Framework

The 2036 participant number is growth with quality, not a stadium target. If quality falls, lower the number and say so.

B. Knowledge and authority (why people return)

Indicator	2027	2031	2036
Quality Framework	v1 public	v2 after peer input	cited outside CWM
Method pages published	4+	full set + adaptations	full set + translations
Publishing rhythm	Method Room + Field Notes + monthly essay, held	still held	library used by others
External citations / reuse	first named uses	regular appearance in toolkits/KA2/trainer courses	treated as reference literature

Indicator	2027	2031	2036
Academic/institute collaborations	1 active conversation	2–3 live collaborations	standing research relationship
External peer review of one methodology	planned	completed	second cycle

C. Voice and advocacy (whether power actually moves)

Indicator	2027	2031	2036
Honest public account of participant insight into advocacy	published	updated annually	standard
Youth/participant co-authored public pieces	2–4	quarterly	structural
Youth advisory / co-authorship mechanism	designed, first cycle	running, public output	independent enough to disagree with us
Policy/field notes tied to a real cycle	2–4 short notes	6+ a year, linked to practice	notes others reuse
Projects where young people can change a plan	named examples	majority of youth programmes	Quality Framework requirement

Do not claim a lobbying operation we do not run. Claim a voice mechanism we will build, then build it.

D. House and sustainability (so the work outlives a busy season)

Indicator	2027	2031	2036
Revenue mix	grants primary; first donors + corporate pilots	grants + donors + corporate + partnerships, capped concentration	durable mix; delivery and lab both funded
Friend of CWM / monthly donors	first cohort	stable secondary line	visible community of supporters
Corporate offer (Rights in the Room)	priced, rights-grounded, scholarship % set	repeat clients + case studies	recognised alternative to lecture-style DEI
Impact Scholarship	designed	running, youth places funded	public annual number of places
Trainer pathway	induction + associate route written	associate → trainer → mentor in use	checkable certification or equivalent
Internal culture mechanics	handbook + weekly debrief + monthly lab review	80/20 time split holding	founders no longer only memory of the method
ANBI / giving infrastructure	confirmed before any tax claim	donations working	legacy giving possible
Inquiries after launch	10+ meaningful in first 30 days	steady KA2/partner/training/donor pipeline	inbound exceeds founder capacity, on purpose

Drift KPI (mandatory, quarterly): the share of public copy that still names human rights education, named methods, and participation-as-power. If “inclusion” and “DEI” language rise while those three fall, the board treats it as a red flag even if income is up.

9 2027 Operating KPIs

Publishing and community

- Website carries Vision, Mission, Human Rights Education, Methodologies, Support Us, and a live link to Culture.World.Me.
- Quality Framework v1 and a Culture Statement published as site articles.
- Mailing list + form (“join the community / work with us”) live and tagged: KA2 / Corporate / Donor / Trainer / Community.
- Publications and research keep its promise: usable method, honest field note, or participation analysis.

Delivery quality

- Every core workshop has a short debrief note.
- Accessibility adaptations written into method pages.
- Induction exists for any new facilitator before they run a CWM room.

Partnerships

- Salto profile rewritten around human rights education and documented methodology.
- 2–3 serious multi-partner conversations active.

Money with a conscience

- Donation tiers published only after ANBI/tax language is verified.
- Corporate pricing and scholarship percentage written down before the first sale.

10 How We Will Know the Vision Is Working

Ask these five questions every year. If we cannot answer them with evidence, the vision is decoration.

- Can a youth worker use something we published without hiring us?
- Can a young person show that their contribution changed a CWM decision?
- Can we name the method, the limitation, and the last thing that failed?
- Can a partner find our human rights core in three clicks, not buried under “inclusion”?
- Could this organisation still sound like itself if the founders stepped back for a season?

Yes to those five is worth more than a larger map.

11 Board Approval

“We will not claim a better world. We will keep rehearsing the rooms in which a better world becomes possible and we will publish what that rehearsal teaches us.”