



# CONFERENCE PROGRAMME PARALLEL SESSIONS

## Programme Parallel Sessions

<b>1st Slot - Parallel Sessions - Thursday 18 January 2018 (14h00 - 15h30)</b>				
<b>Session 1 - Knowledge brokering (I) - Facilitator: Dr. Roberta Ruggiero, CCRS, University of Geneva, Switzerland</b>				<b>Room: Plenary No. 106</b>
Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
201	de Graaf	Coby	Children's Rights Center Amsterdam (CCRA), The Netherlands	Mission CCRA: to promote research and education and function as a platform for specialists, students and professionals as well as institutions and organisations.
119	Lembrechts	Sara	Children's Rights Knowledge Centre (KeKi), Ghent, Belgium	Children's rights knowledge management in Flanders – Lessons learned from developing a reflection tool for children's participation in policy-making.
146	Hoffman	Simon	Swansea University, Wales, UK	Children's International Human Rights: Decentralisation, Localisation and 'Tailor-made' Measures of Implementation.
154	Janta	Barbara	RAND Europe	European evidence-based platform: European Platform for Investing in Children.
<b>Session 2 - Global policy debate and local reality – Facilitator: Prof. Kay Tisdall, Steering Committee CREAN - University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom</b>				<b>Room: No. 109</b>
Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
105	Byrne	Bronagh	Centre for Children's Rights, Queen's University Belfast, UK	From the Global to the Local: Implementing the UNCRC in Policy and Practice.
153	van Daalen	Edward	Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland	Child Labour: Taking Stock of the Polarised Global Policy Debate.
139	Bernheim	Rebekkah	University of Edinburgh, UK	The Impact of Culturally Informed Conceptualizations of Childhood on International Research and Policy Direction.
<b>Session 3 - Child participation informing policy debate - Facilitator Prof. Daniel Stoecklin, CCRS, University of Geneva, Switzerland</b>				<b>Room: No. 108</b>
Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
148	Lloyd	Katrina	Queen's University Belfast, UK	Children's subjective wellbeing: The role of self-esteem and respect.
142	Centrone	Maria Rosaria	Potsdam University of Applied Sciences, Germany	Yes to Sexuality Education at School: Exploring the voices of Italian Adolescents.
134	Fernandes Gomes Correia	Nadine Elisabete	ISCTE - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Portugal	Children's right to participation in ECEC settings: A systematic review.

## 2nd Slot - Parallel Sessions - Thursday 18 January 2018 (16h00 - 17h30)

### Session 4 - Knowledge brokering (II) – Facilitator: Prof. Ton Liefwaard, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Room: Plenary No. 106

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
81	Vandekerckhove	Ankie	Centrum voor Vernieuwing in de Basisvoorzieningen voor Jonge Kinderen (VBJK), Ghent, Belgium	Creating dialogue spaces for research, practice and policy.
124	Dale Mabophiwa Janes	Helen Phatsimo Joe	Swansea University, UK	It's about us, so we need to work together": Co-producing knowledge in Wales through rights-based approaches to research.
111	Templeton	Michelle	Queen's University Belfast, UK	What does it mean to be 'Child-Friendly'? : Children's Views.
115	Athalye	Naina	Kindernothilfe, India	Unicorn in the local garden: Promoting informed action by civil society by making accessible relevant and demystified research data.

### Session 5 - Empirical evidence to inform child welfare services and policy – Facilitator: Ms. Rebecca Budde, CREAN Steering Committee - University of Applied Sciences Potsdam, Germany

Room: No. 109

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
132	Reynaert	Didier	University College Ghent, HAN University of Applied Sciences, Belgium	Children's rights and child poverty: a tense relation for social policy.
176	Veliquette	Alyssa Marie	University College of Southeast Norway	Norwegian Child Welfare Services as a means of integration? Comparing kommune child welfare practice with ethnic minority families.
174	Wilson	Samita	University of Stavanger, Norway	Right to protection: Ethnic minority children's experiences of Western Child Welfare Services.
170	Tulman	Joseph B.	University of the District, Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law, USA	Changing Outcomes for Children: The Matrix Project and Other Systems-Change Strategies for Academic Activists.

### Session 6 - Child care inside and outside the family environment – Facilitator: Prof. Wouter Vandenhoe, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Room: No. 108

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
85	Borda Carulla	Susanna	Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland	What is wrong with putting children first? A case study in the community homes of Bogotá, Colombia.
175	Abrahamsen	Camilla Myhre	University College of South-East Norway	The Right to Family Life in Norway – a Critical Discourse Analysis on Legal, Governmental and Media Documents.
107	O'Keeffe	Helen	Edge Hill University, UK	Parental Involvement in Education: The rights of prisoners' children.
151	Merckx	Evelyn	Ghent University, Belgium	The importance of child psychology in the Belgian custody law.

### 3rd Slot - Parallel Sessions - Friday 19 January 2018 (9h00 - 10h30)

#### Session 7 - Evidence-based education policy - Facilitator: Prof. John Fluke, School of Medicine, University of Colorado, USA Room: Plenary No. 106

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
203	Moody	Zoe	University of teacher education Valais & Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva	Children's rights education: research, assessment and policies.
205	Rinaldi	Stefanie	Consultant and Trainer for Human Right, AllRights, Switzerland	Child rights education in Switzerland: Bridging gaps between law, policy, research and realities on the ground.
156	Mannion Sowerby Nowek McWatt	Greg Matthew Gail Paul	University of Stirling, UK University of Stirling, UK Education Scotland, Glasgow, Scotland, UK St Mungo's Academy, Glasgow, Scotland, UK	Education Policy Formation on Learner Participation: Stories of Productive Assemblage.
149	Sanchez Caro	Carmen Maria	Université Paris 13, Laboratoire EXPERICE, France	Policy making and the developpement of indigenous-oriented ECEC services in Bogota, Colombia.

#### Session 8 - Juvenile Justice - Prof. Karl Hanson, CREAN Steering Committee and CCRS, University of Geneva, Switzerland Room: No. 109

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
88	Kremser	Jonathan M.	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, USA	The Role of Youth Court Diversion within the Balanced and Restorative Justice Framework.
106	Luhamaa Strömpl	Katre Judit	University of Tartu, Estonia	On the way toward child-friendly justice: Developing research-based education and practice in Estonian child protection system.
171	Roth	Maria	Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania	Retrospectives on trajectories in child protection and implications.

#### Session 9 - School cultures and children's rights – Facilitator: Dr. Susanna Borda Carulla, CCRS, University of Geneva, Switzerland Room: No. 108

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
143	Louviot	Maude	Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland	Children's rights education in Switzerland – Links, challenges and opportunities between policies and practices.
165	Malama Robinson	Mia Carol	UNICEF, Finland University of Brighton, UK	Developing school cultures based on child rights: Experiences from Finland and the United Kingdom.
61	Zhu	Yan	University of Edinburgh, UK	Student leader system in Chinese school's organizing system: A child participation practice with a risk of causing children experiences of unbalanced power relation in peer relationships.
166	Sereke	Wegi	Women Against Torture (WAT), Geneva, Switzerland	Addressing educational needs of children with refugee background: comparing European practices.

#### Session 10 - Teaching and learning children's rights in higher education – Facilitator: Prof. Natália Fernandes, CREAN Steering Committee and University of Minho, Portugal Room: No. 104

Ref. no.	Last name	First name	Affiliation	Title
19	Peleg	Noam	The University of New South Wales, Australia	A New Model for Building Capacity on Implementation and Reporting about Children's Rights.
141	Zanatta	Francesca	University of East London, UK	'A right(s) approach to life' Teaching and learning about children's rights in Higher Education as transformative experience and sustainable activism both in practice with children and in everyday life.
79	Arthur	Raymond	Northumbria University, UK	Educating policymakers and policy in children's rights and agency: responding to consensual teenage sexting in England without creating permanent youth criminal records.
100	Iovu	Mihai-Bogdan	Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania	Assessing Students' Learning in Higher Education. Specificities of the European Master Program in Children's Rights.

# Abstracts Parallel Session – 1<sup>st</sup> Slot

Thursday 18 January 2018 (14h00 - 15h30)

## Session 1: Knowledge Brokering:

**Coby de Graaf – Director of the Centre for Children’s Rights Amsterdam:** *“Mission CCRA: to promote research and education and function as a platform for specialists, students and professionals as well as institutions and organisations.”*

### I Mission

#### 1. Research

CCRA’s first goal is research as this is an important basis for CCRA’s education and platform function. Our two consecutive studies focused on the application of the CRC in Dutch case law are of major importance. The first study covers a period from 1 January 2002 to September 2011, the second from 1 September 2011 to 1 September 2014. All published judgements by Dutch courts from this period were studied and analysed. The researched areas of law are family law, immigration law, social security law and juvenile criminal law. The Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport used the second study in its five-yearly state report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. The studies have proven to be useful in other ways as well. Both judges and lawyers have let us know that both studies are of use to them, as have lawmakers at the Ministry of Justice, who praised our research for its handy, comprehensive overview of case law, organised by specific CRC articles. A third study covering the period after 1 September 2014 till September 2017 is under way. The research was funded by the Dutch state.

#### 2. & 3. Education/Platform function

An essential part of our educational and platform program is our annual lecture cycle, which is held on ten evenings in the fall. The CCRA organises these lectures in corporation with the RINO, the Amsterdam based national organisation for continuing education and training in the field of mental health. Central focal point is the rights of the child, with the CRC as the principal guideline. Subjects for instance are the effect of the CRC on national law, juvenile criminal law, the child’s right to be heard and talking to children, the effects of our new national child protection measures, the guardian ad litem, refugees minors, complex custody and visitation in divorce cases, the right to privacy, surrogacy and compulsory education and the right to an education. The lectures are meant for lawyers and other legal professions as well as psychological, pedagogical and psychiatric professions. This interdisciplinary approach is not only reflected in the topics, but also in the combined presentations of specialists from the legal and care professions. A fruitful exchange between theory and practise is the central aim. Apart from academics we invite hands-on professionals with experience in transferring the knowledge they have gained in their everyday work. Our annual afternoon seminar - always during the spring - follows the same principle of ‘reflective practioners’ sharing their knowledge and insights with colleagues.

### II Our History and Background

The CCRA was founded in 2008 by miss dr. Coby de Graaf under the aegis of the Faculty of Law of the University of Amsterdam. The incentive was the increased interest of researchers and students in the rights of the child. Since 1 January 2016 the CCRA continues its activities unchanged as the non-profit ‘Foundation CCRA’.

**Sara Lembrechts – Keki/The University of Antwerp:** *“Children’s rights knowledge management in Flanders – Lessons learned from developing a reflection tool for children’s participation in policy-making.”*

Despite the great expectations and unprecedented opportunities that came with the global adoption of the CRC, children’s rights researchers, policy-makers and practitioners face a wide range of issues that remain extremely difficult to tackle. At the same time, knowledge about such complex problems has never been more available, accessible and affordable. Making the best use of knowledge as a resource to achieve further realisation of children’s rights, however, requires changes in how knowledge is managed, shared, brokered and created.

In this contribution, the Children’s Rights Knowledge Centre (KeKi) will share some lessons learned from its unique position on the bridge between research, policy and practice in the children’s rights field in Flanders (Belgium). Our starting point is an ongoing exercise on the development of a reflection tool for policy makers to stimulate participation of children and young people in shaping childhood policies. This instrument builds upon experience and know-how from practice, data and legislation collected at policy level, as well as academic research stemming from methodological and disciplinary choices.

As such, the case study will shed a light on opportunities and challenges in gathering, making available, disseminating, stimulating and increasing knowledge on children’s rights between academia, policy and practice.

In addition, the exercise opens up a debate on the extent to which children’s rights can inspire critical self-reflection to strengthen policy-development for children and young people.

**Simon Hoffman - Swansea University, Wales, UK:** *“Children’s International Human Rights: Decentralisation, Localisation and ‘Tailor-made’ Measures of Implementation”*

Implementation of the UNCRC is dependent to a very large extent on State internal arrangements for law and policy. The notion of a unitary State responsible for children’s rights is challenged by the decentralisation of State power and responsibilities. This creates a risk of divergence in how children experience rights across States, with potential to undermine implementation of the UNCRC through regional non-compliance, poor coordination, differing priorities, weak monitoring, and lack of ‘buy-in’ from local regimes.

These represent significant risks to children’s rights at the sub-State level and have been highlighted as problematic by Committee on the Rights of the Child. Knowledge brokering by research institutions has the potential to translate scientific knowledge into operational procedures to mitigate these risks, including by aiding the development of ‘tailor-made’ tools for policy implementation to ensure alignment with the children’s rights normative framework, but which accommodate the contingencies, priorities and frailties of policy making below the level of State party.

This paper will discuss the development of such bespoke approaches to Children’s Rights Impact Assessment and a Child Rights Approach in Wales, a devolved nation of the United Kingdom. These tools are used to promote children’s rights in policy processes undertaken by the Welsh Government and public authorities in Wales.

The paper will provide an account of, and rationalisation of the processes introduced (suggesting they are generalizable to other multilevel governance contexts), and will argue that adopting a principled approach means tailor-made tools provide fidelity to children's rights, whilst retaining flexibility to meet the needs of a range of policy makers operating at different levels locally.

**Barbara Janta – RAND Europe:** *“European evidence-based platform: European Platform for Investing in Children.”*

In 2013, the European Commission renewed its commitment to promoting child well-being and made a recommendation entitled ‘Investing in children – breaking the cycle of disadvantage’ as part of the Social Investment Package to promote that goal. One of the guidelines was to strengthen the use of evidence-based policy. This particular recommendation is noteworthy, because it represents one of the first times that a European Commission has specifically advocated the use of evidence in policymaking.

The aim of this presentation is to provide an overview on the research and evaluation activities undertaken by RAND Europe for the European Platform for Investing in Children (EPIC). The EPIC project, funded by the European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, is an online platform that explores and assesses evidence on child and family policies and practice in Europe, and disseminates information on the effectiveness of these interventions.

During this presentation we provide an overview on development of the evaluation framework and its application to assess child and family practices available at the EPIC website.

We discuss what constitutes an evidence-based practice in social policy and how the EPIC evaluation process adheres to scientific standards of transparency and replicability. We conclude by showing how policy makers, academics and practitioners can engage with EPIC practices and the evaluation process.

## **Session 2: Global policy debate and local reality:**

**Bronagh Byrne - Centre for Children's Rights, Queen's University Belfast, UK:** *“From the Global to the Local: Implementing the UNCRC in Policy and Practice”*

The almost global ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) is widely celebrated. This is, however, only where the true work of the UNCRC begins in ‘bringing rights home’ to children and to duty-bearers. This paper will argue that effective implementation of child rights requires active facilitation by a range of actors.

Recognition of the legitimacy and utility of children's rights by policy-makers, advocacy by NGOs and knowledge exchange with academics are all key contributory factors to the development of an environment in which children's rights can be effectively realised.

This is not to underestimate the difficulties that may still remain, but is recognition of the centrality of partnership in creating a child-rights sensitive context which allows substantive engagement with the issues to take place.

In so doing it will draw on a series of research projects led by the authors on the implementation of children's rights, the findings and recommendations of which have directly informed legislation and policy in Northern Ireland. It will be suggested that collaboration and partnership are necessary ingredients in the translation of the global to the local.

**Edward van Daalen - Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland:** *"Child Labour: Taking Stock of the Polarised Global Policy Debate"*

Within the broad field of international children's rights there is arguably no issue that has created as much divide between policy makers and researchers/practitioners as 'child labour' has. On the one side stands the International Labour Organisation (ILO), responsible for global standards and policy aimed at the eradication of all forms child labour.

On the other side we find a large group of researchers and practitioners whose experiences and empirical research findings point at the harmful consequences of the ILO's approach; they opt instead for more pragmatic and protective policies appropriated to local realities. The standoff is further fuelled by feuds over ideology, culture, north/south relations and research methods, to name just a few of the controversial points.

In 2016 the two sides clashed when a group of researchers lobbied the Committee on the Rights of the Child to refrain from referring to the ILO conventions on child labour in the General Comment on Adolescence. In 2017 academics were not invited to the Global Conference on Child Labour organised by the ILO.

Instead several of them participated in a 'counter conference' on public policies for working children. This presentation will provide an 'insiders' perspective on this polarised state of affairs by exploring what lies behind the divide, what the practical implications on the ground are, and how to move forward.

**Rebekkah Bernheim - University of Edinburgh, UK:** *"The Impact of Culturally Informed Conceptualizations of Childhood on International Research and Policy Direction"*

The patriarchal nature of Armenian society excludes girls' experiences from the policy landscape, and little research exists representing their views. The Syrian Crisis led to the exodus of ethnically Armenian Syrians back to Armenia, including many girls. This paper critically reflects on the challenges I encountered researching the socio-cultural integration of Syrian-Armenian girls displaced to Armenia by the ongoing Syrian Crisis.

The research was an exploratory study, and included a brief documentary analysis, interviews with local stakeholders, and a focus group for Syrian-Armenian girls. Of particular interest in this paper is the reaction of local stakeholders, who met my decision to focus on girls' experiences with a mixture of curiosity, confusion, and abject dismissal which then affected data collection.

This paper seeks to address to what extent local cultural understandings of gender and childhood should drive the direction of international children's rights research and policy. This paper fits within the scope of a growing corpus of cross-disciplinary research documenting the experiences of researchers doing qualitative research with children and young people internationally.

This paper interrogates how cultural and language differences, and varying conceptualization of childhood and gender among local stakeholders, children, and researchers, can influence data collection, research findings, and subsequent policy development. The dual challenges arising from the international scope of the research and the complexity of accurately and ethically researching with children and young people necessitates a critical and reflexive approach to the research process.



### **Session 3 - Child participation informing policy debate:**

**Katrina Lloyd - Queen's University Belfast, UK:** *“Children’s subjective wellbeing: The role of self-esteem and respect.”*

In recent years discourse on children’s wellbeing has become a prominent feature within the academic, government and public sectors in many countries across the world.

Understanding variations in levels of child well-being, and the factors contributing to it, can be useful for practical and policy initiatives to help improve the lives of children. One recurring theme in studies of children’s wellbeing is the importance of relationships not only with family and friends but also with the wider community.

However, research has suggested that children and young people who feel disrespected by adults experience negative feelings about themselves and their communities. In a survey carried out on behalf of the European Commission in 2011 children identified a ‘lack of respect by the adult world’ as one of the disadvantages of being a child. Yet, in human rights terms, respect is centred on notions of dignity and equality which are inextricably linked with feelings of self-worth and value. This paper explores the inter-relationships between children’s feelings of being respected in their day-to-day lives, their self-esteem and their subjective wellbeing using data from an annual online survey of 10 and 11-year olds – Kids’ Life and Times (KLT).

In 2016, 5,094 children completed the questionnaire. The results indicate that children’s subjective wellbeing is positively correlated with their self-esteem and with feeling respected. The findings are discussed in relation to Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model that stresses the need to consider children’s development within the context of the interrelations between their own characteristics and the environment in which they live.

The paper concludes by considering the implications of the results for teachers, policymakers and others interacting with children in their day-to-day lives.

**Maria Rosa Centrone - Potsdam University of Applied Sciences, Germany:** *“Yes to Sexuality Education at School: Exploring the voices of Italian Adolescents”*

Italy is one of the few European Union countries where the teaching of sexuality education is not included in the school curriculum, even if in the past forty years the issue has been quite discussed in the public arena. Through a qualitative research that took place with teenagers in three Italian regions, this paper aims at understanding what are their needs, views and perspectives about introducing sexuality education as a formal school subject.

The voices of adolescents are indeed currently quite absent from the public discourse, even if this topic inherently concerns them. Findings reveal that the teenagers interviewed have a positive opinion on the teaching of sexuality education and that school seems the most appropriate space for it. Other spaces to talk about sexuality are lacking and whenever present they are embedded within a protective and preventive discourse.

Furthermore, the research highlights strong gender categorization based on a heteronormative dominant narrative in the experiences of young people. These findings could provide an initial basis to develop a sexuality education curriculum starting from the adolescents' opinions, preferences and lives.

**Nadine Elisabete Fernandes Gomes Correia - ISCTE - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Portugal:** *“Children’s right to participation in ECEC settings: A systematic review “*

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) was pivotal in the definition and advocacy of children’s rights, namely children’s right to participation (Articles 12 to 17). Viewed as children’s capacity to exert influence in all matters affecting their lives, talking or acting in partnership with adults, participation can be exercised in different ways, assuming a multidimensional character (Sinclair, 2004; Stephenson, Gourley, & Miles, 2004).

Distinct areas of knowledge converge on the relevance of considering children’s perspectives on their everyday lives and, specifically, in early childhood education and care (ECEC) settings (Clark & Moss, 2005). Nonetheless, few studies, measures, and empirical evidence still exist on this topic.

This paper presents a systematic review of research conducted on children’s right to participation in the field of social sciences, in ECEC settings, from 1980 to 2017. More specifically, we aim to identify (a) countries and areas in which research has been conducted; (b) main definitions, theoretical backgrounds, and operationalizations of children’s right to participation; (c) type of studies (e.g., quantitative, qualitative), variables, and measures; and (d) results obtained.

The search strategy is based on the ‘Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement’ (Liberati et al., 2009), and several databases (e.g., ERIC, PsycINFO, Scopus) were analyzed, using different combinations of words (e.g., child participation, right to participation, early childhood education), as also as inclusion and exclusion criteria (e.g., age, type of study). With this work we aim to contribute to a deeper understanding of available research on children’s right to participation. Results, implications, and future research needs will be discussed.

## Abstracts Parallel Session – 2<sup>nd</sup> Slot

Thursday 18 January 2018 (16h00 - 17h30)

### Session 4 - Knowledge brokering (II):

**Ankie Vandekerckhove - Centrum voor Vernieuwing in de Basisvoorzieningen voor Jonge Kinderen (VBJK), Ghent, Belgium:** *“Creating dialogue spaces for research, practice and policy.”*

VBJK is an expertise centre on Innovations in the Early Years. In its work on overall quality in Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC), the concept of children’s rights is one of the main drivers. Throughout the years VBJK has experienced how researchers/practitioners sometimes speak a whole different language than policymakers. However, to obtain sustainable change, policy, research and practice need to be inextricably linked. VBJK’s work is characterised by the constant focus on this intersection between practice, policy and research. We are well aware of the pressure to serve policymakers ‘easy’ and ‘ready to use recipes’ but we have been actively developing different ways to deepen the necessary dialogue with the policy level, with input from research and practice.

How we do this, will be illustrated by several examples, such as VBJK’s work on the Transatlantic Forum on Inclusive Early Years (2013-2017), setting up a dialogue platform for relevant research, practice and policymakers on several current issues in Early Years (e.g. accessibility, professionalization, multilingualism, parent involvement....).

Another example would be the continuous work, both in research and advocacy, on the importance of competent systems in ECEC, as enhancing the professional development of the ECEC workforce is critical for ECEC quality. The quality of ECEC provision for children and their families deserves the greatest attention, considering the fact that early childhood is a period of uncontested importance for lifelong development and the knowledge that the cycle of poverty and disadvantage can be countered by focusing on the most vulnerable young children (Sylva et al., 2011; Vandebroek & Lazzari, 2014; Yoshikawa & Hsueh, 2001).

This social issue is one of the political priorities for many policymakers.

**Helen Dale, Phatsimo Mabophiwa & Joe Janes (& Anthony Charles) –**

**Swansea University, UK:** *“It’s about us, so we need to work together”:* *Co-producing knowledge in Wales through rights-based approaches to research.”*

The quote above, offered by a primary school pupil, encapsulates just how important it is for children to be heard and to be participants in ‘knowledge brokering’ and the design, development and implementation of policy. In Swansea, for more than 10 years, research has been undertaken to not just understand children’s views, experiences and aspirations for themselves and society, but to co-construct, with them, innovative ways of ‘doing’ and using research so that they can foster policy change.

Focusing on research undertaken, this paper will offer insights concerning:

-The ways that children can be empowered to be architects of public policy. Dr. Anthony Charles will share with the audience his work with schools and municipal government which has resulted in child-

developed policy being created, implemented and scrutinised by children. A particular emphasis on children's involvement in education and anti-discrimination policy will be offered.

-How child-appropriate training can transform children and open up new possibilities for research practice. Helen Dale, a leading team member of the Lleisiau Bach-Little Voices research project, a project that has engaged with more than 70 schools across Wales, training children as researchers and empowering them to lead discussion regarding how research findings can be used to create change, will share reflections on her work.

-The power of children's voices in radically shifting understandings of knowledge, how it is used, and the ways in which child originated knowledge can make a difference: to children and their communities. Phatsi Mabophiwa, who is conducting research concerning what 'rights' and 'responsibilities' mean to children and how they interface, personally and at a policy level, will present what children have said and the implications of their views.

**Michelle Templeton – Queen's University, Belfast, UK:** *"What does it mean to be "Child-Friendly"? Children's Views"*

The Committee on the Rights of the Child repeatedly calls for organisations to produce 'child-friendly' versions of their information and reports. While many researchers produce 'child-friendly' versions of their work, a lack of clarity exists as to what it means to be 'child-friendly'. This paper aims to contribute to understanding of the term by drawing on the authors' experience of a project that worked with a group of children aged 9-13 years to produce a 'child-friendly' version of a sensitive and complex legal instrument, the Council of Europe's Lanzarote Convention. This particular Convention focuses on children's rights to protection against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse.

In this paper, we describe the approach we used to translate the adult-version of the document in to the final 'child-friendly' version, and discuss some of the methodological challenges involved. By working with children and young people, we identified the key messages from the text; condensed, defined and refined the language used; and, combined this with important concepts in an appealing and engaging way, as determined by the children. In addition, we explored the concept of 'child-friendly' with the group to offer insights into what children themselves think counts as 'child-friendly'.

The approach goes beyond the mere provision of information, raising questions about agency and empowerment and what constitutes 'good' knowledge and who gets to create that. We conclude with some reflections on the challenges of balancing accuracy and accessibility, suggesting that this can only be fully achieved when child-friendly documents are co-produced with children.

**Naina Athalye – Kindernoethilfe, Pune, India:** *"Unicorn in the local garden: Promoting informed action by civil society by making accessible relevant and demystified research data."*

The paper examines the culture of silence that surrounds severe child rights violations. Communication/ interface among academia, policy makers and civil society is central to facilitate justice for children and for the prevention of violence and violations. In this discussion paper examples are drawn from ecological and safety rights of children as seen in environmental, anti-human trafficking and child protection policies in India. The lacunae in information gathering, documentation and dissemination is discussed. .

Even in cases where heads of policy making departments are previous heads of premier academic institutions, child rights does not get included in policy documents. The paper highlights one good practice in the form of a child rights institute (NIPCCID) in India that conducts research at regular intervals and disseminates data. The paper further discusses good practices within the European (specifically German) region in the case of anti-human trafficking. This is comparison with India with regard to academic research and data dissemination. The global south is a key player in world politics and the inclusion of child rights in research is central in sustaining communities and attaining the 17 SDGs. While access to and use of information are delectable elements of a globalized and digitized society today, research data is not always understood by children or adults. Academics need to demystify research data so that children and civil society pressurize policy makers to formulate robust policies for children.

Recommendations are made to academics and policy makers on how children can have access to information on policies, participation of children in research and periodic training given to government officials. Specific research techniques are discussed.

### **Session 5 - Empirical evidence to inform child welfare services and policy:**

**Didier Reynaert - University College Ghent, HAN University of Applied Sciences, Germany:**

*“Children’s rights and child poverty: a tense relation for social policy.”*

The past decades, a child rights based approach to social policy was introduced to combat the increasing problem of child poverty. In such an approach, child poverty is considered as a violation of the rights of children as recognized in the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Using children’s rights as a framework to combat child poverty can have an important added value for social policy, in particular the potential such a framework can have in mobilizing the necessary social and material recourses to guarantee children a life in human dignity.

In this presentation, we will analyse a child rights based approach to combat child poverty. Based on a qualitative research project using in-depth interviews with 30 families living in poverty, the perspectives of parents were examined. The aim of the interviews was to portrait the perspectives of parents living in poverty on how they experience the realisation of their rights and the impact hereof on the rights of their children. The findings of this research project show that a child rights based approach to child poverty encompasses a number of risks.

The major concern is the danger of disconnecting the issue of child poverty from the broader issue of (family) poverty. This can either result in the risk to discount the living conditions of poor parents, in blaming parents for showing a lack of responsibility in raising their children, or both. An issue of concern for social policy therefore is to avoid the separation of social and material resources for children from the resources for parents, as this risk to create conflicts of interests between children and parents.

Hence, in our conclusion we will make a case for a child rights based approach that connects the interests of children with the interests of other groups in society, particularly parents.

**Alyssa Marie Veliquette - University College of Southeast Norway:** *“Norwegian Child Welfare Services as a means of integration? Comparing kommune child welfare practice with ethnic minority families.”*

The disproportionality of ethnic minorities in the child welfare system is an international phenomenon that is not unique to Norway; however, international human rights protection instruments have criticized Norway, noting concern for a lower standard of child welfare assistance for children from ethnic minorities, issues of cultural respect in child welfare, and ethnic discrimination from employees of child welfare services. Norway has a unique child protection system, with a distinct tension between the universality of child welfare legislation and the focus on local implementation of such legislation and standards.

This research highlights the gap between policy and practice, the implementation of the rights of the child, rights against discrimination, and child welfare policy in Norway in relation to ethnic minority families. To examine this gap, two municipalities will be compared – one in the international hub of Drammen and another in the more rural municipality of Sunndalsøra.

Interviews will be conducted with child welfare practitioners and parents who are ethnic minorities in each of the municipalities to examine challenges in service delivery, the ways in which ethnic minority families adapt familial life to Norwegian cultural life, as well as perceptions of Norwegian values.

The results of the interviews will guide an analysis of the child welfare system, in addition to multicultural theories of integration, assimilation, and exclusion. The purpose of the research is to analyze the practice of child welfare with ethnic minorities and how it affects the ways in which ethnic minority families adapt to Norwegian cultural and familial life with consideration for international human rights critiques.

**Samita Wilson - University of Stavanger, Norway:** *“Right to protection: Ethnic minority children's experiences of Western Child Welfare Services.”*

**Background:** Norway is steadily becoming a more multicultural society, which affects its welfare and social policies and practices. Child Welfare Services (CWS) is one of the central services in this welfare state. Norwegian CWS policies are shifting towards a child-focused orientation, which views child as an individual with independent rights. This presents CWS as a complicated arena in which the perspectives on childcare of the majority and minorities sometimes stand in opposition. It is interesting to see how children with non-western immigrant backgrounds live their rights in the global north.

**Problem statement:** How children with ethnic minority backgrounds live their right to protection in a welfare state?

**Methods:** Systematic review methods were used to locate and appraise qualitative studies that focus on minority children's perspectives and experiences with CWS in Norway and the U.K. U.K is included in this review due to its similarity with Norway in terms of child protection system and immigrants groups.

**Results:** Children describe a range of experiences with CWS. While some children have positive experiences, there are many challenges as well. In many cases, children did not know and/or understood why they were referred to CWS.

**Discussion:** This systematic review highlights the importance of listening to children themselves about their experiences with CWS. Children usually have a very different understanding of their situation compared to that seen by CWS. In addition, children face conflicting loyalties due to their plural identities. The general idea of universal services 'one size fits all' is not so relevant in multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies anymore. Children need to have a say in what they need to protection from, rather than adults deciding it for them.

**Joseph B. Tulman - University of the District, Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law, USA:**

*"Changing Outcomes for Children: The Matrix Project and Other Systems-Change Strategies for Academic Activists."*

By committing to applied research and by implementing systems-change strategies, academics can affect children's rights policies and improve outcomes for marginalized children. This paper summarizes the use of systems-change theory and organizing strategies in the context of efforts to address unnecessary criminalization and incarceration of children in the United States. In light of the intersectionality of race, class, and disability, the paper addresses the interplay of the education and delinquency systems. Using examples from criminal law and disability rights, the paper presents a case aggregation strategy and other strategies that rely on research and action by academics. These approaches challenge a discriminatory and counterproductive equilibrium, using virtuous reinforcing feedback loops to create positive outcomes for children.

This use of systems theory and strategic juxtaposition of legal rights is transferable to children's rights in any country or jurisdiction. As a detailed example, the paper presents a methodology for researching and generating a matrix of legally mandated disability accommodations for delinquency court proceedings; for delinquency programs, services, and activities; and for most-integrated, evidenced-based treatment options. Rights to these accommodations exist in the delinquency and education systems; officials, administrators, and other staff in both systems, however, are ignorant of these rights or otherwise intentionally ignore these rights.

Accordingly, the paper explores how academics can design and implement the matrix project and the other projects outlined in order to stimulate positive change. This paper is a product of thirty-five years representing children and parents; directing a law school clinic; organizing lawyers; and publishing about these issues.

## **Session 6 - Child care inside and outside the family environment:**

**Susana Borda Carulla - Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva,**

**Switzerland:** *"What is wrong with putting children first? A case study in the community homes of Bogotá, Colombia."*

Children's and women's lives are deeply entwined and interdependent. Women take the greatest responsibility for children's care both in formal and informal settings, and in many societies bearing and raising children is seen as an essential component of womanhood. Despite their interdependency, children's and women's issues are two dissociated chapters of international law and policy, particularly since the adoption of the UNCRC in 1989. Not only are women's and children's issues addresses separately, but a clear hierarchy has been established by international organizations through promoting the idea that protecting children's rights is a lever for the social and thus the economic development of a nation.

What are the social consequences, for children and women, of putting children first?

Combining a study of the legal corpus which regulates the Colombian government's child day care programme (community homes, operated by female caretakers known as community mothers) with an ethnographic study of its implementation in an underprivileged neighbourhood on the southern periphery of Bogotá, this contribution will expose the enduring tensions between the Colombian government – which advocates the dominance of children's rights over the rights of others – and the community mothers – whose labour rights are systematically violated by the state, prompting them to take action. Shedding light on how these tensions come to be will lead me to argue that if women's rights are not protected, there is a strong chance that the rights of the children they care for will not be protected either.

This paper presents the essence of the authors' contribution to the book "Feminism and the Politics of Childhood, Friends of Foes?", edited by Rachel Rosen and Katherine Twamley, currently on press.

**Camilla Myhre Abrahamsen - University College of South-East Norway:** *"The Right to Family Life in Norway – a Critical Discourse Analysis on Legal, Governmental and Media Documents."*

The thesis will examine the best interest of the child and the right to family life in cases where parents with children in Norway are deported for violating the Immigration Act.

There are cases in which the High Court in Norway have made decision to deport parents with children in Norway and the case has been brought to the European Court of Human Rights, where the decisions have been changed. The research is still in the early stages, but I hope that the thesis can explain the balance between immigration law and policies and the protection of children's rights and the right to respect for family life in these kinds of cases.

Critical Discourse Analysis will be used to analyse legal documents, government documents and media documents on the mentioned topics. CDA can be used to show how discourse can influence the society, and also how society can change discourse. The influence of discourse can convince the public to accept certain changes, both in policy-making and in the society in general. I will try to understand how discourse may influence legal decisions, policy-making and the media in regard to children's rights, the right to family life and immigration law.



**Helen O’Keeffe - Edge Hill University, UK:** *“Parental Involvement in Education: The rights of prisoners’ children.”*

There are aspects of the UNRC which have enjoyed considerable academic and research attention. However, other equally important convention claims, which stipulate the right of children to contact with and engagement of both parents, have been relatively neglected. Education is a key element of this responsibility and the Convention acknowledges the rights of children to their parents’ involvement in their ‘upbringing and development.’

These present an ‘ideal’ where regular contact with both parents is maintained and where parents share their common responsibilities equally. The conventions are challenging for all families affected by separation in whatever form but there are certain circumstances where this challenge is amplified, for example divorce, long-term marital separation, parental work arrangements, illness or financial circumstances. In such cases, contact may be restricted but still fairly flexible. For the children of prisoners, contact is both controlled and in many cases significantly restricted.

This small scale UK based study reflects upon three central issues arising in relation to the children of prisoners; (a) from a children’s rights perspective, should children of imprisoned parents be treated as possessing a presumptive right to have their parents’ participation their education? (b) To what extent have the responsible public institutions addressed this issue, particularly with regard to the rights of children with imprisoned fathers? (c) How do the findings of this study support the proposition that the participation of imprisoned fathers in the education of their children could and should be pursued as a legitimate public policy objective to support this right?

**Evelyn Merckx – Ghent University, Belgium:** *“The importance of child psychology in the Belgian custody law.”*

Child custody law is a sensitive area of expertise, as it struggles with the dichotomy between the child’s right to be heard (a right to participation) and the child’s best interests (a right to protection). Especially the latter right is subject to criticism because it leaves a lot of discretion to judges. In order to alleviate this tension, the legal provisions that judges implement should be based on child psychology.

A concrete case-study recently surfaced in Belgium and illustrates this tension:

A Belgian sociological study revealed that parents in a shared residence arrangement hardly ever communicate about the upbringing of their child. However, this preference for shared residency was established in the law due to psychological research that uncovered that children in such arrangements were happier. Critics of this legal provision now argue that forced shared residency could be counterproductive. According to them, these children were happier because their parents were able to communicate and as a result freely chose shared residence.

In the area of child custody, a lot of room still exist to incorporate interdisciplinary research. In Belgium, policy-makers thankfully already understand its importance.

However, as the past has showed, psychological studies have been invoked without critical analysis of the causal link between the results. The Minister for Justice, Koen Geens, introduced a working group in order to evaluate the law regarding the new family courts. This group consists of experts in the field (e.g.: lawyers and judges) and invites stake-holders to shed their light upon various points at issue, such as shared residency and parental alienation. The question arises whether this will be enough to introduce a best-interests framework that is based upon evidence-based psychological research.

## Abstracts Parallel Session – 3<sup>rd</sup> Slot

Friday 19 January 2018 (9h00 - 10h30)

### Session 7 - Evidence-based education policy:

**Zoé Moody - University of teacher education Valais & Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva:** *"Children's rights education: research, assessment and policies."*

There are many programmes and toolkits aiming to promote, encourage and facilitate Children's rights education in schools. In the French speaking part of Switzerland, the adoption of a new school curriculum explicitly mentioning children's rights as a teaching object has created a momentum: on the one hand, practitioners develop specific projects and/or activities to study children's rights and, on the other, NGOs conceive textbooks for school children and teaching methodologies to sustain those practices. Interestingly, scholars mainly receive solicitations for the assessment of the various projects. It however happens that they are requested by the stakeholders to assist the process from the start, in a transdisciplinary perspective.

Based on a logic of evidence compiling, this paper will focus on the findings of three different children's rights education projects assessments, in which the levels of implication of the researchers vary noticeably. The aim is threefold. First, we will highlight on the basis of scientific evidence "what works" in the field of children's rights education — focusing mainly on the adherence of teachers and pupils and the intended versus effective outcomes — and in which context(s). Secondly, how the implication of researchers can be related to successes or failures of programmes and/or assessments will be analysed. Finally, the issues raised by these findings in respect to children's rights teacher education policies as well as new research on children's rights education will be underlined.

**Stefanie Rinaldi - Consultant and Trainer for Human Right, AllRights, Switzerland:** *"Child rights education in Switzerland: Bridging gaps between law, policy, research and realities on the ground."*

Human rights education as defined by the United Nations aims to foster human rights competences (knowledge and understanding; attitudes and values; skills) and strives to encourage action for human rights. Children's human rights are an integral part of human rights education. Most notably, the UN Convention on the Rights of Education provides that education should aim to develop "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations" (art. 29(1)(b)).

The Swiss government has always been supportive of international initiatives strengthening human rights education. Switzerland has been one of the key States in drafting and promoting the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. Domestically, however, progress is slower. In reports to UN enforcement mechanisms, reference is usually made to individual projects, first and foremost in the area of anti-racism, and to individual references to human rights or child rights within some cantonal curricula. However, no evidence has been produced so far that human rights education has been implemented systematically and as a holistic concept as provided for in several international human rights instruments. Independent research shows that implementation mainly depends on individual teachers, as there is no common understanding of the concept of human rights education, no clear guidelines for implementation and no sufficient resources.

At policy level, some progress has been made in recent years. The 'Lehrplan 21' for primary and lower secondary school in the German speaking cantons defines 'human rights' as a cross-cutting topic and the 'Plan d'Études Romand' for French speaking cantons states that human rights competencies must be fostered at the levels of knowledge and skills. It remains to be seen if these provisions are sufficient to ensure systematic implementation.

Based on a study conducted in 2015 that aimed to reconstruct teachers' views on human rights education and on anecdotal evidence from my own work as trainer and consultant for human rights, I will highlight some gaps that remain between law/policy and the realities on the ground. I will argue that research with teachers and better coordination between policymakers and educational staff is required if human rights education, and children's human rights education in particular, is to be implemented successfully.

**Greg Mannion, Matthew Sowerby, Gail Nowek & Paul McWatt – University of Stirling, UK, Education Scotland, Glasgow and St Mungo's Academy, Glasgow, Scotland:**

*"Education Policy Formation on Learner Participation: Stories of Productive Assemblage."*

In Scotland and internationally, education systems are exhorted to address significant gaps in attainment and achievement between pupils from less advantaged backgrounds and others. But advocates of school improvement have not always remembered to attend to the role of pupils themselves as key stakeholders and rights-bearers in educational provision. New approaches to school and pre-school improvement seek to generate a fairer and more excellent educational provision and are now being called upon to do so in a rights-based manner with the explicit participation of learners themselves.

In this conference paper, we firstly revisit the findings from an earlier research project. In that study, we sought to understand how pupils themselves experienced their own participation as effective in enhancing achievement and attainment in schools in challenging circumstances. In that research, we took a participatory approach to evidence that pupil participation in four arenas of school life was seen as important for doing well. These were: the formal curriculum, extended curriculum, decision making groups, and community-oriented contexts. That research is now drawn upon in on-going policy guidance to schools and pre-schools, in policy formulation, and in a proposed Education Bill.

Taken together, the links among these projects and policies provide an illuminating story of how various stakeholders, actors, concepts, theories, research, and processes gain connected currency to create the opportunity for evidence-based policy formulation. We theorise these on-going processes using the idea of 'assemblage' (Deleuze and Guattari 1984, Youdell 2015) wherein policy formation is about affective connection making across and between various human and non-human territories, expressions, and materials.

**Carmen Maria Sanchez Caro - Université Paris 13, Laboratoire EXPERICE, France:** *"Policy making and the development of indigenous-oriented ECEC services in Bogota, Colombia."*

This study aimed to understand the "bottom up" making-process of the ECEC policy Modalidad Propia and the developing of Casas de Pensamiento Indígena (CPI) en Bogota, Colombia. Based on the right to education and the section V of the general Comment 7 on the application of the UNCRC on early childhood, this ECEC policy promotes community based ECEC settings. Through an exploration of policy documents and a multi-method approach (Clark & Moss, 2008) on 3 CPI, we intended to comprehend the impact of indigenous-oriented ECEC services built on the idea of situated knowledges approach.

The study highlights other answers to ECEC than conventional services which often leads to the question of “minority directions, in the majority world”. (Dahlberg, Moss, Pence, 2007; Vanderbroeck, 2004). This study questions the existing societal norms about ECEC, assumptions on parent’s participation (Rayna, Rubio, Scheu, 2010) and young-children “needs”. It points out the importance of taking families’ and children’s perspectives into consideration on policy making, and argues that how we understand children and ECEC involves political choices (Wyness, 2009; Moss & Petrie, 2002).

The data is interpreted with the help of portrait approach and ethnography of the action (Piette, 2006). Consider community based perspectives in order to enhance other childcare settings and their impact in early childhood policies, brings forward the ethical dimension. The first results show that equity and diversity are part of the new criteria for the city of Bogota ECEC system policies.

The findings support previous research about holistic care-services for young-children and recognize a place for communities and families in the policymaking process, as suggested by the UNCRC.

### **Session 8 - Juvenile Justice:**

**Jonathan M. Kremser - Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, USA:** *“The Role of Youth Court Diversion within the Balanced and Restorative Justice Framework.”*

Diversion from formal court processing is a popular alternative sanction for some first time, non-violent youthful offenders within the United States. Diversion is used either as an alternative to formal processing by juvenile authorities, or prior to the adjudicatory stage of the juvenile court process. While there are also adult diversion programs, the majority of diversion initiatives target youthful offenders. Within juvenile justice, the focus is to protect the best interests of the child, whereas formal processing of the youth, whether in juvenile court or in the adult system, would likely stigmatize the youth and undermine the child’s future wellbeing.

In addition to the negative outcome of youths who would better be served by in the community, are the problems of overcrowded detention facilities and the harm that could come to a youth placed among other offenders in crowded detention centres. This presentation will focus on the youth court approach to juvenile diversion within the Balanced and Restorative Justice approach to juvenile justice.

We will explore the historical background, theoretical framework that informs the diversion practice, as well as data on recidivism among youth court participants. The presentation will be oriented within the discourse of children’s rights, and explore future directions for policies that include youth diversion initiatives.

**Katre Luhamaa & Judith Strömpl – University of Tartu, Estonia:** *“On the way toward child-friendly justice: Developing research-based education and practice in Estonian child protection system.”*

The rights of the child have found their appropriate place in the legislation of Estonia – Estonia renewed in 2016 its Child Protection Act and incorporated in it all the contemporary legal instruments and concepts of the rights of the child. However, practical implementation of these rights is far from ideal. Research shows that one of the central areas of concern is the implementation of the rights of the child in the various court proceedings. There is sufficient research showing that children do not experience that their rights are protected during the court procedures; the same can be concluded on the basis of the court observations and qualitative interviews.

In this paper, we are going to present some preliminary results of recent research carried out as part of IDEA project funded by the European Commission. The project aims at enhancing the practice of representing the rights of the child for the benefit of children. The research included court visits, qualitative interviews with key actors in the field and an online inquiry. The research focuses on identifying with the assistance of the scientific methods the limits of academic education and needs for continuing training of the two central participants in the court proceedings – social workers and lawyers representing the children. It further aims at enhancing the child rights practice through cooperation and trust between different professionals.

Preliminary results show that lawyers and social workers lack knowledge in several areas of child rights protection. Furthermore, there is currently little or no co-operation between them in the court proceedings even though both groups of professionals express their desire for cooperation. This knowledge gives a good basis for planning future academic and continuing education and informs national practice.

**Maria Roth -Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania:** *“Retrospectives on trajectories in child protection and implications.”*

The presentation will draw the attention on the preliminary results of the SASCA project (Support to Adult Survivors of Child Abuse in institutional settings, [www.sasca.eu](http://www.sasca.eu)) which takes place in Italy, Greece, Romania and Ireland, and is co-financed by the EU. It collects the perceptions of youngsters who spent part of their childhood in public or private child protection care and intends to empower young adults to use the data in order to improve policies for looked after children. We shall present the Romanian research data based on 40 interviews with young people out of care and 97 surveys of child protection workers.

Even if many aspects of looking after children in child protection have changed due to the reforms in the Romanian legislation, respecting the rights of children to information on issues that concern their personal lives, to protection from violence and to participation in decision making is still an exception. Several young respondents told stories about their childhoods marked by traumatic experiences due to experiences of violence perpetrated by other children, by family members, educators and other professionals, and an overall lack of support. As for the experiences of violence, children did not get help to process abuse, neglect or bullying, on the contrary they were often blamed for becoming victims.

The results of surveys completed by professionals also revealed that the system does not safeguard children, but this was perceived as a fatality. The presentation will end by discussing some directions we identified in order to collaborate with the existing youth movements of adults with child protection past: we empower groups of young people to make their voices heard, to stand up for their rights, to obtain recognition and compensation for their childhood sufferings and help for the future.

## **Session 9 - School cultures and children’s rights:**

**Maude Louviot - Center for Children’s Rights Studies, University of Geneva, Switzerland:** *“Children’s rights education in Switzerland – Links, challenges and opportunities between policies and practices.”*

Switzerland ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1997. In this context, Swiss children should be informed and able to practice their rights in their daily life. However, the Committee on the rights of the child and the results of research show that few children know their rights.

School has a big role to play in the implementation of the CRC. Curricula, teachings and practices should be grounded in children's rights, with a view to enabling pupils to know and to experience their rights. But, as highlighted by Jeff (2002) the education system leaves little space for the exercise of children's rights, giving priority instead to an authoritarian and less participative mode of operation.

The question arises of the nature of the link between the school setting and the diffusion and implementation of children's rights, or, in other words, between the reality of the school system and children's rights policies. What is the state of children's rights in education policy of Switzerland? What are the implications of the PER (Plan d'Étude Romand), curricula current in the French part of Switzerland in the implementation of children's rights education?

How could school improve implementation of the rights of the child? What are the actual practices? Which are the obstacle to the implementation of children's rights into school despite policies and research results? After a presentation of what is understood under the notion of children's rights education and how CRC could be translated in practices in the school context, this contribution will underline the resources of the PER and show the challenges linked with children's rights education.

**Mia Malama – UNICEF Finland & Carol Robinson – University of Brighton, UK:** *“Developing school cultures based on child rights: Experiences from Finland and the United Kingdom.”*

This presentation focuses on the approaches taken by Finland and the UK to developing school cultures based on child rights. UNICEF Finland has launched a two-year pilot programme in two primary schools focusing on developing Child Rights Based Schools, and UNICEF UK have over 4,000 primary, secondary and special schools registered on their Rights Respecting School (RRS) award scheme.

UNICEF Finland's pilot programme draws on some of the ideas from UNICEF UKs RRS scheme and evaluation, with both the UK and the Finnish approaches aiming to support schools to develop a values-based, vision and structures to enhance and implement a child rights-based school culture.

Findings from the evaluation of RRS indicated that where schools adopted a rights-respecting approach, adults and young people in schools considered that this had a significant and positive influence on the school ethics, relationships, inclusivity, and understanding of the wider world and the well-being of the school community. Within the new (2016) Finnish school curriculum framework for basic education, child rights are now more explicitly stated within the curricula, however, findings from the pilot study indicate that challenges remain in terms of implementing a rights-based approach in schools.

This presentation will outline the measures taken by UNICEF Finland to develop Child Rights Based Schools, and findings from the evaluation of UNICEF RRS scheme which demonstrate specific approaches taken by schools to develop rights-based cultures. The practical and resources-based challenges faced by schools in both nations in working towards developing such cultures will be highlighted, with a view to identifying factors to support the development of tools for enhancing a child-rights school culture and implementing the new Finnish curriculum framework.

**Yan Zhu – University of Edinburg, UK:** *“Student leader system in Chinese school’s organizing system: A child participation practice with a risk of causing children experiences of unbalanced power relation in peer relationships.”*

The idea of encouraging ‘child participation’ is increasingly accepted and applied by many countries as an important approach to contribute the development of children’s rights. However, in different contextualized cases, child participation practices need to be carefully examined to ensure the positive result of empowering children in different contexts.

Based on the data collected in a 5-month ethnographic fieldwork with forty-nigh P5 children in a rural boarding school in China, this paper aims at discussing children’s experiences of ‘student leader’ system – one widely used child participation practice in many Chinese schools.

This paper firstly introduces the function of ‘student leader’, and the close relationships between high-able children’s advantage of the academic performance, the role of ‘student leader’, and the power amongst peers.

Then this paper focuses on showing the positive results of involving a group of children as ‘student leaders’ to support teachers’ work in school from the perspective of child participation. The third section of this paper involves the idea of ‘power-oriented instrumental friendship’ - a friendship type with a significant characteristic of highlighting friendship’s instrumental function of providing a chance to share friends’ power. In the end, this paper aims at pointing out the problematic unbalanced power relation between children involved in the ‘power oriented instrumental friendship’ to disclose the risk that children with more power, such as student leaders, might take advantage of their power to marginalize and exploit children with less power.

This risk also points out that it is important to count in every child’s school life experiences when employ any child participation practices to simultaneously promote the ideas of child participation and child protection.

**Wegi Sereke – Women Against Torture (WAT), Geneva, Switzerland:** *“Addressing educational needs of children with refugee background: comparing European practices.”*

Europe is experiencing a staggering rise in the number of newly arriving refugees. Net migration is said to be the largest component of population change in Europe (MPI 2003). Minors and adolescents, including unaccompanied refugee children, represent 25% of the total number of refugees who have entered Europe over the last few years (Hebebrand et al 2015, 2). The dramatic increase in the number of refugees creates substantial burden to existing social welfare mechanisms in Europe.

Likewise, the plight of children with refugee background (CRB), in particular their educational needs, is now emerging as one of the most important factors in shaping migration debates in Europe. It poses uncharted and increasingly challenging questions to policy makers, practitioners and researchers alike. There is a body of evidence to suggest that many CRB are failing to attain a level of education that allows for their successful integration into their respective host communities in Europe.

This has far-fetching implications not only on the rights of CRB but also on the broader objectives of societal harmony, which is the hallmark of open and democratic societies. By taking this challenge as a critical policy issue requiring rapid and targeted response, the paper will discuss contemporary challenges of the right to education of CRB in Europe. Like in many other areas of the “migration crisis” in Europe, knowledge about the issue at hand is limited and fragmented. This signifies the need to promote evidence based research and knowledge construction, a core objective directly linked at least with one of the major discussion themes in the current call for papers.

## **Session 10 - Teaching and learning children's rights in higher education:**

**Noam Peleg - The University of New South Wales, Australia:** *“A New Model for Building Capacity on Implementation and Reporting about Children’s Rights.”*

This paper introduces, and analyses the success and shortcomings of a new capacity building programme for on the implementation and reporting of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that was launched in 2017. The workshop is an initiative of the Diplomacy Training Program (a human rights capacity building organization), the Australian Human Rights Centre (a research centre at UNSW Law) and the National Children’s and Youth Law Centre (a child’s rights NGO).

It is a 2-day intensive training program that aims to build knowledge and understanding of the UNCRC and of the Australian reporting process to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. The workshop combined presentations by leading experts and practitioners in international law and the rights of children with interactive practical sessions. The program was designed to enable government officials and NGOs to build knowledge, skills and networks to engage effectively with the reporting process to the Committee and to relate the CRC to relevant policy and practice in Australia.

It therefore also used the experiences and skills that participants bring as a resource, including facilitating sharing experiences and build collaboration between participants. The workshop introduced the UN Human Rights framework and Treaty Monitoring process; build knowledge on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and its key principles; build knowledge and skills to promote the application and implementation of the CRC in policy, programming, budgeting and monitoring; and promote engagement and collaboration in CRC promotion and reporting. The paper will describe the motivation behind this programme, lessons from its first workshop, plans for follow up activities with NGO and government partners anticipating Australia’s submission to the UNCRC Committee in 2018.

**Francesca Zanatta - University of East London, UK:** *“A right(s) approach to life’ Teaching and learning about children’s rights in Higher Education as transformative experience and sustainable activism both in practice with children and in everyday life.”*

Article 29 of the UNCRC requires duty-bearers to support children ‘for responsible life in a free society (..)’. The urgency of fulfilling these goals appears of great significance in current times, particularly in light of recent events, above others the rise of the far right, the denial of climate change (Boussalis and Coan, 2016) and the refugee crisis. Concerns linked to the current political climate have broaden the public interest on children’s presumed apathy and on the role that education might play in supporting conscious citizenship and social engagement, of children and adults alike (Kirk, 2016) (Gambino, 2016) (Monkovic, 2016).

There is in fact a growing belief that civic education can not only drive social change but also prevent subjugation and disengagement (Pew Research Centre, 2014) (Grover, 2007) (Covell et al., 2011).

Reflecting on my teaching practice in HE, I suggest that the engaging with children’s rights is for students and academics a transformative experience not only influencing their future practice with children, but their everyday lives. In this article, I therefore explore experiences and views on the perceived role and impact of children’s rights education for Early Childhood students and academics. Engaging in participatory methods, this research wishes to create spaces for reflection on the learning experiences and applications deriving from the teaching of this subject in HE.



In my discussion, I suggest that the establishment of right-based, democratic spaces for knowledge, reflection and activism in Education (Livingstone, 2005) (Theocharis, and van Deth, 2016) could ultimately represent a unique opportunity to create meaningful experiences that engage children and adults alike in sustainable activism.

**Raymond Arthur - Northumbria University, UK:** *“Educating policymakers and policy in children’s rights and agency: responding to consensual teenage sexting in England without creating permanent youth criminal records.”*

Currently the law in England and Wales means that young people who engage in consensual teenage sexting are at risk of being charged with child pornography and indecency offences. Child pornography laws do not distinguish consensual teenage sexting from child pornography and exposes both the sender and receiver of youth sexting to the risk of criminal prosecution, classification as a sex offender and a permanent criminal record of youthful sexual exploration and experimentation.

Even where no formal action is taken, any investigation of such behaviour will be recorded on the young person’s criminal record where it may be disclosed in a way which impacts upon the young person’s future access to education, employment, travel and housing.

The response to this paternalistic approach is typically that young people need greater education about the consequences of their behaviour. I will not be arguing that there should be no protection of children in the context of sexting, child exploitation and the creation and distribution of child pornography. Instead I will argue that policy makers and the police need to recognise young people as holders of rights, including rights to sexual citizenship.

Educating policy makers and implementers in a meaningful consideration of children’s rights would allow children’s voices to be heard and valued and empower young people’s agency, including their agency around exploring and expressing their sexuality. Such a rights framework provides a normative lens through which to critically examine and evaluate the benefits or harms of children’s growing access to and provision of digital technologies, thereby identifying where and how policy and practice need to change so as to support children’s rights more effectively.

**Mihai-Bogdan Iovu - Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania:** *“Assessing Students’ Learning in Higher Education: Specificities of the European Master Program in Children’s Rights.”*

**Background:** The traditional approach to teaching and learning in higher education was to use examinations and essays as primary methods of assessing students. Changes in the higher education system have put pressure on faculty to employ different and new assessment methods to evaluate students’ learning outcomes: knowledge and skills.

**Purpose:** This paper has a twofold objective: (1) analyzing students’ involvement in and perceptions about assessment practices employed in a specific postgraduate program and (2) involve students in thinking about their own learning process and its evaluation.

**Methodology:** Students enrolled in a postgraduate program filled questionnaires at the end of the examination period, after being exposed to different assessment practices, but before they received their final grade at the teaching module.

**Results:** Preliminary results showed that although students have been exposed to the same teaching and assessment practices, there is a great diversity and variability in their rating system. Usage of essays had the highest agreement level of usage (44.4%), followed by oral presentations (27.8%). Contrary, the highest disagreement level was noticed for reflective journals (35.3%), multiple choice tests (27.8%) and book/articles review (23.5%). 22.2% of the respondents nominated field placement and presentations as the most useful practices.

**Conclusions:** As evaluation is an important component in higher education, we consider this will make a significant contribution to our current thinking and designing effective practices in higher education programs.

---

## Practical Information:


### Wi-Fi Access


**Wi-Fi network:** guest-unige

1. In order to access to the WiFi network please connect your mobile device to the SSID 'guest-unige';
2. You will be directed to an e-portal, please enter your mobile number and click the "Register" button;
3. You will receive a code via SMS, you need to enter on the next screen and click the "Login" button;
4. If your code is accepted, you will be automatically redirected to the e-University website;
5. Your access code is valid for 6 months, during which you will not need to request a new code.

### Relevant contact information:

@ CREAN email address: [crean@unige.ch](mailto:crean@unige.ch)

 CREAN phone number: Pierre Coquillot +33 6 13 78 27 00  
Elena Patrizi +41 (0) 76 545 08 95

 CREAN website: [www.crean-network.org](http://www.crean-network.org)