



# International Children's Rights Symposium

In Partnership: Policymakers, Practitioners, Academia and Young People

Dr Susan Elsley and Dr Ian Milligan

June 2017



# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	2
Summary.....	3
Welcome to the International Children’s Rights Symposium .....	6
Session 1: The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child .....	9
Session 2: The Development of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children .....	16
Session 3: Moving Forward: Implementing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children .....	20
Session 4: The Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children .....	22
Session 5: The State and their commitment.....	26
Session 6: The Future .....	30
Session 7: Closing remarks .....	32
APPENDIX 1: BIOGRAPHIES OF CONTRIBUTORS.....	34
APPENDIX 2: SYMPOSIUM PROGRAMME .....	38

## Introduction

This is a report of an international symposium on children's rights that took place in June 2017. It was organised by the Centre for Excellence for Looked After Children in Scotland (CELCIS), at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland.\*

The event brought together an unprecedented gathering of participants who share a commitment to shaping the world through promoting children's rights. Participants included those who had worked on the development of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children (UN Guidelines), as well as those currently working on the realisation of children's rights in Scotland, the UK and internationally.

The purpose of the event was to reflect deeply on the progress and successes in realising children's rights thus far, to clarify what must be our focus to address the challenges ahead, and to share these reflections and deliberations with others to 'sense check' our thinking, spurring us on to further progress for children.

This report from the symposium aims to be a record of the conversations from the event in June 2017, as well as a resource for sharpening our focus on children in the future. It will also serve as a steer to inform the development of our national and international strategy and activities at CELCIS, within our newly launched Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures.

*\* The symposium coincided with the launch of the Institute of Inspiring Children's Futures, a joint venture between CELCIS, the Centre for Youth and Criminal Justice (CYCJ) and academics from across the University of Strathclyde, which has a global vision of ensuring children and young people that face adversity have what they need to reach their full potential.*

## Summary

The following summarises the main themes that emerged from the symposium. It does not, however, do justice to the rich ideas and reflections contributed during the day.

### **Sustaining a global community committed to children's rights**

The importance of building and sustaining a global community of children's rights partners and champions emerged as a central theme from the symposium.

### **Effective partnerships support children's rights**

Developing effective partnerships was regarded by symposium contributors as essential to sustaining the long-term work required to develop children's human rights instruments, resources and activities. To be effective, these partnerships had to be cross-sectoral, drawing on the contributions of UN agencies, NGOs, states, experts, providers and children. Political will, sustained commitment and open dialogue were essential to these processes.

### **Developing a global community of children's rights champions**

There is an ever-growing global community of children's rights champions who are active in local communities and at national and regional level. The symposium heard from children's rights practitioners and activists who highlighted the importance of maintaining the connections between rights conversations which are global, regional, national and local. The Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), led by CELCIS and partners, on alternative care provides a positive example of developing and sustaining a commitment to children's rights globally, attracting 5,188 participants from around 172 countries to its first course in 2017.

### **Children's views and voices at the centre of what we do**

Children and young people's views and voices have to be at the heart of discussions and actions on children's rights - in communities, at state level and internationally. In early work on children's rights, children were not engaged in meaningful ways. This has changed with examples of practical and innovative approaches being used by the Committee on the Rights of the Child and at state and community level. However, there is still some way to go to ensure consistent participation by children and specifically child-led problem solving.

### **Supporting peer-to-peer approaches**

Young adults with experience of care emphasised the importance of peer-to-peer approaches for supporting children and young people where their rights needed to be protected and secured. Although children and young people are effective advocates for themselves, they also need access to professional advocacy and support.

## **Commitment to ALL children**

All children need to have their rights supported, regardless of their diverse experiences and circumstances. Participants drew attention to groups of children who do not have a voice and are not consistently engaged in processes. This includes disabled children, unaccompanied refugee and migrant children, children who require support from mental health services and young people in juvenile justice systems.

## **Promoting children's rights internationally, nationally and locally**

Promoting awareness and knowledge of children's rights was seen as a crucial building block in supporting greater commitment to children's rights in communities, states and in society generally.

## **Promoting awareness of children's rights**

Although there is greater awareness of children's rights than ever before, there are significant gaps in knowledge and understanding. More government supported public awareness activities would provide a stronger base for children's rights. This should include community discussions, supported by practitioners, around complex and challenging areas such as children having equal protection from violence (physical punishment) and female genital mutilation/cutting.

## **Education on children's rights for children**

Children and young people should have access to education on human rights in primary and secondary schools. This should take place in an environment that respects human rights. In turn, children should be involved in bringing the CRC alive and helping adults to understand it.

## **Workforce learning and development on children's rights**

The importance of practitioners and professionals - in education, social work, law, health, etc. - being trained in children's rights and having access to ongoing learning opportunities at all points of their careers was strongly endorsed by symposium participants. Inter-professional training on children's rights would bring wider benefits in terms of shared understanding.

## **Embedding the implementation of the CRC**

Ensuring states are fully committed to the implementation of the CRC continues to be a central focus, with an emphasis on using resources which support a child rights approach.

## **Embedding the CRC**

There needs to be progress on the implementation of the CRC so that it is deeply embedded in institutions and legislation, and 'internalised' in the workings of the state. This state commitment requires to be constantly refreshed to take into account changes in circumstances, evolving priorities and new issues as they emerge.

### **Incorporation of the CRC**

Many states include a commitment to CRC principles in their constitutions and legislation. Strategic litigation is increasingly being used to support children's rights. However, if the CRC is not incorporated in domestic law, governments can pick and choose which elements of the CRC they support.

### **Investment in all children**

We need to demonstrate the benefits of a child rights approach to economics which can challenge existing budgets and decision making. There is a need for transparency in how budgets are used. Where there are significant meetings about funding, decision makers should ask children and young people where money and resources should be allocated.

### **Children's rights which need focused attention**

The symposium highlighted areas where more focused attention was required to challenge children's rights failures at a state level. These included: the lack of legal standing for children in child protection cases; the rights of unaccompanied refugee and migrant children; legal aid and justice for young people; equal protection from violence for all children; the rights of disabled children; failures in alternative care including young people leaving care; and appropriate mental health provision for children and young people.

### **'Continue to be bold'**

Finally, the symposium closed with calling on children's rights champions to 'continue to be bold' in working for the realisation of children's rights.

# Welcome to the International Children's Rights Symposium

**Jennifer Davidson, Executive Director and Professor of Practice, Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures, University of Strathclyde**

Jennifer Davidson welcomed participants to the symposium and acknowledged the major contribution of Dr Nigel Cantwell to children's rights.

## Why we are here

Dr Nigel Cantwell is a long-time advocate for children's rights globally and was instrumental in developing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children. Nigel has worked closely with us at CELCIS, here at the University of Strathclyde, on resources related to the implementation on the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children. He was awarded an Honorary Doctorate by the University of Strathclyde this week (June 2017). The opportunity has provided us with the reason to hold this International Symposium on children's rights, bringing together participants from all over the world.

This is an unprecedented gathering. Many of you have played key roles in shaping the world through the promotion of children's rights, and we are so much the better for it. We have participants at the symposium who were actively involved in the development of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children, along with others who are working on the implementation of children's rights here in Scotland, the UK and internationally.

This is an opportunity to reflect candidly and honestly together on the process and successes, as we build on what we know already and explore what we can do next to fully realise children's rights.

## Our work at the University of Strathclyde

The Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures at the University of Strathclyde was launched as part of our week of celebrations and discussions leading up to the symposium.

The work of our centres - the Centre for Excellence for Looked After Children in Scotland (CELCIS) and the Centre for Youth and Criminal Justice (CYCJ) - is focused on implementation and impact. At a national level we function as an intermediary, working with government to inform policy and to ensure that what we are hearing locally from practitioners and children and young people is fed into better policymaking and implementation.

Our centres consider the root causes of what we see are the needs of looked after children, children in need of protection and children who are involved with the criminal justice system. While local, these are also global issues we are struggling with, and we are keen to learn internationally and also contribute where our work can benefit others. We can only do this hand-in-hand in partnership with you and others.

## **Chrissie Gale, International Lead, CELCIS, University of Strathclyde**

Chrissie introduced the international work at CELCIS and its future priorities and partnership work.

### **International work at CELCIS**

The international work at CELCIS has developed substantially over the last five years due to the commitment of our team and other colleagues, partners and supporters.

This collaboration has allowed us to use our learning and knowledge nationally and internationally to better understand and improve experiences, and create more positive outcomes for children and young people. Our work with partners has included a significant contribution to the dissemination and use of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children.

The learning from our international work has enriched our work within Scotland. Our three-year international strategy takes a systems approach to child protection and child care reform. It will continue to be inspired by the following:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
- UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children
- Sustainable Development Goals, in particular Goal 16 and the Indicator 16.2 with their focus on securing the rights of the child

Our future priorities are in varying stages of development, and lie in three key areas:

### **Knowledge development and transfer**

- A global study on foster care
- A longitudinal study evaluating outcomes for children who have experienced alternative care around the world
- Publication and dissemination of research findings

### **Learning and development**

- Expanded delivery of our Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) 'Getting Care Right for All Children: Implementing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children'
- Working in partnership with other academic institutions globally to enhance social work studies and practice

### **Building political will and motivation**

- Working with governments to provide opportunities for global debate with a ministerial conference in 2018 on the implementation of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children

- Working on advocacy programmes and campaigns to change donor practices that perpetuate poor quality alternative care across the world.

### **A commitment to 'doing'**

Young adults with experience as refugees and child migrants joined us at a recent conference in Berlin. One young person said: 'It is wonderful to hear of the passion in the room to make sure children's rights are realised. However, I have been asked to speak at many of these meetings. I would like to know when you are going to do something?'

'I would like to make a commitment that we will continue to listen and discuss and debate with the full and meaningful participation of children, young people and young adults, ensuring we also are committed to the 'doing'.'

Dr Chrissie Gale, International Lead, CELCIS

# Session 1: The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

This session considered the development and implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC).

## **Florence Bruce, Former Director of the Child Abuse Programme, Oak Foundation**

Florence summarised the development of children's rights in the twentieth century and, from an eyewitness perspective, described the development of the CRC in the late 1970s and the 1980s, with a focus on the pivotal influence of the International Year of the Child in 1979.

### **A brief history of children's rights**

In 1924, Eglantyne Jebb drafted the Declaration of Geneva, the first set of principles on children's rights. The Declaration focused mainly on child protection. The 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child was inspired by Jebb and had a set of 10 rights, focusing again on protection, but also including the culture of non-discrimination in which to raise the child and the best interests principle.

In 1978, Poland came forward with its proposal to draft a UN Convention, hoping that it would be adopted in the International Year of the Child (IYC) in 1979. However, there was a consensus to hold back from working on the Polish draft and instead enrich a draft convention based on the learning from the International Year of the Child.

### **What emerged from the International Year of the Child (1979)**

Children's rights were very far from the minds of policymakers before the IYC. The IYC rallied many actors around children's issues, with 140 countries establishing national commissions to spearhead new movements, research and legislation.

The activities became a catalyst for future action with a sharpened and focused debate on children. This unprecedented mobilisation on children's rights was a movement that non-governmental organisations (NGOs) wanted to sustain after the IYC in 1979.

Listening to the voices of children emerged as a theme of concern during the IYC in many countries, as activities were driven bottom up. The acute needs of child labourers and their families were highlighted. The needs of children without parental care, homeless children, street children and abandoned children found new expression and were profiled. However, we were not attentive to issues of gender.

There was a gradual realisation that refugee children needed more than food and blankets. They required their educational and play needs to be met. Psychosocial needs gained currency. The needs of children with disabilities and the importance of children's right to play beyond the boundaries of playgrounds were profiled.

It was the first time that many of these themes were brought to national and international attention. This work led to networks of NGOs contributing in Geneva and New York to the evolving work on the convention. Here in the UK, Childline was formed after the plight of children's needs was raised by Esther Rantzen. There was the first report on sex tourism involving boys in Sri Lanka, as well as reports on child pornography and juvenile justice.

### **Drafting the CRC**

These new activities influenced those who were involved in drafting the convention which took 10 years to write, with one week's work per year. NGOs were influential and, although UNICEF was not involved initially, it became involved later on. There was little engagement with children, a far cry from recent practice.

The International Year of the Child was a moment in time balanced against the ongoing work of the Convention. Generally, there was increased sensitisation on children's rights at national state level, leading to the CRC in 1989.

'It's my firm belief... that changing a nation's culture to be truly child centred can't be imposed by laws alone. It does require broader societal change. It does take time and I understand the impatience of young people.'

Florence Bruce, Former Director of the Child Abuse Programme,  
Oak Foundation

### **Ann Skelton, Director of the Centre for Child Law, University of Pretoria**

Ann recently became a member of the Committee on the CRC. She talked about the achievements of the CRC, focusing on law and litigation, drawing on examples from her own country of South Africa.

### **The achievements of the CRC are many. Specific activities include:**

- Development of 20 General Comments
- Holding 22 days of General Discussion
- 75 sessions of the Committee
- 1000s of meetings
- Pre-sessions, involvement of NGOs Child Rights Connect and UNICEF
- 3 Optional Protocols
- Development of new working methods (2 chambers)
- Webcasts with live streaming which can involve children

Many of these are happening in other treaty bodies as well. What is different in relation to the CRC is the nature of child participation. The Committee is trying to make an effort to promote direct participation to influence its deliberations. Children and young people are now involved in pre-sessions, sessions and days of General Discussion. It is now quite common that children are involved.

### **Demonstrable effect on law and policy**

One major achievement of the CRC is the development of child rights laws in states. A UNICEF study showed seventy countries now have dedicated children's rights laws to come in line with the CRC. Many modern constitutions, including South Africa, now contain a child rights section, drawn from the CRC.

There is almost universal ratification with 196 countries having ratified the convention, with the USA as an important exception. Some would argue that this level of ratification makes the CRC international common law, in other words, something that is binding.

### **Example of South Africa**

The South African Constitution contains children's rights provisions. Section 28 (1) of the South African Constitution states that "Every child has the right to family care or parental care, or appropriate alternative care when removed from the family environment".

'Strategic litigation' is being used to advance children's rights in South Africa. The following are two examples of case law where the rights of children to family or parental care were deemed to have greater authority than other laws:

1. Where the parent is imprisoned after a trial and children were at risk of being placed in care. Section 28 should be seen as responding in an expansive way to international commitments and to take into account the best interests of the child.
2. Where a child had been separated from parents after the parents were found guilty of begging at the side of the road. This led to a change in legislation which required that there be a very quick (24 hours) review of separation where a child is removed by force. Again, the Convention was influential, particularly around participation rights.

The CRC used in litigation can be very powerful at the domestic level. Strategic litigation is being used more and more across the world. It does require independent judges and a good constitution, but many more countries have that now.

'Words that are catalysts for action are powerful. And we can see the words of the Convention trickling down onto the words of the judgement which must then trickle down into the lives of children.'

Ann Skelton, Director of the Centre for Child Law, University of Pretoria

## **Jaap Doek, Chairperson, Supervisory Board of Child Helpline International**

Jaap drew on his experience to explore the challenges and limitations in securing children's rights for those children and young people in conflict with the law, and those who experience child protection procedures.

### **Introduction**

When children are allegedly in conflict with the law, the CRC provides them with procedural guarantees and safeguards. These include: the right to be promptly informed about the allegations and charges against them; the right to have legal or other appropriate assistance and to have the matter determined without delay; the right to appeal the decision in the first instance; and the free assistance of an interpreter. Throughout the process the child's privacy should be fully respected (article 40 CRC; Beijing Rules).

In the case of the deprivation of liberty, the child has the right to prompt access to legal and other appropriate assistance, and the right to challenge the legality of the deprivation of liberty before a court or other competent authority (article 37 under (d)). One of the reasons for this elaborate set of guarantees is that the child in conflict with the law is facing powerful state authorities (police, prosecutor and court). To establish a certain degree of equalities of arms, the child must be provided with these guarantees.

### **The child in child protection procedures**

Traditionally, child protection procedures are procedures against the parents initiated by a child protection service or a similar body. That service/body is mandated by law to undertake such action. It is an intervention by the State (represented by the service/body) in the family life and privacy of parents. They are facing an experienced service/body supported often by a variety of professionals and their reports. The principle of equality of arms is often buried by the claim that the process is in the best interests of the child.

The child has no legal standing in child protection procedures, although she/he has rights, inter alia the right to be cared for by her/his parent(s), the right to privacy and the right not to be deprived of liberty unless necessary. The child is undoubtedly an important stakeholder in the process. This is recognised in the CRC in article 12: the child has the right to express her/his views which should be taken into account in accordance with age and maturity (see also article 9, para 2).

The bottom line is that the degree of the participation of the child depends on the judgement of adults. This does not provide equality for the child in a process in which the child is facing a powerful state agency asking for a measure(s) that will affect her/his rights with respect to family life. The child has the right to be protected against unlawful or arbitrary interference in her/his privacy and family life (article 16).

The CRC fails to provide the child with the tools necessary for this protection; the CRC Committee should address this failure by drafting a General Comment on the procedural rights of children in civil law proceedings in areas such as child protection, custody and child-parent contact procedures. The child should have the right to:

- legal or other appropriate assistance throughout the process to ensure a fair hearing according to law;
- prompt and direct information on the process and on the purpose of it;
- have the decision reviewed by a higher competent, independent and impartial authority or judicial body, which includes challenging the legality of a deprivation of liberty;
- free assistance of an interpreter if the child cannot understand or speak the language used (e.g. asylum-seeking children);
- have her/his privacy fully respected at all stages of the proceedings.

The panel posed the following critical question:

**Session 1 Critical Question and open discussion - What are the three most important things that need to happen to ensure implementation of the CRC at national level?**

Summary of participants' comments:

**Public awareness**

- There should be public awareness campaigns about children's rights that are child-led and supported by government. Children and young people should be involved in bringing the CRC alive and helping adults to understand it.
- Education on children's rights should be mandatory in the school curriculum and be part of the daily life of schools at both primary and secondary level.
- Rights should be taught in school in an environment where they can be experienced on a daily, routine basis, in an atmosphere that respects rights.
- There should be better understanding of family and community-led processes for social change.
- Education about rights should be at community as well as state level, especially in relation to local custom and practice, e.g. physical punishment and FGM/cutting. Local professionals should be involved in this process.
- There is a need for research into community experiences of challenging customs and seeking positive social change.
- There should be wider recognition of children's capacity to be their best advocates, with support for their right to speak for themselves. Specifically, the right to independent professional advocacy for looked after children should be available across all parts of Scotland, along with legal aid for children.
- There is a need for media stories which give positive messages and are relatable to everyday life.

## Training and professional development

- We need to train today's professionals in the CRC, not just future ones. There should be ongoing training for a new generation of social workers, especially where there are gaps in country provision.
- Professional training should be undertaken jointly, so there is the possibility of shared understandings of rights. Unless we start adapting the curricula for, for example, social work, law, teaching and nursery workers, so that professionals learn about the CRC together, we will continue to have problems with achieving shared understandings.
- On the other hand, training within individual professional groups (for example, social workers and lawyers) is also necessary to allow for specific professional learning.
- Professionals need to work together. There is often a lack of co-ordination between different institutions locally and nationally.

## Political will

- It essential to incorporate the CRC into domestic law. If it is not binding in domestic law, governments can pick and choose which rights to support.
- Legal aid and justice for young people is an opportunity to enforce their rights.
- We need to recognise that there are conservative and reactionary forces which are pushing back against universal human rights.
- There is a gap between fine words and legislation and how it takes place in practice. We need to identify strengths and move into areas where children's rights implementation can be improved.

## Implementation of the CRC

- There is a need to explore evidence of implementation - what do individuals do and say differently in their day-to-day engagement?
- We need to demonstrate the benefits of a child rights approach to economics which can challenge existing budgets and decision making.
- Political will has to translate into the maximum extent of available resources. The Committee on the Rights of the Child's General Comment No. 19, on public budgeting for the realisation of children's rights (article 4), can be used at local and national level.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Committee on the Rights of the Child (2016) General Comment No. 19 on public budgeting for the realisation of children's rights

[http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?TreatyID=5&DocTypeID=11](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?TreatyID=5&DocTypeID=11)

'Let's continue to be bold and build on the all good stuff happening out there.'

Florence Bruce, Former Director of the Child Abuse Programme,  
Oak Foundation

## Session 2: The Development of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children

This session described how the UN Guidelines came to be, and how various provisions of the UN Guidelines came into existence. Alexander Yuster, Nigel Cantwell and Murillo Vieira Komniski drew on their own experience of being involved in the process of developing the UN Guidelines.

### **Nigel Cantwell, International Consultant**

Our discussion today does not look at the content of the Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children, but focuses on how we developed them.

The CRC is a binding instrument ratified by states, whereas the Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children is not a binding instrument. I had the privilege and pleasure to work on both, and on the 1993 Hague Convention which is a private international law instrument.

### **Alexander Yuster, Associate Director, Programme Division, Section Chief, Social Inclusion and Policy, UNICEF**

When I started working on implementing national standards on juvenile justice and alternative care in 2003, there were standards on juvenile justice but there was very little on alternative care. The idea started to develop about whether there was a need to create international standards.

This was given added impetus by an international conference in Stockholm in 2003 on alternative care. The declaration that came out of this conference asked governments to strengthen the legislative framework for public care and to adopt standards for alternative care.<sup>2</sup>

In December 2003, Nigel Cantwell developed the initial ideas for standards for alternative care. We then developed advocacy documents to convince others of the importance of doing this. These documents covered HIV, children in emergencies and kinship care. In order to take this forward, we looked to working with others, including with the Committee on the Rights of the Child.

We decided the best approach was to develop 'guidelines' rather than 'standards' as the CRC supersedes anything that could be called 'standards', whereas 'guidelines' suggest that they are there to support implementation. After a day of General Discussion held by the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the government of Brazil came forward to say

---

<sup>2</sup> Stockholm Declaration on Children and Residential Care (2003)

<http://www.bettercarenetwork.org/library/the-continuum-of-care/residential-care/stockholm-declaration-on-children-and-residential-care>

that they were interested in taking this forward. We now had a governmental champion and an NGO committee was formed in 2005.

**Murillo Vieira Komniski, Advisor to the Director, Brazilian Cooperation Agency, Ministry of External Relations, Brazil**

Three factors led to the approval of the Guidelines:

- political will
- the historic momentum in civil society for the need for Guidelines
- people working together from government, NGOs, civil society, experts and the UN system.

Representatives from Brazil visited the Committee of the CRC in October 2005. We offered to champion the issue of alternative care within the UN human rights system and held a stakeholder seminar in Brazil. Subsequently, I was posted in Geneva to the human rights desk for the Brazil mission to the UN.

From 2007, we engaged in maintaining a multi-sectoral process involving 14 countries and other stakeholders. We kept the process going, negotiating the 172 paragraphs of the Guidelines with the UN Human Rights Council. The Guidelines were presented to the Human Rights Council and then got approval at the UN General Assembly in December 2009, making use of the symbol of the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the CRC.

Brazil emerged as a 'bridge builder', a new role, during this process. The multi-stakeholder approach was important, with organisations and partners working in hand-in-hand.

**General points raised by the panel about the development of the UN Guidelines**

**Young people's participation**

Young people participated in the development of the UN Guidelines. SOS, the international NGO, brought together a small group of young people who, in turn, consulted more young people in their own countries and engaged others more widely during the drafting process.

The young people made significant contributions, including an unexpected one in relation to restraints in care. The adult contributors wanted to include a complete prohibition on restraint. However, young people advocated for the limited use of restraints carried out with safeguards in a rights-protecting way. This position was therefore included in the final UN Guidelines and was an area we might not, as adults, have dared to put in this way.

## Prevention

When talking about alternative care, we focus on what happens when we are in the system rather than before. One of the impacts of the intergovernmental process of negotiation was a message from governments themselves that they wanted an emphasis on prevention in the UN Guidelines. There was a firm commitment to have alternative care set in the context of child rights and child welfare.

## Abandonment

We considered whether to include a reference to safe, anonymous abandonment but, in the end, we left this out.

## Guardianship

There was a significant issue about the legal responsibility of guardians. The specific problem is that guardianship is used in different ways around the world. Guardianship can be used as a type of foster care, it can be a symbolic position, and it can also be carried out by an authority as opposed to an individual person. 'Guardianship' is therefore not used as a term in the UN Guidelines, although the concept of legal responsibility for the child is included.

## Children across borders

Governments should not be detaining children because they have crossed a border, but they do. This was therefore included in the UN Guidelines.

## Residential care

Young people were very clear that there was a place for appropriate residential care as not all young people want to be placed in a family. There was a clear distinction made between institutions and residential care as small group, family-like provision.

## Religion

A number of countries raised issues about religion and 'diversity in religion'. This was one of the major controversial issues.

## Poverty

The UN Guidelines have had a wider impact beyond the area of alternative care, e.g. adoption. We have the first mention in the UN Guidelines that poverty alone should never be the sole reason for removing a child from his or her own family. That is a principle that has wide implications in the field of child protection.

The panel posed the following critical question:

**Session 2 Critical Question by the speakers - Do you see any differences in progress made between juvenile justice and alternative care, recognising that juvenile justice standards have been in place since the 1980s and the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children since 2009?**

Summary of participants' discussion:

### **Implementation in alternative care and juvenile justice**

- Firstly, there was a challenge about the lack of black people's participation in the seminar.
- The influence of political will, personalities and the power of negotiation are at play in each jurisdiction.
- We are seeing a lack of confidence in democracy, especially among the young.
- The CRC might be an important way of re-engaging trust and building democratic participation and trust. The CRC can enable civil society, governments and NGOs, and be a focus of constructive pressure on governments. There is a need for synergy between political will and grassroots participation.
- There is always a place for 'positive pressure' and 'creative tension' between governments, academics/experts, NGOs, etc.

### **Alternative care and juvenile justice**

- There is a bigger range of 'vested interests' in alternative care than in juvenile justice (e.g. donors, employees, service providers, adoption agencies and faith based organisations).
- It is easier to discuss juvenile justice focusing on state security, judicial systems and protecting society, than to build an alliance in alternative care.
- Although juvenile justice standards were established more than 30 years ago, there has not been significant success in implementation. There are links between the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children and juvenile justice standards.
- Measurement around juvenile justice is difficult because of different systems.
- The UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children have been very well promoted because they were owned and promoted by many NGOs, and there has been consideration of implementation.

### **Children's rights in care**

- Unaccompanied minors are isolated and there are wider issues that need to be tackled.
- There can be contradictions. In Scotland, the Government is only now looking at raising the age of criminal responsibility, in spite of longstanding positive steps to remove the distinction in the Children's Hearings System between children who need care and those who offend.
- Issues around mental health are resonant and important to take account of.
- In England, children with learning difficulties are often inappropriately placed within psychiatric facilities. Resources should follow the needs of the child.
- Children are being sent from care settings to juvenile justice or mental health institutions in some countries. Care is improving but those most in need are being displaced.

# Session 3: Moving Forward: Implementing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children

**Mia Dambach, Director of International Reference Centre and Co-ordinator of Advocacy and Policy Development, International Social Service**

**Chrissie Gale, International Lead, CELCIS**

This session highlighted tools and responses being developed in order to promote the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children.

Following the introduction of the UN Guidelines, international NGOs wanted to develop tools which could change frontline practice and support those responsible for implementation. We therefore developed the following projects to increase knowledge and use of the UN Guidelines:

- An implementation handbook (Moving Forward) and a monitoring tool (Tracking Progress).
- A Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) 'Getting Care Right for All Children: Implementing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children. This is a free online training and education tool available globally to promote knowledge, understanding and dialogue among front-line workers.

## [Moving Forward: an implementation handbook on the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children](#)

CELCIS worked with international NGOs to develop the implementation handbook Moving Forward.<sup>3</sup> This is the first time we consolidated thinking about the UN Guidelines using promising practice, policy questions, terminology and analysis of key concepts such as best interests.

## [Tracking Progress: measuring the implementation of the UN Guidelines](#)

Following on from the implementation handbook, we have developed Tracking Progress. Tracking Progress is an international tool that can be used to measure the implementation of the UN Guidelines, with the same stakeholders, led by the Better Care Network and Save the Children. This will be launched in 2017/18.

---

<sup>3</sup> Moving Forward: Implementing the Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children  
<http://www.alternativecareguidelines.org/MovingForward/tabid/2798/language/en-GB/Default.aspx>

## [Massive Open Online Course \(MOOC\) on the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children](#)

CELCIS recently completed the first run of a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) based on the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children. <sup>4</sup> This will run four more times. Over 5,188 joint learners from 172 countries finished the first course. The course encourages participants to think about how they are undertaking their work, includes contributions about young people's experiences and facilitates shared learning through conversations across the world.

### **Other activities**

There are a number of other activities that international NGOs are undertaking in support of the implementation of the UN Guidelines:

- [De-institutionalisation campaigns in Eastern Europe and Central America for children aged 0-3 years](#)
- [Childonomics project \(Eurochild\) which gives an economic argument for investing in children in alternative care](#)
- A project led by several funding foundations which is considering how money enters a country from foundations and from individuals
- [Better Volunteering, Better Care campaign which is being spearheaded by Better Care Network](#)

---

<sup>4</sup> Getting Care Right for All Children: Implementing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children <http://www.alternativecaremooc.com/index.php/en/>

## **Session 4: The Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children**

**Susan Bissell, Director, Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children**

Susan talked about the focus of the Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children and its developing work with Pathfinder countries.

### **Introduction to End Violence**

A year ago, we launched End Violence. Alongside the World Health Organisation (WHO) we also launched INSPIRE – a package of evidence-based strategies to prevent and respond to violence against children. The podium at the launch was crowded, young people on the podium flanking the then Secretary General. UNICEF's Executive Director, the President of the General Assembly and a parade of Ministers and Ambassadors also took the podium. It was a heady day, full of hope – we announced our intention to change the world for children, keep them all safe and secure, no matter where they are or who they are.

We got there through a stealthy series of conversations, consultations and meetings across regions, languages, cultures and demographics. For those organisations and individuals that supported that process – one that even consulted children and young people – I am enormously grateful, for it is easier to sit in a room with a few people and produce a partnership on paper than it is to spend the time and lay the solid foundation required to sustain something.

### **About End Violence**

End Violence grew out of deliberations over the new sustainable development goals (SDGs), also called Agenda 2030. This was a participatory process that took over 4 years. This agenda refers to children and violence, exploitation, abuse, neglect, trafficking, torture, child marriage, child labour and FGM/Cutting.

We have three ambitious goals with End Violence: building and sustaining political will; accelerating action, including increasing resource allocation; and strengthening collaboration. The associated trust fund is intended to support the second goal of accelerating action or, in my own words, 'making stuff happen for children'. There are three 'windows' in this fund: ending violence online; ending violence in the everyday lives of children within their families, schools and communities; and ending violence where children are escaping conflict and crisis.

### **Who is End Violence?**

End Violence has six stakeholder groups: governments, civil society, the private sector, academics and researchers, the UN where present, and children and young people. In an individual country all of these groups ARE End Violence. We ask them to work together, implementing some version of INSPIRE, depending on the context and the types of

violence children are experiencing. We have consulted children and young people on strategy so that we have a solid foundation.

The government in a country is the key interlocutor with the End Violence Secretariat and its governing bodies. Where that government is prepared to step up on the international stage, adopt Agenda 2030 and the End Violence strategy, we call that a 'pathfinding' country. Pathfinding is the highest level of commitment to End Violence, evidenced in the detailed planning, implementation, financing and monitoring of a plan of action. Ideally, we want every government to sign up to End Violence, and we want the pathfinding process to eventually turn into everyday business, everywhere.

### **Where we are now**

Our 13 Pathfinding governments are deep in action, in many cases building on work that came before End Violence. The Secretariat and partners are in discussion with an additional 10 countries that are supportive.

We have joined hands with other partnerships like Alliance 8.7 (focusing on child slavery, child labour and trafficking) and Together for Girls. The Secretariat is working with two regional bodies in South Asia and in Africa to encourage more pathfinding, and move the locus of support from New York and Geneva to regions. In addition, we convened leaders in the private sector at the World Economic Forum in January 2017. We are keen to bring business and the children's rights and business principles into full force in End Violence. Indeed, corporate leaders in tech, finance, manufacturing, and travel and tourism in particular can play significant roles to keep the world's children safe from harm.

End Violence has developed a theory of change, a business plan, the basis of a results framework, and a Secretariat operations budget and work plan. There is also a robust results framework for the associated trust fund. Our proposition is that investment in the fund will result in positive change at individual, family and societal levels. Measurement of that success will become a sort of virtuous cycle and more resources will be made available, both for the fund but also from national sources.

The development of End Violence has not been cost neutral – neither financially nor in terms of the input of pure grit. A small number of private financiers have stepped up, as have a few governments, civil society, UNICEF, WHO and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). We are especially grateful to the UK Government for placing trust in End Violence, making the initial GBP 40 million contribution to the associated fund that went live in December 2017. Our ambition is to grow this fund to 1 billion USD – 1 dollar per child who experienced violence last year. Funding is our biggest 'risk' of not succeeding, in my view.

### **Conclusion**

The End Violence value proposition stems from the notion that together we are an irresistible force for change. Justice working with social welfare, health and education, public and private actors side-by-side, and children and young people involved and

engaged. What I really believe is that we are too big to fail; too much has been done and invested in to stop; we cannot give an historic opportunity a miss.

In February 2018, we will gather for our first Solutions Summit in Stockholm. Pathfinders and partners will talk about what is working, and what is not. We will hear from children and young people about their experience of violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation, and about the role they are playing in prevention. The private sector, in particular the tech industry, is already involved in planning, and we are joining with the WePROTECT Global Alliance, focused on ending online sexual violence. We look forward to welcoming you there.

'Let's make stuff happen for children'.

Susan Bissell, Director, Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children

Susan Bissell posed the following critical question:

#### **Session 4 Critical Question - "What will you do?"**

Summary of participants' comments:

#### **End Violence**

- Physical punishment and equal protection under the law is part of the discussion in End Violence, with a focus on positive parenting, and supporting families and care givers with disabilities.
- Scotland is moving towards banning physical punishment in the home. The Government is focusing on developing behavioural interventions, such as resources, for parents and carers.
- Disabled children need to have their voices heard. There is a need to make alliances with the disability movement.
- Violence is present in care settings and needs to be addressed.
- The vulnerability of boys is a major issue. It includes violence against each other, sexual violence at an early age, and the position of boys in society. There is a challenge in maintaining a focus on boys and we need data and evidence.
- Violence does not exist in isolation, so we need to focus not solely on violence towards children but violence generally. There is a link between violence against adults and violence against children. The difference is that children as a group do not have a voice.
- Social welfare systems are devalued and undermined across the world.

#### **Contributing to End Violence**

- We need to explore mechanisms about how international rights instruments can be translated into a nationally owned pathfinder approach. This also needs to be linked with community led approaches.

- We need civil society representatives in each country, so that civil society can contribute to End Violence.
- There is a need for broader debate about how to better measure SDGs. Many countries engage in the reporting process about how they are achieving SDGs, but still do not have the common ground of shared indicators.
- We need child-led solutions to contribute to End Violence.
- We need to explore mechanisms about how international instruments on rights can be translated into a nationally owned pathfinder approach.

# Session 5: The State and their commitment

## **Bruce Adamson, Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland**

Bruce is the new Children and Young People's Commissioner for Scotland, and he talked about the role of the Commissioner and its relation to the CRC.

### **Progress on human rights**

We need to celebrate how far we have come in children's rights, but also need to make commitments about what we are going to do in the future. Earlier this week was the 72<sup>nd</sup> signing of the charter for human rights, when we reaffirm our faith in human rights.

In 1993, the General Assembly adopted the Paris Principles. The Committee on the Rights of the Child adopted separate principles for children's commissioners. This was needed for children because children's developmental state makes them particularly vulnerable and their opinions are rarely taken into account. Children do not have democratic or economic power and therefore struggle to have a meaningful role in the political process. They have significant problems in accessing judicial systems, and in accessing remedies and accountability. Children, therefore, need children's champions and national protectors.

### **Children and Young People's Commissioner in Scotland**

It is important to understand that the Children and Young People's Commissioner in Scotland is not part of government. Successive Scottish Governments have made children's rights a priority, but there is a real challenge in turning rhetoric into action. For example, we do not yet have a National Action Plan on the Rights of Children. As the new Commissioner, I am discussing with government my role in holding them to account.

We are having frank discussions about equal protection and the minimum age of criminal responsibility, where Scotland is shamed by not even meeting international minimum standards.

I can instigate investigations, meet with Ministers and report to Parliament. These are powers that can help make a change, and I need to work with the media and with civil society. A core part of the role of the Commissioner is not to take away power from the authorities, but to work with them and to put children at the centre of decision making.

The Scottish Parliament is a human rights guarantor. One way to do this is to engage children and young people, recognising that they deserve democratic representation even though they do not vote. MSPs need to be accountable.

There is good practice in Scotland. Recently, for example, I learned of the partnership work of the Children's Parliament and the City of Edinburgh Council, ensuring children are at the heart of children's services planning. I am looking forward to working with the Public Service Ombudsman and the inspectorates to put children's rights at the heart of standards.

In Scotland we have a vibrant and diverse civil society and world-leading academics. My job is to work in partnership and support your work with children and young people. It is a bridging role between the international rights framework and the domestic role, and between civil society and government. But always at the heart of this work are children, their voices and experiences.

### **Human rights and Scotland**

The CRC is special. It changed the way we think about children: that children are human beings with distinct sets of rights, not just passive objects of care and charity.

What struck me from looking at the open learning course on alternative care run by CELCIS was the use of the word 'love' by participants and other professionals. That is what has struck me about the value of the CRC. It actually takes a different approach to international law.

But, it is not only my duty to make sure I promote children's rights: it is a state duty to ensure that human rights education is undertaken. My job is to hold them accountable to that and help them on the way. We need to make sure that human rights are built into the education curriculum, into professional registrations and the way in which inspection works.

Incorporation of the CRC is absolutely key. It is about incorporation and justiciability, but it is also about culture change. We need to make a business case for children's rights and early intervention, leading to better outcomes, better satisfaction and more efficient services. Unless we make the economic argument, things won't get done.

I am building on work that has already been done. The Concluding Observations on the UK came out in 2016. The third cycle of the Universal Periodic Review is due to be adopted at the Human Rights Council in September 2017. There is a human rights road map already. Equal protection for children and the age of criminal responsibility are urgent areas to work on in Scotland.

My main focus is to get children's voices embedded in practice. We are looking worldwide at what other organisations are doing and some of this emerging practice is exciting. We have good practice to build on in Scotland. The recent Scottish Cabinet meeting with children and young people should be the norm.

### **Rosemary McCreery, Former Head of UNICEF Russia and Belarus**

Rosemary worked with UN agencies for 30 years, she is now retired and volunteers with Trociare in Ireland. She brings two perspectives on a commitment to the CRC, as an ex UN staff member and as a concerned citizen from Ireland.

## **The State and the CRC**

In the early days of the CRC we focused on ratification. This has been achieved. However, on the whole, the CRC has not been 'internalised' by states. The challenge is, therefore, to ensure that it is internalised without being 'swallowed'.

The ratification of the CRC itself is not enough. Instead, there needs to be a constant refresh of the state commitment to the CRC as circumstances change, new issues emerge, and other priorities intrude on the commitment to child rights.

There still is, particularly in some low-income countries, a perceived contraction, which I would argue is not a genuine one, between a 'basic needs approach' (health, education, clean water, nutrition and sanitation) and the child rights agenda. Part of our task, therefore, is to get the child rights agenda identified as a basic need, which underlies all other basic needs.

The lack of capacity on all fronts, often mentioned in this symposium, is a real limitation in many countries. This includes areas such as developing the legislation to domesticate the CRC, and following that through with standards, procedures, rules and regulations. These are often left hanging. But you cannot implement the CRC without a regulatory framework. More particularly, the issue of monitoring what is happening is often left to the next stage. However, if you do not monitor you cannot learn from it.

Budgetary constraints are present in every country in the world and that is partly influenced by the absence of 'childonomics', the benefits of investing in children. There is still a long way to go in states costing plans of action and committing themselves to budgets.

These budgetary constraints have led to a shortage of trained personnel, including social workers. In many countries across the world there is not an understanding of the real role of social work, and a resistance to employing social workers. There is also a resistance in many countries to the role of NGOs and civil society as full partners in implementing the CRC. They are critical to the multi-stakeholder approach, and are 'the salt in the CRC soup'.

## **A non-specialist point of view**

I would like to turn to Ireland to give you a few perspectives from a non-specialist point of view. Ireland is a small, wealthy country, with a population that is largely homogeneous. We might suppose there is a high awareness of child rights as a result of our history of child abuse that is still unfolding. It is also kept up to the mark on standards in the EU relating to children. All of these conditions should be favourable for the implementation of the child rights agenda, but they are not sufficient.

There has been significant progress in areas such as education, child welfare and protection; one recent achievement was the recognition of children's rights in the constitution. But, I want to point to a few significant shortcomings in several key child

protection areas. Some of these have been mentioned in the context of Scottish experiences, which is reassuring:

- Mental health services for children, in terms of prevention and responses, are completely inadequate.
- We are dealing, like every country in Europe, with acute issues in relation to migrants and asylum seekers. We are not dealing properly with children coming to us as migrants and asylum seekers – nor with their parents. We will look back on this in 20 years as a period of abuse comparable to that of institutional abuse.
- There have been particular failures in the provision of alternative care, such as monitoring conditions of children in foster care.
- The media is good at instant outrage, but there is a lack of structured and sustained media analysis in ways which mobilise the necessary political and personal ways to resolve problems.
- The lack of resources leads to major gaps in the provision of services at the level of recruitment and retention of professionals.

'How will we construct an agenda that we will be proud of twenty years from now? The price of this is eternal vigilance - we can't afford to let our attention slip from the principles of the convention'.

Rosemary McCreery, Former Head of UNICEF Russia and Belarus

## Session 6: The Future

### Care experienced young adults and University of Strathclyde social work students

Artūrs Pokšāns, Raquel Lopez Alvarez, Rosie Moore, Fouzi Mathey Kikadidi, Edith Wycherley, Ariana Zane

Young adults with experience of care from across Europe led this session, along with University of Strathclyde social work students. They identified ideas for the future of alternative care, drawing on symposium discussions.

The following are ideas that we heard today that we think are the most important. Firstly, we would like to acknowledge the importance of words and highlight Ann Skelton's statement:

'Words are important as they are catalysts for actions'

#### **Educating professionals on children's rights - *some ideas:***

We believe that there should be education about children's rights at all levels.

There should be mandatory training for student teachers (and those already in practice) about the care system – the processes, the experiences of children and what is 'promising practice'. This should become standard in teacher training and a mandatory part of becoming qualified.

#### **Advocacy for ALL children - *some ideas:***

Some children lack an understanding of their home environment. This can have an impact on how children experience education in their present lives, as well as in the future. We think that different approaches can be taken, including:

- Creating peer-led organisations to provide support, training, welfare support and housing accommodation for young people leaving care, with national representation.
- Ensuring there is advocacy to ensure that siblings are not placed in different places.

#### **Diversity**

It should be recognised that children are a large and diverse group. This needs to be stressed repeatedly. They are ethnically and nationally diverse. They can be in care, in the juvenile detention system or in mental care institutions. A case-by-case approach should take account of the need for different approaches for different children.

### **Investment in ALL children - *some ideas:***

There is a need for transparency in how budgets are used - not necessarily how much money is given, but how it is used. Where there are significant meetings about funding, decision makers should ask young people where money and resources should be allocated.

Young people are very insightful and often know more about their communities, the problems they face and the rights they are lacking. Young people are a great resource to use when it comes to decision making on funding and budgets.

### **Creative tension - *some ideas:***

The resources that were highlighted in the symposium are positive ways to approach the UN Guidelines: interactive, fun and efficient.

We need more preventive programmes on alternative care including how they change or help families.

It is important to include all kinds of children. A major unrepresented group is children in the judicial system and children viewed as being 'difficult'.

The CRC does not specifically protect unaccompanied children. There is little known about unaccompanied children. There is a gap in expertise about how to work with unaccompanied children in a way that meets their needs, and incorporates their experiences into UN Guidelines for practitioners.

Unaccompanied children who are age assessed fall through protective nets. In France, in Paris particularly, young adults who are no longer children cannot work and do not have official papers. No one is addressing that problem.

## Session 7: Closing remarks

### **Nigel Cantwell, International Consultant**

The message from today is the importance of the cooperation and partnership required to get things done. But, also, the amount of preparation that is needed by partners and the way in which this cooperation is undertaken. Community and societal preparation is essential and has to use awareness raising and other approaches to ensure a common basis for cooperation. Then structures and mechanisms for that cooperation have to be put in place. Planning is absolutely vital.

Ann (Skelton) said today that words can be a 'catalyst for action'. Yesterday, when receiving my honorary doctorate, I said that 'action is shaped by words'.

What we heard today was precisely the kind of words that we need to hear. It's not the hot air words that we hear in a vacuum; it's the words that can precisely move us to take action and should be duplicated in various fora.

This brings me to the idea of 'children' as an encompassing category. I have always felt unhappy that everybody under the age of 18 has to be called a 'child' because we have the CRC. The Convention does not say that everybody under the age of 18 is a child - the Convention says that when you see the word 'child' it means someone under 18. Everybody under 18 does not need to be regarded as a child.

Prevention was highlighted. It seems to me that the best advocates are young people. That is not to say that adults do not have a role if young people are able to articulate their collective views. It would be a compelling argument, in terms of budget allocation, if young people with experience of care could formulate what they wanted when care was being considered, and compare that with what they actually got.

Sometimes, we forget the diverse groups of children that the Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children are trying to cater for – such as those with mental health problems, with disabilities, those who are stigmatised or seen as 'difficult', and unaccompanied children and young people. We need to take account of the diversity of situations of children, their life experiences and different contexts (such as, access to social workers). This is an immense task and means localising analysis of how we do things. In addition, we need to ensure that care responses are individualised, to the extent that they can take into account the situations, needs, characteristics and wishes of the individual child.

### **Jennifer Davidson, Executive Director and Professor of Practice, Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures, University of Strathclyde**

This has been a day of crossing boundaries - internationally, nationally, regionally and locally. It has crossed disciplines, not focusing solely on social work or education. We have considered the different circumstances, groups and needs of children. We have also

crossed boundaries in coming together from different parts of the world, and bringing diverse experiences to achieve more together.

Some big questions remain:

- What about unaccompanied minors and care-leavers in Scotland?
- Meaningful data is important. How are we collecting data that is meaningful and can help us move forward and take us to the next level?
- What does realising children's rights look like in our day-to-day practice in our interactions with a child? How can we link this to the developmental needs of young children?

We have talked about alignment and the importance of collaboration. In Scotland, we have been actively focusing on taking international standards into our national reality, and connecting with more strength to the international context. This is all important.

And finally, a mantra that has emerged from the day that we want to keep with us. '**We need to continue to be bold**'.

Together, let us boldly take today's challenges forward, propelling us towards the important work that lies ahead.

## APPENDIX 1: BIOGRAPHIES OF CONTRIBUTORS

**Bruce Adamson** is the Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland. Originally from New Zealand, he is a lawyer with over 20 years of experience in children's rights. He is a former Chair of the Scottish Child Law Centre and previously was legal officer at the Scottish Human Rights Commission. In 2013, he was the United Nations Representative for the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions. He has acted as an international expert for the Council of Europe, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and worked in emerging democracies in the Western Balkans and Ukraine. He has been a member of international projects on the reform of the European Court of Human Rights and on the role of national parliaments and human rights.

**Raquel López Álvarez** is from Tenerife, Spain. She is an activist and advocate for improved support for care-leavers and has participated in several European projects. She is involved in mentoring young care-leavers in her local community. She has an MBA, and a postgraduate qualification in high school training and labour counselling. She is the co-founder of a graphic arts social enterprise, operating a co-working space and graphic design workshop.

**Susan Bissell** is currently acting Director of a new global partnership and fund focused on the safety of children around the world, called End Violence. She is a career professional in the protection of children, having served with UNICEF in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India, and in the research centre in Florence, Italy, as well as in the New York headquarters. Susan holds a doctorate in public health and medical anthropology. She is married, has a daughter, and aspires to have a standard poodle in early retirement.

**Florence Bruce** was Director of Programmes in the International Catholic Child Bureau (ICCB) in Geneva, where she managed international programmes in the 1980s and 1990s on street children, sexual exploitation of children, psychosocial needs of refugee children, and children deprived of their liberty. She was also ICCB's Permanent Representative to the human rights bodies in Geneva, and to UNICEF, where she was active in several policy fora – the UN CRC and the NGO Group for CRC, discussions on child labour and sexual exploitation, and NGO relations with UNICEF. She was on the organising committee for the First World Congress against the Sexual Exploitation of Children, Stockholm, 1996. In 1998, Florence moved to Oak Foundation to lead its global grant-making programme against child abuse. She recently stepped down from this role after 18 years to take stock and reflect.

**Nigel Cantwell** is a Geneva-based international consultant on child protection policies who has been working on the human rights of children internationally for over 35 years. He founded the NGO Defence for Children International (DCI) in 1979, and coordinated the NGO Group for the Convention on the Rights of the Child throughout the drafting of that treaty. In 1994, he joined UNICEF, initially as a consultant on children's rights and

protection issues, and then as head of the 'Implementation of International Standards' unit at UNICEF's Innocenti Research Centre in Florence until 2003. Specialising increasingly on safeguarding children's rights in inter-country adoption and alternative care, he has carried out numerous field assessments of adoption and alternative care systems worldwide. He played a lead role in developing and drafting the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children, and is co-author of the "Moving Forward" handbook for implementing these UN Guidelines.

**Mia Dambach** is the Director of the International Social Service (ISS) and International Reference Centre (IRC) based in Geneva, with over a decade of experience in child protection matters. Mia began her career as a children's lawyer in Sydney, Australia, and joined ISS/IRC in 2008 as a Children's Rights Specialist. She coordinates Advocacy and Policy Development for the ISS network, focusing on child rights initiatives such as alternative care, adoption and international surrogacy in the UN arena and with regional bodies.

**Jennifer Davidson** is the Executive Director of the new Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures at the University of Strathclyde (with Centres for Improving Children's Services and Youth & Criminal Justice). Jennifer's range of social work experience spans Canada, the United States and the UK, where she has held leadership positions in child and youth care, social work and professional education. Jennifer has served on national and international committees related to children's services, and was a founding member of the US National Campaign for the Ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Jennifer's interests lie in the relationship between children's rights discourse and children's lived experiences, and in the impact and relevance of international rights and standards to national and regional practice in children's services.

**Jaap E. Doek** was a member of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child from 1999 to 2007, chairing the Committee from 2001 to 2007. He is an Emeritus Professor of Family and Juvenile Law at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam. Currently, he is a Deputy Judge in the Court of Appeal of Amsterdam and was a Juvenile Court Judge in the District Court of Alkmaar and The Hague from 1978 to 1985. He is the Chairperson of the Board of Aflatoun Child Savings International, a member of the Advisory Committee of the Innocenti Research Centre of UNICEF in Florence, Italy, and a member of the Expert Committee for the selection of candidates for the Annual Children's Peace Prize (an initiative of KidsRights, in the Netherlands). In 2012, Jaap was awarded the 'Juvenile Justice without Borders' International Award in recognition of his commitment to promoting better situations for, and treatment of, children and youth in conflict with the law.

**Chrissie Gale** is International Lead for CELCIS and has more than thirty years of professional programme management experience, including twenty-four years in an international context. Her speciality is Child Protection, with skills that include analytical thinking, conceptualisation and strategic planning, coupled with provision of technical support to governments and other stakeholders in all aspects of child protection systems, child care reforms and deinstitutionalisation. This has included: all aspects of development of national reform programmes; technical guidance on system review, legislation and strategic planning; and design of large participatory evaluations and numerous situation analyses for different organisations, including UNICEF, Save the Children and UNHCR. This work is complemented by her teaching experience and facilitation of learning and knowledge exchange.

**Fouzi Mathey Kikadidi** is a public policy consultant for Cekoïa Conseil, a consultancy agency based in Paris specialising in the social and public health sectors. She has been a peer researcher for the Université Paris-Est Creteil for more than 7 years now. Fouzi is a children's rights trainer for SOS Children's Villages, and has been helping the Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children to engage with civil society and government in France. She holds a BA in Business Administration and is currently completing a Master Degree in Educational Sciences.

**Murilo Vieira Komniski** is a Brazilian career diplomat, with experience in multilateral and bilateral affairs, including human rights. He is currently advisor to the Director of the Brazilian Cooperation Agency of the Ministry of External Relations (ABC/MRE). He was previously the head of the International Advisory of the Secretariat of Government and the Special Secretariat for Human Rights of the Presidency of the Republic and of the Ministry of Communications. Murilo graduated in International Relations at the Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC/SP), holds a Masters in Diplomacy with focus on Multilateral Affairs at the Brazilian Diplomatic Academy (Rio Branco Institute - IRBr), and undertook the LX Course of High Studies (CAE) at IRBr. He was previously seconded to the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, served at the Permanent Mission of Brazil to the UN in Geneva and at the Brazilian Embassy in La Paz, Bolivia.

**Rosie Moore** is a student on the BA Honours Social Work course at the University of Strathclyde.

**Rosemary McCreery** worked with UN agencies for 30 years, mainly UNICEF, but also for the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the UN Secretariat. She's worked in East and West Africa, South East Asia and Eastern Europe. Rosemary retired to Ireland 10 years ago and until recently was Chair of the board of International Services for Human Rights. She is on the board of Trocaire and is a lay member of the Irish Mental Health Tribunal.

**Artūrs Pokšāns** is from Riga and is a teacher in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Latvia. Artūrs' experience with children's rights comes mainly from involvement in several projects with SOS Villages Latvia, as well as first-hand experience of the state childcare system during childhood.

**Ann Skelton** has worked as a children's rights lawyer in South Africa for over 25 years. She was at the forefront of child law reform through the South African Law Reform Commission. Ann is currently the Director of the Centre for Child Law, University of Pretoria. She is an advocate who often appears in the superior courts, arguing children's rights cases. She is an internationally recognised researcher and has published widely. Ann was recently elected as a member of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child.

**Alexandra Yuster** is Associate Director, Programme Division, UNICEF HQ. She leads UNICEF's global work on Social Inclusion & Policy, encompassing social protection, child poverty, public finance and local governance. She previously served as UNICEF Representative in Moldova from 2008 to 2013, where UNICEF helped the Government to maintain and strengthen social protection during the economic crisis, as well as to reduce the rate of institutional care by 50%. Prior to this, Ms Yuster was Senior Adviser, Child Protection at UNICEF HQ, responsible for social welfare and justice issues. In this role, she led a successful initiative to establish international UN Guidelines for children in alternative care, working with a broad coalition of UN, NGO and government partners. Her UNICEF career also includes 12 years working at country level in India, Zimbabwe and Mozambique. Born and raised in New York City, she holds a BA in Anthropology and a Masters in Public Health.

**Edith Wycherley** is a student on the BA Honours Social Work course at the University of Strathclyde.

**Ariana Zane** is a student on the BA Honours Social Work course at the University of Strathclyde.

## **APPENDIX 2: SYMPOSIUM PROGRAMME**

### **Welcome to the Symposium**

Jennifer Davidson, Executive Director and Professor of Practice, Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures, University of Strathclyde

Chrissie Gale, International Lead, CELCIS, University of Strathclyde

### **Session 1: The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child**

Florence Bruce, Former Director of the Child Abuse Programme, Oak Foundation

Ann Skelton, Director of the Centre for Child Law, University of Pretoria

Jaap Doek, Chairperson, Supervisory Board of Child Helpline International

### **Session 2: The Development of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children**

Nigel Cantwell, International Consultant

Alexander Yuster, Associate Director, Programme Division, Section Chief, Social Inclusion and Policy, UNICEF

Murilo Vieira Komniski, Advisor to the Director, Brazilian Cooperation Agency, Ministry of External Relations, Brazil

### **Session 3: Moving Forward: Implementing the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children**

Mia Dambach, Director of International Reference Centre and Co-ordinator of Advocacy and Policy Development, International Social Service

Chrissie Gale, International Lead, CELCIS

### **Session 4: The Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children**

Susan Bissell, Director, Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children

### **Session 5: The State and their commitment**

Bruce Adamson, Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland

Rosemary McCreery, Former Head of UNICEF Russia and Belarus

### **Session 6: The Future**

Panel: Artūrs Pokšāns, Raquel López Álvarez, Rosie Moore, Fouzi Mathey Kikadidi, Edith Wycherley and Ariana Zana

**Closing remarks:** Nigel Cantwell and Jennifer Davidson

## **About CELCIS**

CELCIS, based at the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow, is committed to making positive and lasting improvements in the wellbeing of Scotland's children living in and on the edges of care. Ours is a truly collaborative agenda; we work alongside partners, professionals and systems with responsibility for nurturing our vulnerable children and families. Together we work to understand the issues, build on existing strengths, introduce best possible practice and develop solutions. What's more, to achieve effective, enduring and positive change across the board, we take an innovative, evidence-based improvement approach across complex systems.

## **For more information**

**Visit:** [www.celcis.org](http://www.celcis.org) **Email:** [celcis@strath.ac.uk](mailto:celcis@strath.ac.uk) **Tel:** 0141 444 8500