

Childwatch
INTERNATIONAL
RESEARCH NETWORK



Bernard van Leer  Foundation



Assessing and Monitoring Child Friendly Communities and Cities
Analyzing results and moving forward

A workshop Report from the Child Friendly Communities and Cities Research Program

UNICEF Innocenti Research Center and Childwatch International

Florence, October 26-27, 2010

INTRODUCTION

The Child Friendly Cities and Communities research initiative is a partnership between the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (IRC), Childwatch International, the Children's Environments Research Group (CERG) of the City University of New York and the Bernard Van Leer Foundation. The project is designed to improve the self-assessment capacities of cities and communities as the basis for planning, advocacy and community action to improve the living conditions of children. For the purpose, the research team (IRC and CERG) developed tools for communities and local authorities, which can easily be adapted to different contexts (www.childfriendlycities.org/en/research). The *Child Friendly Community Assessment Tools* enable children, caregivers and community service providers to assess the degree of fulfillment of child rights by involving them in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data about living conditions for children. The *governance tool* enables local authorities to look critically and comprehensively at the governance structures and processes in place for children and their families. The key features of this research include: a) a participatory methodology with easily adaptable tools for the involvement of children, parents and a community service providers; b) collection of data that can be useful for bottom-up planning and advocacy by a community; c) collection of data based on a set of common indicators of child friendliness that that can be made available by many communities to municipal governments for city-wide mapping of conditions for children for improved planning and service provision; and d) the promotion of awareness raising on child rights.

The assessment tools have been administered in selected cities and communities in 9 countries, in collaboration with the local UNICEF offices, municipalities and local research teams. The countries reflect a variety of geographical, cultural and political settings and include: Brazil, Dominican Republic, Sudan, Morocco, Jordan, Philippines, Spain, Italy and France. A multi-country report is being developed and will include: key findings from the administration of the tools in the different settings; a comparison of the methodologies used and an analysis of the implications of these tools for policy development, for community involvement in local planning and advocacy efforts and for raising awareness on conditions for children.

To complete and enrich the research process, a workshop was held in Florence, Italy, in conjunction with the Child in the City Conference (Florence, Italy on October 27-29, 2010). This offered the opportunity to bring together some of the members of the advisory board for the research initiative with some of the team members from the nine-country field test (see Appendix A for a list of participants).

The Goals and Structure of the Workshop

The main objectives of the workshop were:

- To share and review results generated through the application of the assessment tools and methodology in different settings.
- To contribute to a final critical review of the community assessment tools and guide.
- To review the effectiveness and relevance of the draft set of materials for the assessment of governance and to consider possible new ones.
- To identify open challenges and remaining gaps.
- To identify other contexts for further use and application of the assessment tools
- To outline directions for a new phase of the research initiative.

During the welcoming session, Gordon Alexander, Interim Director the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (IRC), emphasized the importance that the urban child agenda is gaining within UNICEF as well as the continued significance of Child Friendly Cities and Communities initiatives in supporting this agenda. This renewed interest in urban childhood is in line with the focus on the Millennium Development Goals with an equity approach. On behalf of Childwatch International Roger Hart, of the Children’s Environments Research Groups (CERG), briefed participants on the history of the project and pointed out that after this phase of developing assessment tools is over, there remains a great deal of important work that needs to be done to strengthen the Child Friendly Cities initiative. He highlighted that while more efforts are needed to continue developing strategies for improving community level “child friendliness”, there is also a need to find ways to reinforce municipal level structures and processes for the better governance of child friendliness. He expressed a desire to see the Childwatch network of research institutions build upon the on-going program of research.

The first half of the workshop¹ reviewed the research that has so far been conducted by the Child Friendly Communities and Cities research Initiative. A discussion was promoted to address key questions and areas of concern. The toolkit was reviewed in detail and suggestions for improvement were collected.

The second half of the workshop addressed the kinds of research that would be valuable for furthering the improvement of the international child friendly cities initiative. The discussion was again focused on both the community level and the municipal level.

Participants split into two main groups based on the two strands of the research initiative. One group worked on the assessment of how children’s rights are fulfilled at the community level and the other group worked on the assessment of governance structures and processes for children’s rights. Each group looked at different topics. The plenary discussion summarised the key conclusions of the groups.

¹ The outline of the workshop is attached (Appendix B).

MAIN OUTCOMES OF THE WORKSHOP

- The workshop provided a space for reviewing and enriching the research process by contributing to the fine-tuning of the CFC Assessment Toolkit, identifying remaining gaps and challenges and defining new ideas for expansion of the effort. Suggestions for additional efforts included exploring linkages with Child Friendly Schools, further work on mapping of communities and emphasis on local planning initiatives. New areas of research were pointed out and included: models of participation of children in municipal governance, an analysis of examples of how financial resources and budgets are allocated for children and child protection mechanisms in community settings, among others.
- During the workshop, a review and analysis of the preliminary findings and feedback from countries highlighted the value of the methodology for: raising awareness on children's rights, creating spaces for dialogue on children's rights at the community level and for collecting data at the community level and through a participatory approach.
- The CFC indicators developed by the current research effort have contributed to a breaking the down of the nine "building blocks" into a more flexible framework for use in different cultural contexts. Nevertheless, it is still important to ensure that these are adapted to the local contexts.
- The importance of involving local authorities from the start and of advocating for these to believe and engage in participatory processes was highlighted as a priority action in the process. Although some guidance has been provided, the need for more orientation was suggested for the following areas: democratic sampling, application of the methodology in larger settings; preparations and training.
- The Governance Toolkit (particularly the checklist) was seen as a very valuable instrument to raise awareness and empower municipal stakeholders and to foster inter-agency discussion of children. It is ideal for initiating self-reflection and dialogue on children's rights and among different actors. The greatest challenge with the governance assessment is the absence of any system of inter-agency coordination for children in cities to be able to carry out the self-reflection exercise. Even with cities that have declared that they are "child friendly", inter-agency coordination for children is not a common practice.
- Some of the reticence of governments to engage in self-critical reflection on governance for children's rights is understandable because of the different levels for responsibility for the governance of children's rights.

REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH TO DATE

A summary was provided of the preliminary results of the action research and administration of the Child Friendly Community and Governance Assessment Tools in selected cities and communities of the nine participating countries. The key outcomes and challenges highlighted during the presentation and discussions are described below and are organized along the two main strands: Community Assessment and Governance.

Critical Review of the Community Assessment Toolkit

Overall assessment:

- The administration of the Community Assessment Tools has contributed to an increased awareness of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in the participating communities.
- The community assessment tools created opportunities for a dialogue among parents, children and decision makers on children's rights that did not previously exist.
- The methodology appears to have enabled the participating communities to collect their own data and to use this as a basis for discussions, of local planning and advocacy for children. But unfortunately, the short time-frame of the research did not enable a proper assessment of the impact of the assessment process on community planning and advocacy. The workshop participants suggested a two-year follow-up to explore whether planning of actions has taken place effectively.

The need for more guidance on preparation for the assessment process:

- Although the methodology is designed to be carried out by facilitators with limited research experience, it was highlighted that more emphasis should be placed on the preparatory phase of the assessment. It is important to map existing capacities in the community before starting so that the methodology can be based on the resources available.
- If existing Child Friendly Community or City processes are in place, assessment should be embedded in current efforts (e.g. in Brazil, the match between the Platform for Urban Centres and the assessment matched quite well). On the other hand, there is a need to better understand how to work with communities that are not involved in initiatives promoting children's rights. The preparatory stage should include strong partnership with authorities from the start, a mapping of potential partners and the identification and training of good facilitators.

The indicators of child friendliness:

The research has produced a set of indicators to define the different dimensions of “child friendliness”. Child friendliness simply means that the indicators have been constructed from the full range of articles of the CRC that are relevant to communities and local governments (the implications of the CRC for individual families and for national governments are not included). A table summarising the indicators used in the community tools and governance tools, with the corresponding articles of the CRC listed alongside, was shared with the workshop participants (Appendix C). The table also included a list of the types of corresponding datasets that can typically be retrieved through existing sources or through the decentralization of national data. Discussion revolved around the following key points:

- The children’s *rights* approach as a base of the whole assessment methodology was considered a strength of the methodology, but it would also be helpful to show how the tools contribute to the fulfilment of the Millennium Development Goals.
- It was suggested some indicators be rephrased. For instance, there should be a distinction between availability and accessibility as these have different meanings. Furthermore, some CRC articles are over-represented and some items are repetitive. It was therefore recommended that the representativeness of the CRC articles be carefully mapped in relation to the statements in order to reduce the length of the tool.
- It was suggested that the table be completed with key words of each CRC article cited so that consistency can be quickly reviewed.
- Topics such as safety and protection from violence should be expanded. For instance, child friendly home environments, protection from violence at school (i.e. bullying of teachers and peers), organized crime, as well as the impact of violence on the media and the Internet should be more detailed.
- The education section of the indicators should address physical and learning disabilities and children’s view of their curricula.
- There was a suggestion that there should be more indicators focused on participation and they should include the opinion of children about the quality of places that are available for them for leisure. Some suggested that participation become a separate domain in the assessment tools because this topic is so central to the effective implementation of the CRC. Also, the existing items focus most on the existence of participation structures rather than on the quality of, and engagement with, those structures.

- Some participants felt that the assessment tool should include questions related to satisfaction, therefore giving a more subjective analysis on the quality of services.
- In the closing stage of the workshop a discussion emerged on the need that municipalities feel to set standards for what it means to be ‘child friendly’ and the dangers of doing this in a culturally universalistic manner. It was recalled that the nine building blocks of the UNICEF Child Friendly City initiative have served as a guiding set of elements at the global level. The CFC indicators developed by the current research effort have contributed to a breaking the down of the blocks into a more flexible framework for use in different cultural contexts. Nevertheless, there is still a danger that communities and municipalities will see these set of indicators as a fixed universal list of rather than indicators that should be adapted and modified to align with their own cultures particular values for children. One way of encouraging the users of the assessment tools to modify the tools might be that the community makes their own lists of what their culture has traditionally considered to be the rights of their children. Sometimes this is best done by first asking what the ‘wrongs’ for children are in their culture/community. This can then be turned into a local bill of rights for children that can be compared with the CRC and the indicators that this initiative has developed from it. From this comparison a set of locally relevant missing indicators could be identified.

The need for more discussion of the role of local authorities in community assessment:

- Some participants emphasized that there is a need to have the support of local authorities in implementing the assessment but others highlighted the need to make sure that in working with local authorities the data collected is not manipulated for political purposes or campaigning.
- Ideally, a municipality should have some system of inter-sect oral coordination for children to be able to analyse the kind of data generated by the assessment tools and intervene on the base of the assessed needs. Yet, most municipalities do not always have such a system of coordination, even when they claim to have a Child Friendly City program or a program of government decentralization.
- Furthermore, some municipal authorities do not even support the collection of this type of community data, based on the perspectives of citizens. Others would prefer to see this data collected at the municipal rather than community level. These are political and ideological differences cannot be generalised across nations but they should be discussed in the Facilitators Guide.

Reducing the length of the assessment process:

- The administration of the tool is time consuming. It was recommended that the research team find ways to reduce the length of the tools and provide alternative ways of administering them, perhaps in separate sessions for different dimensions of the CRC.

The use the tools for municipal-wide analysis:

- Some cities that would like to use the tools for a municipal-wide analysis could achieve this through a statistical sampling of households but most cities do not have the resources to implement this type of research. Alternatively, the tools could be adapted and carried out simultaneously in schools throughout a city. However, those countries that tested the tools in schools expressed concern about children's freedom of expression in this context, and suggested that training and mentorship of teachers would be advisable to ensure a supportive environment for discussion and debate.

Sampling issues:

- The country research teams often had difficulties in defining and engaging a democratically representative sample of the community in the research. More guidance is needed on sampling strategies in order to improve the democratic representativeness of the community. For instance, it needs to be made clearer how communities can supplement the participatory group approach to the collection of data with the strategic sampling of excluded children through household sampling, as in the Philippines pilot study and in the case of Haitian families in one of the Dominican communities. Representativeness can also be improved by collecting additional data through use of the tool with individual children of the community who are not living in homes. Additional efforts to seek strategies for collection of data at the local level should be promoted. It was also argued that there is a need to compare different types of exclusion that children experience in urban settings. However, it was pointed out that in industrialized countries it is very difficult to identify excluded children.
- The disclaimer in the facilitators guide on the limitations of data collected through voluntary community participation to be socially and geographically representative of a community should be made more visible. The guide should explain that community participatory research cannot be bounded by the same guidelines as traditional statistically representative city-wide household surveys; the two approaches have different strengths and weaknesses. The best way to make this clear in the revised facilitators guide will be to have a section on how the assessment tools can also be used in traditional household sampling research.
- The definition of "community" often does not correspond with administrative boundaries, which provided some confusion to participants when answering

assessment items. The facilitators guide will need to advise on ways of approaching this issue.

Reaching the most vulnerable children with the assessments:

- The items included in the community tools are more appropriate for children who attend schools and/or live at home. Some participants saw the need to design an additional version of the assessment tool that addresses the reality of the most vulnerable children, such as children living on the streets, working children and migrant children.

The synthesis of existing municipal data with the community assessment data:

- To strengthen the robustness of data, the facilitators guide needs to stress the synthesis of existing municipal data with the community assessment data, in both community-wide meetings and in reports to local authorities.

Improvements to the community representation of data:

- More ideas on how the data can be visually represented and shared with both the community and decision makers should be provided in the facilitator's guidebook.

Assessing community strengths as well as problems:

- The current focus of the methodology is on identifying the gaps in child rights fulfilment at the community level and priorities for action. However, the strengths or assets a community has for children should also be highlighted through the research. An asset-based approach will help the community celebrate its accomplishments for children's rights and provide a platform for children and parents to envision and imagine the ideal community in the future.

The training of facilitators:

- The role of the facilitator is crucial and it is important to invest in proper training. It was suggested that there should be a simplified trainer-the-trainer module to complete the guidebook.

Connecting Children across Communities through the Assessment Process:

- Connecting children involved in the assessment throughout the world via an online portal/website was highly valued by participants as a motivational strategy for participation and the peer-to-peer learning exchanges that can occur.

Critical Review of the Governance Toolkit

Overall assessment of the governance tools

- The degree of accountability of municipal governments with regard to children's rights is a central issue in the strengthening of good governance for children but it has been difficult to design a realistic and effective approach to how to establish a tool for governments to even reflect on the issue. Three possible tools were offered for experimentation by the research teams: a *Governance Checklist*, a version of the *Community Assessment Tool* for municipal stakeholders (described previously) and *Governance Scenarios*.
- Workshop participants concluded that the governance checklist tool has strong potentials to raise awareness and empower municipal stakeholders and to foster inter-agency discussion of children. It is an ideal instrument for initiating self-reflection and dialogue on children's rights and among different actors. But, as expected, the research teams found that few government officials were willing to spend the time to complete the Community Assessment Tool (Tool 1 – version adapted to Government officials). As far as the tool on the “governance scenarios” is concerned, the workshop participants felt that even though the research teams had not had the opportunity to experiment with this, it should be left in the toolkit for use by any municipality that might become enthusiastic about seriously reflecting on governance.

The challenge of determining who will assess governance:

- The greatest challenge with the governance assessment is the absence of any system of inter-agency coordination for children in cities to be able to carry out the self-reflection exercise. Even with cities that have declared that they are “child friendly”, inter-agency coordination for children is not a common practice. Some of the research teams were able to bring together a range of sectors because they were working under the aegis of “UNICEF”. Without this influential backing it is not clear how easy it would be to bring agencies together to carry out the self-assessment process. Nevertheless, workshop participants felt that the facilitators guide should present some examples of alternative strategies, such as the Philippines, where the Mayor supported the convening an inter-agency meeting.
- Some of the reticence of governments to engage in self-critical reflection on governance for children's rights is understandable because of the difficult problem of different levels for responsibility for the governance of children's rights. In many countries decentralization is a new phenomenon and it is not clear what level of government is responsible for a specific aspect of children's rights. In some cases, municipalities might have some responsibility for service delivery but might not be able to allocate resources at their level. Sometimes, local governments have neither the knowledge nor the commitment to engage in a child

friendly city process. Coordination among sectors is another major concern in child friendly governance.

The need to stress that the tool is designed to improve reflection and discussion rather than as an evaluation of governments:

- The group suggested that the guidelines of the tool be rephrased along this line and that the word “assessment” be removed so that municipal stakeholders do not feel frightened or reluctant to participate in the process. The tool should focus on the showing the current status and the progress made. Some of the questions should therefore be rephrased.

Resistance to the lengthy process:

- Local governments may be reluctant to use the assessment tools because their administration is time-consuming and requires some preparations. A shorter version of the tools might be needed to reduce the actual administration time. This version would include a reduced number of indicators; and items would be formulated in a simpler format.

Additional indicators needed:

- It was suggested the tools incorporate indicators on the existence of measures to control corruption.

Comparing the results of community assessment and the assessment of governance:

- More guidelines are needed on how to compare the results obtained through the community assessment tools and governance assessment tools.

THE IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Over the next three months the assessment tool kits that have been developed will be finalised. The research initiative is now beginning to develop a comprehensive guide on how to engage communities in the mapping of child friendliness but there are many more important issues to address in helping to improve the child friendly cities initiative. The workshop discussion was designed to help inform what some of the more important research issues might be.

Development of guidance material for the community-based planning of child friendly communities

- The action planning and implementation phase of the results from the assessment requires more guidance and training. At the moment, there is not enough information in the community assessment facilitator’s guide on how to prepare a

local plan of action. It was suggested a separate guidebook be developed on this topic and that portions of the governance tools be used to map out political structures and avenues for acting on the identified priorities for children's rights.

- Issues to consider in the development of additional guidance on local planning include:
 - o The limited data available that is typically available for planning processes.
 - o Differences in the size of cities and the dynamics of power structures.
 - o How to make the assessment, mapping and planning processes and conclusions accessible and useful for children, parents and decision-makers.
 - o The need to address linkages between the municipal, regional and national levels of planning.

- Participants agreed that more guidance and tools are required on mapping. However, mapping should be introduced as a technique that is useful for local action, not as the goal per se. The guidance materials now being written should include both traditional mapping tools and the paper based, open source mapping systems (such as Google Earth), and advanced spatial technologies (GIS/GPS) that are available in some countries.

The Development of the Child Friendly Community Assessment Tools for Use in Schools

The group reviewed the possibility of linking child friendly community research effort to the development of child friendly schools. In particular, participants reflected on the potentials of the community toolkit for the development of school curricula on child rights, community life and governance. Finally, the group considered whether the toolkit could contribute to defining child friendly school standards. Key remarks from the discussion included:

- The assessment tools would be valuable for the promotion of child rights education within school settings. It was also agreed that child rights education should be promoted in schools through a life-skill development approach. Teachers need to be trained and mentored to engage in child rights teaching and participatory education and the tools, as they are already designed, support both.

- How best to promote the use of the assessment process in schools is likely to vary by nation. Sometimes schools are a responsibility of the central government and sometimes of local governments. Child rights education is often absent in the national education curricula and teachers typically have little flexibility for including child rights in their teaching. None of the participants were aware of a child rights curriculum in their current school system. There was a concern that

where the education system is highly centralised, it may be very difficult for citizens to influence changes in the local context.

- It was noted that it would be difficult to use the tools effectively in schools that were not “community schools”, that is in the sense of drawing from the surrounding geographic community. The most valuable element of the tools is that they allow children to assess their community and for the children to compare these assessments across age groups, age and generations. These comparisons could still be done when a school draws children from across a city but it would be much more challenging for the teachers. The teachers’ curriculum guide will need to address both types of schools.
- Pre-service teacher education is equally important as in-service teacher education on children’s rights. Unfortunately there are rarely children’s rights training in departments of teacher training in colleges and universities.
- It was mentioned that following the examples of Spain and other countries, celebrations around the UN CRC anniversary could be useful entry point for implementing the tools and children’s rights within the schools.

Needed Research on Local Governance for Children’s Rights

Models of Local Governance for children’s rights

- It was acknowledged that although there has been considerable experimentation with the democratic representation of children in municipal governance there has been little systematic mapping of the different models of local governance and how they work. Research on different models of children’s representation in municipal governance is now being piloted by CERG but there is a large agenda of research to be addressed.

Local Budgets and financing for children’s rights

- There has not been a systematic analysis of methods and good practices of budget and financing at the local level. More research is needed on how municipalities allocate resources for children and how they ensure that this is done.
- Exploring the cost-effectiveness of Child Friendly Cities approach might be a very valuable research effort in promoting advocacy for CFC.

Child Friendly Communities and Child Protection

- Further research is needed on the role of the community as a protective environment for children. In particular, research should look at the protective/risk factors within the community, including the interaction between the informal and the formal systems of protection. A comparison of different practices would be valuable. A specific focus on children's justice could be explored.
- Sharing and dissemination of the current research effort and future initiative was considered a key element. It was argued that results should be widely disseminated and shared in international conferences. That way more funding and interest from the donors could be encouraged. On the other hand, the CFC website should be strengthened as a tool for dissemination of research and any other relevant information on community and municipal governance. It should become an interactive website which would enable a more up-to-date and global repository of information.

Strategies for connecting Child Friendly Community development processes with the work of municipal governments

- Explore the possibility of using the school system to collect data on children throughout the municipality.
- Experiment with the development of local plans of action as a way of bringing the community together with municipal actors.
- Encourage municipalities to experiment with using the CRC reporting system for bringing the voices of children and other actors, from all levels (including the local level) into the process and into discussions around key issues.

CONCLUSIONS

The workshop provided a space for reviewing and thinking over the CFC research initiative. Overall, the preliminary findings and discussions have highlighted that the methodology has strong potentials for awareness raising and creation of spaces for community discussions on child rights in addition to generating spaces for bottom-up local planning. The process has further contributed to the definition of child friendliness. Issues like sampling, representativeness, preparation and setting up of the assessment process were raised and should be taken into consideration in the future use of the assessment toolkit. It was proposed that there be further development of the community assessment tool through links with the Child Friendly Schools initiatives and the development of guidance on community mapping

and planning. Suggestions were also made for new research areas in municipal and community governance for child rights.

After the workshop the Community Assessment Toolkit and the Governance Toolkit will be revised and a report prepared on their use in nine countries. The on-line tools will be revised and hard copy published versions will be prepared in English, and other languages if funding is obtained for this. The publication of the study and the toolkit is expected for 2011.

Appendix A: Participants

UNICEF IRC:

Dora Giusti, Child Protection Specialist, dgiusti@unicef.org

Maria Rubi, Consultant, mrubi@unicef.org

Claire Akehurst, Administrative Assistant, cakehurst@unicef.org

Noortje van Heijst, Consultant, nvanheijst@unicef.org

Children's Environments Research Group:

Roger Hart, Director, roghart@gmail.com

Pamela Wridt, Associate Director, PWridt@gc.cuny.edu

Jennifer Tang, tang.jen@gmail.com

Advisers to the Child Friendly Communities and Cities Research Program:

Gregorio Aranda, Coordinator CFCI Campaign, UNICEF Spain, garanda@unicef.es²

Christoph Baker, Assistant to the Executive Director, UNICEF Italy, c.baker@unicef.it

Sudeshna Chatterjee, Research Affiliate, Children and Youth Environments, Centre for Research and Design, University of Colorado, Sudeshna.kca@gmail.com

Monica Gonzalez, Research Institute on Quality of Life Studies, University of Gerona, Spain, monica.gonzalez@udg.edu³

Selim Iltus, Studies & Research Officer, Bernard van Leer Foundation, the Netherlands, selim.iltus@bvleerf.nl

Ray Lorenzo, Cooperative ABCitta, Milan, Italy, rayloren@tin.it

Karen Malone, University of Wollongong, Australia, kmalone@uow.edu.au

Willem van Vliet, Professor and Director, Children Youth and Environments Centre, University of Colorado, willem@colorado.edu

Rosaline September, University of West Cape, South Africa, rseptember@uwc.ac.za

² Also part of country research team in Spain

³ Also part of country research team in Spain

Researchers from the Nine-Nation Study

Angela Desiree Aguirre, Institute of Philippine Culture, School of Social Sciences, Ateneo de Manila University, Principal Researcher, admaguirre@yahoo.com

Mélusine Harlé, Chief of local government relations and partnerships, UNICEF France, mharle@unicef.fr

Ana Lima, Principal Researcher, IBOPE, Ana.Lima@ibope.com.br

Francois Leonelli, Vice-President, UNICEF France, francois.leonelli@orange.fr

Esam Osman, CFC Sudan

Mohamed Sid Ahmed, Programme Officer, Integrated Community Based Development, UNICEF Sudan, msidahmed@unicef.org

Other participants:

David Donaldson, Director of Education, US Fund for UNICEF/UNICEF Geneva-PFP ddonaldson@unicefusa.org

Isami Kinoshita, Chiba Univeristy, isamikinoshita@faculty.chiba-u.jp

Appendix B: Agenda

Agenda

9:00 – 9:45 Welcome session

Welcome remarks (Gordon Alexander, Interim Director, IRC)

Introductions to meeting and all participants (Dora)

Brief history of the research program (Roger)

Presentation of the workshop agenda (Pamela)

9:45 – 11:30 Session 1: Overview of the multi-country application of the methodology/tools

CERG and IRC

This session will provide an overview of the preliminary results of the use of: 1) the community assessment tools and 2) the Governance tools in the countries participating in the initiative. The presentation will highlight key conclusions regarding the local administration of the tools, their effectiveness, their strengths and their weaknesses, the relevance of the local findings to the communities and/or the municipalities and how the tools and guide need to be improved.

11:30-11:45 Coffee break

11:45- 13:15 Session 2: Introducing indicators of child friendliness

IRC

An overview of the key indicators and dimensions used will be presented and will include those collected through the community tools, the governance tools and other sources of data. Participants will validate the dimensions and indicators of child friendliness developed through the research.

13:15-14:15 Lunch

14:15 – 17: 15 Session 3: Parallel Working Groups

Participants will break up into the following two parallel working groups. Each group is responsible for discussing the topics assigned to them in the allotted time, or approximately 1 hour per discussion.

Working Group 1: the Community Development of Child friendly Cities

Topic A: Critical Assessment of the Community Assessment Toolkit (1 hour)

Goal: to identify whether there are any areas requiring further development.

Topic B: The development of Guidance material for the Community-Based Planning of Child Friendly Communities(1 hour)

Goals:

- Review of a plan to extend the facilitator's guide for community assessment into guide materials on community mapping.
- Discussion of the desirability of developing guide materials for the development of local plans of action and advocacy for child friendly communities.

Topic C: The Development of the Community Rights Assessment Tools for Use in Schools (1 hour)

Goal: Discussion of the plan for modifying the toolkit and developing related curricula for schools as means of linking the child friendly schools and child friendly communities' initiatives.

Working Group 2: Governance for Child friendly Communities

Topic A: Critical Assessment of the Governance Assessment Tool (1 hour)

Goal: to identify whether there are any areas requiring further development.

Topic B: Community Governance for Children's Rights (1 hour)

Goal: Discussion of how best to proceed with a proposed new initiative to compare and critically assess, internationally, different models for the participation of children and parents in planning, monitoring and decision-making for child friendly communities - through community-based organizations, schools, children's groups etc.

Topic C: Municipal Governance for Children's Rights (1 hour)

Goal: Discussion of how best to proceed with a proposed new initiative to compare and critically assess, internationally, different models of children's participation in municipal governance.

17:15-17:30 Closure of Day

Sample of ideas generated during discussions and agenda for Day 2.

DAY 2

9:00 -12:00 Plenary Discussion: open questions/challenges and future plans

Each working group will present a summation of their discussion and ideas, which will be followed by an open discussion of future plans.

Closure