



**Scotland's Commissioner
for Children & Young People**

**Children and Young People's Participation in Scotland:
Frameworks, standards and principles for practice**

**Dr Greg Mannion
School of Education
University of Stirling**

August 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1 – Research Design	2
Aim	2
Research Questions	2
Research Approach	2
Interview Data Analysis	5
Structure of the Findings	5
Section 2 – Findings	7
Analysis of Frameworks	7
Cross-Framework & Thematic Analysis	8
Thematic Analysis	11
<i>Theme A: The Purposes of Frameworks</i>	11
<i>Theme B: Framework Standards and Principles</i>	11
<i>Theme C: Theories and Drivers</i>	13
<i>Theme D: Positioning CYP in Frameworks: Child-led/Intergenerational</i>	14
<i>Theme E: Monitoring and Evaluating Participation</i>	15
<i>Theme F: The Effects of Frameworks in Use</i>	17
<i>Theme G: Tensions Involved in Designing and Using Frameworks</i>	19
Section 3 – Summary and Conclusion	23
References	24
Appendix 1. Methodology	26
Appendix 2. Cross-Framework Analysis	29
Appendix 3. Individual Framework Analyses	31
Appendix 4. Acronyms Used	41

List of Tables

Table 1:	
The Geographical Reach of Researched Frameworks	7
Table 2a,b:	
Comparison of Participation Frameworks	9/10
Table 3:	
<i>Framework 1. MacRobert Arts Centre (Stirlingshire)</i>	28
Table 4:	
<i>Framework 2. Involved (Scottish Borders Local Authority Area)</i>	29
Table 5:	
<i>Framework 3. National Theatre of Scotland</i>	30
Table 6:	
<i>Framework 4. Hear by Right – (National Youth Agency)</i>	31
Table 7:	
<i>Framework 5. Ask First (Northern Ireland)</i>	32
Table 8:	
<i>Framework 6. Funky Dragon (Wales)</i>	33
Table 9:	
<i>Framework 7. Scottish Health Council's Participation Standard</i>	34
Table 10:	
<i>Framework 8. Community Engagement Standards (Scotland)</i>	35
Table 11:	
<i>Framework 9. Scottish Youth Parliament</i>	36
Table 12:	
<i>Framework 10. International Pilot Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating Participation</i>	37

Introduction

This research report documents an inquiry into the viability of the construction of a set of a national quality standards and a framework for children and young people's participation (hereafter we use the term 'framework') in Scotland.

At the time of writing this research there was no nationally agreed framework for children and young people's participation in Scotland or any widely agreed model for the monitoring and evaluation of this work. The development of a form of national framework in Scotland was seen by Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People as a possible way of providing the opportunity for improved agreement on standards, goals and processes, and participation indicators for monitoring and evaluation. A national framework was also seen as potentially providing a platform for organisations to better understand the process of involving children and young people in a participatory way and assist them in evaluating the outcomes and effectiveness of their work in this area.

Therefore, this research sought to inform Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People's work. The development of some form of national participation framework in principle offered the hope for it to be a guide for better practice, a way of generating baseline information for the evaluation of children and young people's participation over time, and as a way of realising children's rights in practice as part of the unfolding of a more democratic society.

The research is based on the presumption that a national framework would need to be informed by existing theories (for example, Hart, 1992; Treseder, 1997; Shier, 2001; Mannion, 2007), by empirical research on existing practices in organisations from home and abroad (for example, Mannion, 2003; Johnson, 2011), and, by a fresh consideration of existing frameworks (after Cutler, 2003; Welsh Assembly, 2007; Badham and Wade, 2008; Lansdown, 2005, 2011; O'Kane, 2011) and their current uses. This report does not set out to provide a comprehensive literature review or theoretical overview of the debates in this area (though clearly is informed by these). Instead, the report's contribution is based on an empirical study and comparison of ten current frameworks of participation and interviews with ten key stakeholders. The design of the study is such that practice in local Scottish, regional UK, and international contexts is reviewed and may, therefore, have wider relevance for readers internationally.

Section 1 – Research Design

Aim

The aim of the research was to inform the possible development of a set of National Quality Standards and a Framework for Participation for Scotland by describing the key elements of selected frameworks, their current use (including their approaches to monitoring and evaluation), and an analysis of their similarities, differences and inherent tensions.

Research Questions

The research questions posed were:

1. What are the key elements, similarities, differences and emphases of the existing participation frameworks?
2. How do the frameworks suggest evaluating effectiveness and monitoring progress?
3. What are the challenges and opportunities of using different frameworks?
4. How do they allow for the participation of children and young people in these processes?

Research Approach

More complete details of the methodology used in the research are outlined in Appendix 1. In summary, the approach taken involved two phases.

Phase 1 involved a desktop study, scrutinising ten selected frameworks for participation that were in use across national and international contexts and from across various domains (educational, arts-based, health-related, third sector, governmental and other statutory bodies). Frameworks were analysed individually and compared to each other by considering their scope and purposes, principles, criteria, structures, monitoring and evaluation approaches, outcomes sought, the involvement of children and young people (CYP), and how accessible and applicable they were across contexts. Tabular summaries of the individual frameworks are provided in Appendix 2. A cross-framework summary comparison is provided in tabular format in Appendix 3.

Phase 2 involved conducting telephone interviews with 10 key stakeholders involved in the use of frameworks of participation in various fields. Respondents were invited to comment on their experiences of choosing frameworks, issues involved in their use, their effects and outcomes, and related understandings of CYP's participation. In the next section, data from the interviews is analysed under thematic headings that emerged from the analysis.

Section 2 – Findings

Analysis of Frameworks

The ten frameworks (see also tables 3-12, pages 32-41) analysed included local organisational frameworks, nationally important approaches across the regions of the UK, and one international approach. Three frameworks offered a standard for participation for all ages (in the NHS, the Community Engagement Strategy, and in the National Theatre of Scotland). Two frameworks looked specifically at the arts as a context for CYP's participation, with one of these organisations working in a local area, and the other operating nationally. Another was specific to the health service. The other frameworks are of interest because they were in use across contexts and have already demonstrated how adaptable and accessible they were in a variety of services or setting types. Table 1, below, describes the reach of these exemplar frameworks and the type of leadership structure that supports them.

Table 1

The Geographical Reach of Researched Exemplar Frameworks and Approaches to Children and Young People's Participation			
Leadership structure	Local Area Based	Nationally / Regionally (UK) Based	Internationally Based
Led by non-statutory organisation, NGOs or NGO (sometimes with Government support)	1. Framework of the MacRobert Arts Centre, Stirlingshire	3. National Theatre of Scotland model	10. International Monitoring and Evaluation of Participation Project (Oak Foundation)
		4. 'Hear by Right' standards and toolkit	
		5. Ask First (Northern Ireland)	
Led by statutory organisation, government body or inter-governmental organisation	2. 'Involved' – Scottish Borders Local Authority Area approach	6. Funky Dragon Assembly for CYP	[UNCRC and associated tools might be an example here though these are not a direct focus of the research]
		7. Scottish Health Council Framework	
		8. Community Engagement Standard	
		9. Scottish Youth Parliament	

In Appendix 2 there is a further tabular comparison of selected frameworks.

Thematic Analysis

In this section, themes were arrived at inductively through a qualitative analysis of the frameworks and the interview data. These themes are used to capture some of the more salient similarities and differences between frameworks. The analysis includes transcribed evidence from interviews with 10 key adult informants who were either very familiar with these frameworks, or, of other similar frameworks of participation. The seven themes, A-G, are:

- A. The Purposes of Frameworks
- B. Framework Standards and Principles
- C. Theories and Drivers
- D. Positioning CYP in Frameworks: Child-led / Intergenerational
- E. Monitoring and Evaluating Participation
- F. The Effects of Frameworks in Use
- G. Tensions Involved in Designing and Using Frameworks

Theme A: The Purposes of Frameworks

There was a clear sense from all stakeholders that frameworks for CYP's participation had a role to play in their organisation. The main thrust of the rationales given by respondents was that from their experience of working closely with CYP, they felt that this age group are a minority excluded group whose participation is not assured without support:

Children don't feel that they have, they have the voice ... or necessarily all the access.
Stakeholder 8

Huge swathes of public policy are developed without it entering anybody's head that they [CYP] should have a say, or they should be heard, or their perspective should inform the decisions.

Stakeholder 10

From talking to young people that they feel that they've never really had much of a voice and given the opportunity to have a voice and influence over what happens to them.
Stakeholder 3

Other rationales for the existence and use of frameworks included their role as a 'developmental tool', as a mechanism for demonstrating good practice (and the ability to avail of funding as a result), as a way of helping organisations understand and meet legal obligations, and the sense that there was generally 'a culture developing in the public sector' around participation of all minority groups now and that the various standards had a role to play in this.

While it was noted that standards, principles and frameworks were not 'a silver bullet' (Stakeholder 7), the idea of a national Scottish framework was

welcomed by some respondents while others felt that adapting existing frameworks was a way forward:

National standards?: I would find it very useful [...] to be able to refer to (national standards) [...] I think that would be a good thing. It would raise expectations.
Stakeholder 8

Most stakeholders valued the idea that there should be a framework specifically for CYP's participation to ensure their participation.

I think having [a standard] for children and young people that stands alone is important.
Stakeholder 5

Theme B: Framework Standards and Principles

Many frameworks employ terms we can describe as 'principles' in their frameworks and statements of standards. While 'standards' are sometimes likely to be more obviously measurable statements of a level of service, a principle offers a wider more challenging scope for development towards excellence or a guide for an organisation's 'ethos' or 'direction'. Thus, framework principles have a distinctive role because of how and what they signpost.

Many of the principles that were formally stated in the frameworks also arose in the interviews. An example was the principle of inclusion. One stakeholder felt that participatory activities should be, "Fun for everyone, [since] we are not that different", noting that the process was about actively, "seeking out difference: the more difference you're working with, the richer sometimes it becomes because that's reflective of the world" (Stakeholder 2).

Looking across the frameworks, we can notice some key **overarching principles** that were commonly found (though not every framework contained mention of all of these):

- inclusion
- voluntary participation
- transparency (providing access to information and knowledge)
- respect for CYP (their rights and their differences),
- fair and equal opportunities – (for CYP from diverse backgrounds, and fairness in terms of new forms of power sharing among the generations)
- being relevant
- being purposeful (involving, for example, a participatory planning phase)

Other practical and structural issues are apparent in how all frameworks are put to use. These more operational aspects relate to range of process

and approaches that are key ingredients of frameworks in use. Viable frameworks can be seen to work with **operational principles** such as:

- employing safe practices for CYP
- being child-friendly (in language and being more 'fun' than burdensome)
- incorporating training and development for adults and the organisations involved
- incorporating capacity building for CYP
- involving (preferably direct) contact and liaison with the relevant adults (eg decision makers) (some form of intergenerational dialogue)
- having systems for internal and external monitoring and evaluation
- involving feedback to CYP and to the wider public.

Theme C: Theories and Drivers

As can be seen on tables 2a and 2b (in Appendix 2), frameworks can be guided by various theories and driven by distinctive events in their discrete socio-political and material contexts.

It was interesting to notice the prevalence of three key theoretical frameworks of participation: UNCRC, Hart's (1992) ladder, and Treseder's (1997) model. Of course the UNCRC is perhaps a legally binding 'driver' (see below) but it also appears to function for stakeholders as a theoretical position with respect to CYP's rights regardless of its legal standing. As one stakeholder put it: "rights are rooted in entitlement and obligation." (Stakeholder 10)

Hart's ladder appears as a guide from frameworks that sought to be more child-led in their structures while Treseder's model (or some adaptation of it) was used by frameworks that were more targeted towards intergenerational approaches. This is perhaps to be expected since critiques of Hart's ladder have noted its (perhaps unintentional) rhetorical positioning of 'child-led' projects at the 'top rung' of the ladder, while Treseder's model has a flatter structure. One stakeholder said they purposefully omitted Hart's ladder because it is seen as being 'so hierarchical' (Stakeholder 6). Another said:

We've always used Hart's. [I know] that's been amended. But we've kind of, based on, used that though, from the outset really. And it works for us.

Stakeholder 3

It has been interesting to notice the overarching framework drivers located in the different regional and international contexts. Expectedly, the UNCRC provides a touchstone for a number of frameworks. Stakeholders noted that a number of frameworks have become operational since devolution of powers to some of the regions of the UK. These were seen as key political events that gave rise to new cultural contexts for CYP's participation, for example the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland. Other drivers

come more directly from other requirements on local or national statutory and governmental bodies as duty bearers to provide for citizen's rights or CYP's rights (which of course give local expression to the UNCRC). National or region-wide legal requirements (as in Section 75 in Northern Ireland), or locally driven systems (for example when one local authority demanded recognition of CYP's views in funding mechanism bids) were noted as drivers by stakeholders.

International shifts in practice (aside from the UNCRC) also appear to have impacts, such as the drive to recognise the voice of the patient in health service delivery (through the effects of the NHS Reform Act 2004), or the views of community members in planning. In these cases, CYP are not a particular focus but get potentially included within a desire to create a more participatory form of working. The risk here is that CYP do not gain recognition as rights holders alongside adults as a subgroup. In other cases, concerns over CYP as a minority group have given rise to the context within which an operational framework became possible (as in Wales after the Waterhouse 'Lost in Care' report drew attention to the needs of vulnerable CYP and incidents of abuse and neglect).

Across all frameworks, respondents were keen to note that there was a very important role for local 'champions' of CYP's participation, without whom the frameworks were likely to make much less of a difference (Stakeholder 8). One stakeholder said: "a great deal of it depends on the leadership of the organisation" (Stakeholder 4). Another said that, "basic training with staff in terms of raising awareness about young people's voice and influence of children's rights" (Stakeholder 3) was very important. A third said:

You must train professionals to understand the CRC [Convention on the Rights of the Child] and its implications for their practice. And they don't do it. This is not happening almost anywhere in the world, it's not happening. And so if you're going to get cultural change you need to begin to expose teachers, judges, doctors, nurses, psychologists, social workers, whatever, within an understanding of what the CRC means in its most profound sense.

Stakeholder 10

There was evidence of frameworks working with, but also beyond, a law-enforcement approach to CYP's participation. Stakeholders at times referred to legal requirements as being key or the 'bottom line' and good practice going beyond this.

[There are] different standards or duties to engage [with]. In the context of new equalities legislation, [...] you can't evidence you've met your equality duties without having engaged effectively with the people who you're affecting. And because we've now got the nine groups which included gender and race, that's all of us. That is every person in Scotland.

Stakeholder 7

Theme D: Positioning CYP in Frameworks: Child-led /intergenerational

As tables 2a and 2b (pages 30-31) demonstrate, frameworks sought to create different ends and used different means (through monitoring and evaluation for example, hereafter referred to as M&E) in terms of how adults would relate to CYP. Some organisations claimed that at least in some aspects of their work, they were 'child-led' but accepted that being child-led at all times seemed impossible or very challenging. One stakeholder noted that unlike in other contexts, "young people identify what it is that they want to talk about" and that "we do everything...as directed by the young people" (Stakeholder 9) but most stakeholders did not claim this degree of being 'child-led'. Other frameworks in use strategically sought out key spaces for intergenerational dialogue that respondents felt were cornerstones for their effectiveness. At local or national level, there were examples of all-age partnership approaches to planning and decision making that brought together lead adults (for example, heads of service or government ministers) with CYP. It was the structures that gave expression to the frameworks of participation that made these encounters possible (whether through SYP, local panels, or national assemblies).

Intergenerational working groups could be found in many diverse contexts. In one local authority, an intergenerational learning and teaching group involved equal numbers of staff and young people, for example. These two stakeholders made the same similar point about this feature of accountability for CYP in participatory practice:

Holding local and national politicians to account – requires a face-to-face encounter and structures for this.

Stakeholder 5

You can't hide if you've got a group of young people in front of you and they're asking you really direct questions.

Stakeholder 6

Theme E: Monitoring and Evaluating Participation

Frameworks also provide starting points for monitoring and evaluation of practice. M&E has been shown to be important since it improves the chances of programme objectives being met, and can show how participation impacts on CYP themselves, as well as on their families, and wider communities (Theis, 2003). M&E can thus help create an argument for the participation of CYP:

[M&E] will serve to lend weight to your argument [...] without an evidence base it's quite difficult to do that. [but] I don't think everybody has to undertake this process of monitoring and evaluation.

Stakeholder 10

More widely M&E can focus on the quality of the participation itself as well as whether it is an effective strategy when compared to other approaches. CYP's participation can also involve them in deciding what to monitor and how to monitor (Theis, 2003). There was evidence of outcomes-focused and

other aspects in the formal statements in frameworks as well as in adult interviewees' comments.

Some stakeholders felt the pressure from an audit culture of the need for a viable framework to "go beyond just a set of principles" (Stakeholder 3). Another felt that "everything must be outcome focused" (Stakeholder 5) and yet another noted, "there is some element...of having to report on how well they're doing" (Stakeholder 4). This last comment indicates the rising strength of an outcomes approach in many sectors.

Another conceptualisation of M&E is that it can be seen as a legal requirement of a duty bearer, the statutory body. One stakeholder longed for stronger legal requirement: "I believe that it should be enshrined in legislation and government should be made to do it" (Stakeholder 4). If this view is taken, then a perceived absence of a legal requirement can make M&E less of a priority. One stakeholder noted that "participation isn't statutory" (Stakeholder 6). Another felt that M&E was an impossible task and felt a standard could be a guide for better practice rather than as a tool for M&E: "the standards are not about monitoring or evaluation [...] There's no way somebody can go and audit all that" (Stakeholder 7).

In contrast, another conceptualisation found in the data is a rights-based approach to M&E. This approach sits in contrast to an outcomes approach driven by a desire to prove something works and in contrast to a needs based approach. Caitlin Scott, in a literature review¹ of child rights based monitoring and evaluation (Appendix 3, INTRAC, 2004), explains:

A rights-based approach is considered in much of the literature to be distinct from a needs based approach. The latter model has fallen out of favour in recent years due to its conceptualisation of children as passive, needy victims, without the will or capacity to act on their own behalf, and its failure to focus attention on the responsibility of adult society and institutions to protect and provide for the young. Hence, one of the best justifications for rights-based monitoring and evaluation is that it helps "to reinforce human rights standards, hold duty bearers accountable and strengthen participation and equity" (Theis 2003: 13). According to a rights-based approach the people involved are to be seen as active agents rather than passive beneficiaries.

(Scott, 2004, p. 63)

Not many stakeholders made this argument clearly in their interviews, perhaps reflecting a concern in the UK context with audit trails as the dominant discourse around M&E. In contrast to a needs-based approach, this stakeholder put forward a rights-based argument contrasting it to an effectiveness or outcomes-based model:

The right to be heard is the fundamental human right. It's about your citizenship and your dignity. [...] It should not be contingent on evidence that it works or produces particular outcomes.

Stakeholder 10

¹ Scott, Caitlin, 'Child Rights Based Monitoring Review'. Denmark: Save the Children Report, December 2004 (INTRAC)

Support for M&E was seen as important but it was seen as a time-consuming and resource-intensive task. Some advocated peer-to-peer approaches (as in a form of critical ally). Others focused on helping organisations do self-evaluation while others developed schemes for doing externally validated 'kitemarking'. Some approached M&E by arguing that it needed to focus on their specific service or activity (eg quality arts provision or the provision of an effective health service). For other organisations, it was their norm to involve CYP in generating an agenda for topics to address (inclusive of M&E).

Frameworks commonly took their 'standards' or principles as having attendant indicators or criteria (often expressed at various levels such as 'emerging' or 'developed'). These are offered to organisations for consideration in self- or externally-driven monitoring. These approaches sought to involve CYP in most cases.

For many organisations, the role of CYP in M&E is seen as a critical component that is core to the realisation of children's participation and their rights. Scott (cited in INTRAC, 2004) notes that the involvement of CYP in M&E is both a right in itself and a means to the realisation of further rights. This is because CYP involvement in M&E generates a place where CYP can work closely with adults to ensure that their voices and ideas have shorter term outcomes and longer term impacts. As such, M&E involving a dialogical and intergenerational dimension ensures not only that we go beyond tokenistic approaches to CYP's participation but that we get beyond solely offering adult-led, consultative approaches and move towards a more intergenerational and dialogical approach to changing services and transforming civic life. Scott (cited in INTRAC, 2004) suggests this needs to involve a shift from quantitative towards qualitative approaches; participatory and dialogical forms of M&E have the potential to open up what programmes and services for CYP might be for and how they are delivered.

In this area, there is a need for debate around what is to be monitored, by whom, and how. There is an element of complexity here since we can argue that CYP's participation and M&E can be both a form of a realisation of a right and a means to the realisation of further rights (perhaps for others in other times and places). Mostly, the evidence supports the internationally emerging view that rights-based programming for CYP will need a parallel form of participatory monitoring and evaluation however conceived. As Theis (2003, p. 13) puts it: "monitoring and evaluation offer valuable learning opportunities that can be used to strengthen stakeholder accountability. A rights-based evaluation is not just a technical exercise in data collection and analysis. It is a dialogue and a democratic process to learn from each other, to strengthen accountability and to change power relations between stakeholders."

Theme F: The Effects of Frameworks in Use

Stakeholders and frameworks both mentioned various effects of CYP's participation. These can be categorised into effects felt by CYP themselves,

on services, on adults, on the organisations, on wider society, relations between CYP and adults, which are in line with other studies (see Kirby and Bryson, 2004). But this study also reveals the important role of *places* in the realisation of CYP's participation.

Stakeholders were clear about effects on CYP themselves. On CYP:

It's made significant improvements to the lives of young people.

Stakeholder 3

For the children who actually engage in the process, the level of personal development I think they are a very large pay off.

Stakeholder 10

The effects on CYP were not just personal and social development related. They were also politically framed in terms of empowerment and rights realised:

I think that there's absolutely no question that empowering children to speak to be heard and to create spaces where they can, can articulate what's happening to them is one of the most effective ways of removing impunity from people who abuse and hurt children. So I think in terms of child protection it's absolutely imperative.

Stakeholder 10

I think there's also, of course, the sort of general rights argument.

Stakeholder 9

Services are seen to improve through CYP's participation. One stakeholder felt that "if they involve young people at the right stage in their planning, they may have a better outcome in their service" (Stakeholder 6). Another claimed that "it's lead to significant changes in how organisations deliver their services" (Stakeholder 3). A third said "I think you get better decisions" (Stakeholder 9). Better services as an outcome also related to impacts on organisation-wide culture for some: "the work becomes richer for it, everything becomes stronger and richer and deeper because of it" (Stakeholder 2).

Parents, carers, community members and professionals also were seen to be affected by CYP's involvement in decision making. These effects took the form of changed perceptions of CYP's capabilities and needs, the gaining of new professional understandings and skills, and enhanced job satisfaction. For example:

The parents were extraordinarily impressed by skills and confidence and abilities that their children demonstrated that they hadn't conceived they could have.

Stakeholder 10

People [...] have perhaps maybe underestimated what a young person's perspective on something could be. So they come in, you know, you'll get remarks like 'wow that, that was such a mature analysis of that'.

Stakeholder 2

It can benefit those working with young people, improve the greatest job satisfaction. Better understanding of the needs of young people. It increases their knowledge and skills in relation to, you know, well what children need. Stakeholder 3

It changes the adults' understanding of what young people are capable for as a start. So we're starting to meet a lot of our outcomes that we've focused on around changing perceptions of young people and building positive images of young people. Stakeholder 6

There were also positive effects for others and for the realisation of a more democratic ethos and "an understanding of reciprocity, citizenship, accountability, democratic process" (Stakeholder 10) in the organisations and cultures. For some organisations, "by focusing in on children and young people it's allowed them to [become aware] more widely in terms of their other service users as well" (Stakeholder 3).

Unsurprisingly, with effects like these on adult professionals and carers, there are attendant effects on the organisations involved too. In particular, this effect often took the form of changed relations between CYP and adults because the gained more respect for each other or realised new relations of care and control were possible.

Lastly, there was evidence on how *places* needed to be differently ordered for CYP's participation to be realised. What we notice here is that CYP's participation happens some 'where':

Pupils are bussed in to school in the morning. So young people still can't really use those spaces in the evening [for meetings]. Stakeholder 6

So that the goal is to create spaces where children can be heard and engage directly with policy makers at the local level. [...] Children are in a different place and will, and will continue to need quite high levels of adult facilitation and support and collaboration [...] children want and are looking to adults. Not to dictate the terms but, but to create spaces where they can collaborate and where they can be in partnership and where they can get support. Stakeholder 10

Theme G: Tensions Involved in Designing and Using Frameworks

In this last section, the inherent tensions found in frameworks and their uses are drawn together. The brief commentaries are informed by stakeholder views and the analysis that preceded. These six tensions are not an exhaustive list. Nor are they necessarily resolvable; some of these tensions are perhaps core to the practice of engaging in a participatory way across intergenerational boundaries.

1. Being for CYP's Participation vs Being for All Age Participation

As we have seen, CYP's participation can be addressed by frameworks that are designated for this age group or by these dedicated to the whole population. Frameworks that had explicitly used child-friendly language tended to be those that were designed with CYP in mind. Simplicity was important to some: "we deliberately avoided the 'Hear by Right' style

because it's too detailed for what young people wanted". Interestingly, the analysis of the community engagement and health related frameworks is instructional in helping us realise that CYP's participation needs to connect to wider civic debates and activism related to race, gender and disability for example. However, most of the stakeholders, perhaps expectedly, argued for a framework discretely for CYP. One stakeholder was minded to note:

I think the difference for children is that they have a uniquely different status. They do not have autonomy in the way that adults have. [...] And children are, you know, required to be in education and they are economically dependent on adults and so on and so forth. They don't have rights to independent decision making. They don't have a right to vote and so on. So children have a unique legal status in society. And therefore the understanding and participation has a different meaning for them in many senses. And therefore I think that there is a legitimate cause for differentiating.

Stakeholder 10

2. Advocacy Tool vs Developmental Tool

The tension here is between employing a framework as a rhetorical tool to *advocate* for new practices in a wider array of service provider organisations, and the more practical *developmental use* of a framework within a given organisational setting through a variety of practices (such as use of toolkits, training, and processes of monitoring and evaluation). Both approaches seek to 'drive up practice' as one stakeholder put it, but do so in different ways. At one extreme, the advocacy approach leaves organisations to do the work of putting frameworks to use. Other stakeholders noted they get involved in doing light touch support work for frameworks to be put to use: "our approach is very much to stand alongside them" (Stakeholder 4). A more developmental approach involves directly engaging with organisations through, for example, training and evaluation processes. As another stakeholder said, "by doing self assessment, it's an educative task for them" (Stakeholder 1). The developmental approaches taken by Hear by Right, however, demonstrate how this work can be very resource-intensive, requiring staffing for training and external evaluation process for those wishing to use the framework in the desired programmatic way. In practice, various levels of support are possible from stakeholders of frameworks and their organisations.

3. Statutory Body as Watchdog vs (I)NGO² partnership or consortium

Following on from the last debate, there is the tension between structuring, leading and housing a national framework within a nationally funded body of some form (akin to SYP or Funky Dragon) or having the framework led by some form of consortium of NGOs and other bodies supported at more of an arm's length by government funds. As in the case of Northern Ireland, with support there is the scope to engage CYP in the corridors of power in

² INGO stands for International Non-Governmental Organisation. NGO stands for Non-Governmental Organisation.

local and national public bodies. However, this access is not so well assured as with frameworks more directly managed by government. There are consequences in the design of a framework for how the lead organisations are resourced in order to adequately support its onward use. Various models exist even within the UK. The international approach to monitoring and evaluating practice is funded by the Oak Foundation and involves voluntary participation for example. But there are signs that international approaches are becoming more acceptable and expected.

4. Being Child-led vs Being Intergenerational

No framework for CYP could argue for being adult-led in all its practices. Hence the tension sits along a continuum between being child-led (at least in some respects or as a key aspiration) and being more directly focused on creating intergenerational dialogical places of decision making.

This tension is expressed in many ways in frameworks. As we have seen, different frameworks ('in use') drew upon different the theoretical guiding principles that connected, had different age-related structures (boards of trustees, CYP as advisors, for example), and sought out different forms of decision making environments where younger and or older could meet and share power.

Some actively sought out contexts (at local and national level) where meaningful intergenerational dialogues might be possible. Some argued that these contexts needed to be within the 'normal working arrangements' for these various (often adult-led) organisations (such as schools, local authorities, hospitals etc). Either way, this work is destined to be difficult at times but likely to bear rich rewards. Some stakeholders were at pains at times to express the challenges here:

Generally we're, I think we're quite far off the mark. I think the [organisations] are, they're hierarchical by their nature. And that makes participation really, really challenging.

Stakeholder 6

They will not do it even when it is legislated – falls off the agenda.

Stakeholder 4

Speaking of another setting, stakeholder 6 said: You come into [the organisation] and you think 'how on earth would you expect a young person to engage in this machine?'"

Nolas' (2011) analysis may be instructional here. She contrasts a 'transactional' with a 'relational' approach to participation (though accepts that these probably coexist in most contexts). In relational approaches, 'interests' are generated in an emergent way through experiential approaches. Transactional approaches, in contrast, are one-directional because they are driven by the needs of the experts to find out recipients' views. This latter approach risks a failure of engagement for CYP in real acts of citizenship. Whether a framework seeks to be child-led or intergenerational, taking a relational approach may be worthwhile to counter this risk.

5. Bespoke & Contextualised vs Generic Model

Here the tension is between considering the problems to be so different in schools, hospitals, communities and other settings that what is required are various frameworks of participation or some mechanism for ensuring CYP are not forgotten in existing models. There are, for example, on-going efforts to revitalise school councils, and we might argue this is a discrete area of concern that needs its own bespoke and targeted approach, given the nature of participation within learning organisations.

In part, the tension is also related to a question of where to start: Is it better to target a service (such as education or health and to devise bespoke approaches) or to offer a generic model? Similarly we can ask, is it more opportune to start with public sector or with all charged with working with CYP? One stakeholder remarked that many professionals are working [in] government departments across entire services and many which are not solely dedicated to children and young people. A nationally agreed framework (including or not including toolkits, training, support staff and the like) is likely only to be a functional response if it is sufficiently flexible and adaptable for use in local settings. Having both local practice responses (and therefore local frameworks for these responses) as well as a form of national framework is perhaps the best result one might hope for. There are other factors that might drive the consideration of an 'off the peg' framework, since stakeholders nationally and internationally are keen for more international standardisation and some way of making comparison across national boundaries (and potentially feeding into international rights monitoring mechanisms).

6. Downward Accountability vs Upward Accountability

This area of tension refers to the possible desire to use a framework by a duty bearer (service provider or government body) to ensure CYP's rights are attended to from a position of 'power with' CYP (downward accountability) or from a position of authority over CYP's services and their associated professionals (upward accountability). Here, a government may wish to demand professionals act in a legally enforced way and account for their actions. One stakeholder wished for "systematically comparable information across Scotland" (Stakeholder 1) that might do just this. Many stakeholders conceded that this is a necessary approach. Yet, CYP's participation, when seen as a right-based activity, needs also to be an important force for change through creating places for intergenerational dialogue where accountability is towards criteria CYP generate themselves; accountability in that case moves back down to CYP.

Another way of working with this tension is perhaps to see flows of accountability in both directions and being inclusive of intergenerational and reciprocal accountability (when duties and rights are held by both generations). This approach can allow us to see this tension as sustainable and maybe even welcome. Other theorists have argued that this relational form of accountability does not at the outset have clearly defined goals or

purposes (since the very process of participation will derive these). This tension can be framed as the desire to making intergenerational cultural change happen in practice on the ground often in unexpected ways (involving reciprocal intergenerational accountability) while, *at the same time*, wishing to create comparable and systematic reporting procedures for reporting to people in authority (upward accountability). This tension may be one that is unavoidable to some extent, but it is worth noting that the tension is inherent in a given framework through noticing where the main burden of scrutiny lies and if and when CYP have a role in this (if this is appropriate). One stakeholder noted that “You’ve got to be continually coming back to the group of people you’ve made a commitment to work with on a consultative and participatory basis and get their check in” (Stakeholder 2).

Section 3 – Summary

1. The contexts

The contexts for CYP's participation now span many fields including health, welfare, education, entertainment and leisure, as well as other local and national services and provisions. CYP's participation is advanced and supported by frameworks of participation when (a) CYP are the recipients of public services (for example, education), (b) when they are indirectly the recipients of services or are affected by services (for example as members of families who receive health services), and (c) as members of the general public (for example, as road users). In private service contexts too CYP's participation needs to be supported via frameworks. This complexity points to the fact that 'frameworks-in-use' are features of a very varied landscape of CYP's participatory cultures in Scotland, the UK and internationally.

Evidence from this research and from other studies strongly suggests that in the right context (with the right principles, theoretical understanding, policy and legal drivers, supports, structures, CYP's champions, and resources) frameworks of participation can play a vital role.

2. Elements of participation

The research has shown that frameworks of CYP's participation in practice usage differ in their aims and goals, remits, approaches to monitoring and evaluation, and structures, yet all have many similar principles and operational practices, even if these are applied with varying levels of rigour. These elements include:

Overarching principles:

- equal opportunities for inclusive, voluntary participation
- respect for CYP's rights and differences
- transparency and accountability in decision making
- intergenerational power sharing
- relevance of content, purpose and outcome

Operational practice:

- safe practice
- child-friendly approaches
- training and capacity building for adults and CYP
- involvement of CYP in relevant governance practices
- liaison and dialogue with relevant and influential adults
- internal and external monitoring and evaluation of progress
- involvement of CYP in monitoring and evaluation
- feedback mechanisms for the wider public

3. Wider influences

Frameworks of CYP's participation are influenced by wider cultural forces and through their use, influence these wider cultures. In practice, frameworks of participation need, and at the same time seek to create:

- A. times and places for engagement by CYP among themselves and with adults
- B. a reorientation of the professional in types of social service in private, voluntary and public arenas
- C. a widening of who can participate in the sphere of citizen engagement, and
- D. (arising from a, b and c,) new relations among children, their families, the wider adult public, politicians, policy makers, and service providers.

This substantial agenda requires, therefore, a realignment of many activities to support the construction of more equitable, participatory futures for CYP.

This review shows that frameworks of participation have a key role to play in the enactment of more participatory structures and practices but need to be seen as part of a wider shift in child-adult relations and practices. As one stakeholder said: "frameworks alone are 'not a silver bullet' but they may encourage progress" (Stakeholder 7).

4. Key questions for CYP participation

This research has used one way of comparing and reviewing frameworks of participation. The approach taken suggests some key questions that an organisation may wish to consider in reviewing its approach to CYP's participation. These questions also serve as the basis of an inquiry into the efficacy of any particular framework-in-use in an individual context, and a way for external parties to scaffold the development of frameworks-in-use.

The key questions are:

- What are the purposes of a given framework for CYP's participation? Are these the right purposes for this context? [For example, we could consider community health as a key outcome in one context while pupils' education might be a goal in another].
- What principles and practices are found in the use of a given framework? Are these comprehensive enough? Do they reflect what is needed in this context? Are they expressed in practice?
- What is the reach (geographical, population) of the practices the framework gives rise to? Is the reach sufficiently extensive or appropriately delimited?
- What, if any, are the key theoretical drivers behind the framework in use? What are the effects of these and are these effects appropriate?
- What are the local and wider effects of the framework and its uses in this context? What approach to monitoring and evaluation of effects and outcomes is taken? Are CYP involved?
- To what extent does the framework strive to be child-led or to strive for new forms of intergenerational dialogue, or both?

5. Interactions and Tensions

The analysis shows how various features of frameworks interact, have efficacy, and give rise to some generic tensions that appear almost in-built into framework principles, structures and practices. A key task for the future will be to assist organisations in considering how in-built tensions play out in various contexts. These tensions include whether:

- the context seeks to advance participation for all ages (as in the case of health services) or to attend to younger age populations
- a framework is sought to mainly work as a rhetorical tool to advocate for CYP's participation, or as a more practical developmental tool with its own staffing, training, and other support mechanisms
- the framework will operate and be monitored within a statutory context, be supported by charities or non-governmental organisations, or in corporate contexts
- the overarching goal is to be child-led or to work towards some new form of intergenerational dialogical practice
- the framework context requires a bespoke structures and cultures of practice or can be a generic model employable in a variety of contexts
- the framework in use can allow for downward accountability to CYP, upward accountability to adults, or some reciprocal flow of accountability in both directions

6. A new national framework

By looking in some depth at a number of frameworks, the research reminds us that all frameworks of CYP's participation are socio-culturally and historically located in their specific contexts. Frameworks, in fact, do not exist outside of their operational context. The implication of this is that any effort to devise a new national framework would also necessarily be a product of its place and time. It is worth noting that many existing frameworks have widespread take-up and tend to have long histories of support from a wide range of organisations; it is therefore unlikely that organisations with habitual use of existing frameworks will wish to change their practice. In addition, frameworks that have operational approaches to monitoring and evaluation required funds to enact these processes and staff to steer them. This leads to a question about whether a new national framework of CYP's participation needs to be devised, to what end, and the factors affecting its adaptation for use in a variety of settings.

One view is that such a new national framework could viably provide a sounding board or watertest for organisations to better understand their own process of involving children and young people in a participatory way and assist them in evaluating the outcomes and effectiveness of their work in this area (perhaps using some of the questions and tensions outlined in this report). A possible purpose of a national framework, therefore, would be to act as a scaffolding for organisations wishing to employ, devise and

operate a framework of their own or to adapt for use some extant framework.

This research suggests that the creation and deployment of a national 'scaffolding' framework could usefully have impact if it could effectively provide guidance to organisations on the construction, ingredients, effects, use, and processes involved in using local frameworks of participation. Such a 'meta-framework' could scaffold local structures of participation by providing an overarching view on what an operational framework of participation might need to include (drawing in part on 2, above for example), what inherent tensions might be expected (see pp 19-22), and what issues organisations might like to consider to enact effective monitoring and evaluation with CYP (see pp 16-18 *et passim*).

7. Wider intergenerational context

This research points towards new trajectories and new openings by considering frameworks of CYP's participation in a wider intergenerational context. Evidence suggest that forms of participation and intergenerational dialogue are required for CYP's participation Evidence from this research suggests this idea has more widespread backing in principle now among professionals than in the past (even if professional understanding of the consequences of this may be lacking).

There is also a greater understanding of how legal support across various service delivery contexts supports the process. But CYP's participation has been shown to have far-reaching effects well beyond those felt by CYP themselves and the services they directly receive.

A wider context – the emergence of participatory civil society – frames the participation of CYP in a more intergenerational and relational way. In a relational approach to CYP's participation, 'interests' are generated in an emergent way through intergenerational experiences enabled by CYP's participation in new times and places. Interestingly, these interests may not solely be owned by the younger or older age cohort. Yet, many still view CYP's participation as a one-directional process driven by the needs of adults to find out CYP's views and respond to them. Whether a framework seeks to be child-led or intergenerational, taking a relational approach may be worthwhile to counter this risk.

8. Ethos of change

Formal statements built into frameworks of participation showed us that CYP's participation needs to be underpinned by a strong democratic and participatory ethos of change. While CYP's participation in democracy is a foundation, its inclusive realisation within cultural practice is also the goal. The evidence here suggests that putting in place legal imperatives to drive forward CYP's participation will be necessary but insufficient for stretching professionals into taking on a rights-based agenda: addressing (perceived and actual) needs through participation is not the same as addressing rights through intergenerational dialogues.

Final Comments

There are some interesting challenges ahead, however, that are not to be underestimated. Evidence suggests that the potential for any framework lies in how effectively it is used, and this is dependent on resourcing.

The harnessing of principles, toolkits and monitoring and evaluation approaches needs considerable support, including a widespread approach to staff development for those working with CYP (directly and indirectly) in order to shift away from a needs based approach to a rights based one involving intergenerational dialogue.

Without these supports across all services, we run the risk of not attending to the rights of CYP found in the UN Convention. It is not surprising to hear that many organisations that do not currently attend in a robust way to CYP's rights to participate. But even those that are committed to CYP's participation in decision making face many challenges in enacting the changes they seek. The role that frameworks of participation play in this has been shown to be important but so too do organisations that look across these practices and attempt to steer or orient them in new ways.

The evidence suggests that CYP's participation is slowly becoming 'everybody's business' as is the imperative to engage in some form of monitoring and evaluation. There was evidence that organisations that seek to engage marginalised adult subgroups are likely too to consider CYP as relevant participants. The reverse is also evidenced in the cases reviewed: some stakeholders suggested that attending to CYP's participation can have knock-on effects helping professionals, organisations and wider cultural change. In this way, the argument for frameworks for all-age participation 'in the round' may release wider forms of engagement along with the potential for the creation of new forms of social capital and intergenerational reciprocal learning of many kinds. Yet, many stakeholders took time to emphasise that CYP's participation would be best advanced by discrete approaches and frameworks for this age group since their status in society was distinctive and required this form of attention. Frameworks of participation may, in some contexts, need to take account both of CYP's distinctive position in society, while also becoming aligned with wider participatory and democratic civic practice.

One thing is clear from stakeholders' views. Due consideration of CYP's participation in decision making is less of a checklist for organisations to attend to, and more of a journey towards organisational change that requires a radical shift in thinking and programming by adults. Taking on this work will likely result in the creation of new places and times for CYP's participation (be this child-led or more intergenerational). Perhaps, initially, the organisations that seek to go on this journey will also likely be the ones that are either focused already on CYP's rights and needs in the round. But there are signs that, as an outcomes-based appraisal culture expands, more forms of monitoring and evaluation will inexorably result in new practices advancing many new forms of CYP's participation. Without a clear steer from leadership in this area, we may find that the desired

unexpected effects of CYP's participation are less easy to spot in the rush to consult CYP on pre-ordained adult-led outcomes.

Supported frameworks, especially those that afford forms of child-led agenda setting, have a role in voicing CYP's views that might otherwise not get aired. But child-only spaces will serve to cut off CYP from most key decision making arenas. Thus, finding places and times for effective intergenerational dialogical approaches have been shown to be key aspects of the functioning of all frameworks (even those seeking to be more 'child-led').

For all stakeholders, this intergenerational dialogical encounter was key to challenging and changing these organisational cultures towards taking more account of CYP as participants in the decision making processes. Intergenerational dialogical encounters were also central to the creation of new criteria and processes of monitoring and evaluation.

The findings 'speak back' to existing empirical and theoretical work in this area too. Kirby et al. (2003) suggest the following three types of purpose:

- A. practical benefits to services
- B. citizenship and social inclusion
- C. personal and social development.

However, evidence here supports commentators' (Mannion, 2007; Percy-Smith and Thomas, 2010) views that we may be missing some key purposes of children's participation: the prospect of changed relations between children and adults, and through this, changed roles for adults in children's organisations within newly formed places of child-adult engagement. In line with this therefore, we will also attend to the role of place and of adults in framework design and use within organisations. This is because this study among others has shown that adults are key players and gatekeepers of the sites of CYP's participation, and hence 'place' (and the practices that are made possible there) also plays a role in how participation ensues (see Mannion, 2009; Mannion and Adey, 2011; Mannion, Adey and Lynch, 2010).

Lastly, children's participation requires explicit outcomes for adults (parents, carers, staff), organisations and communities and wider civic society if it is to have sustained impact.

As we have seen, some key tensions appear to be in-built into how frameworks operate. One of these tensions surrounds the need to attend to the role of CYP (see Johnson, 2010). Cooke and Kothari (2001) point out that we must avoid the attendant risk of placing too much of a burden on children through participatory methods. As Shier (2010) cautions, CYP's participation is complex and the contexts for participation are varied; for this reason, frameworks need to attend to how flexible and adaptable they can be for use in various practice contexts.

References

- Badham, B., Wade, H., (2008) *Hear by Right: Standards framework for the participation of children and young people*. The NYA/LGA.
- Cooke, B. & Kothari, U. (Eds.) (2001) *Participation the New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Cutler, D. (2003) *Standard! Organisational standards and young people's participation in public decision making*. London: Carnegie Young People Initiative.
- Hart, R. (1992) *Children's Participation: from Tokenism to Citizenship*. UNICEF.
- INTRAC (International NGO and Training and Research Centre) (2004) *Child Rights Based Monitoring Review*. Denmark: Save the Children.
- Johnson, V. (2010) *Changing Contexts of Children and Young People's Participation in Evaluation*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Central Lancashire.
- Kirby P, & Bryson S (2004) *Measuring the Magic? Evaluating and researching young people's participation in public decision-making*. Carnegie Young People Initiative.
- Kirby, P., Lanyon. C., Cronin, K., & Sinclair, R., (2003). *Building a Culture of Participation, Involving children and young people in policy, service planning, delivery and evaluation*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
- Lansdown, G (2005) *Can you hear me?: the right of children to participate in decisions that affect them*. Working Paper 36. The Hague: Bernard van Leer Foundation.
- Lansdown, G. (2011) *Global: A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating Children's Participation*. A preparatory draft for piloting by Save the Children, together with UNICEF, Plan and World Vision.
- Mannion, G. (2003) *Children's participation in school grounds developments: creating a place for education that promotes children's social inclusion*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp 175-192.
- Mannion, G. and I'Anson, J. (2004) *Beyond the Disneyesque: children's participation, spatiality and adult-child relations*. *Childhood*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 303-18.
- Mannion, G. (2007) *Going Spatial, Going Relational: Why 'listening to children' and children's participation needs reframing*. *Discourse*, Vol. 28, No. 3, September 2007 Special Issue on Pupil Voice in Educational Research, pp. 405 – 420.
- Mannion, G. (2009) *After participation: the socio-spatial performance of intergenerational becoming*. In B. Percy-Smith & N. Thomas (Eds) *A Handbook of Children's Participation: perspectives from theory and practice*. London: Taylor and Francis.

- Mannion, G. Adey, C. and Lynch, J. (2010) *Intergenerational, Place-based Education: where schools, communities and nature meet*. Report to Scottish Centre for Intergenerational Practice.
- Mannion, G. and Adey, C. (2011). "Place-Based Education Is an Intergenerational Practice." *Children, Youth and Environments* 21(1): 35-58.
- Nolas, S-M. (2011) Reflections on the enactment of children's participation rights through research: between transactional and relational spaces. *Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol. 33, Number 7, pp 1196-1201.
- O'Kane, C. (2011) *GLOBAL: Toolkit for Creating a Step Change in Monitoring and Evaluating Children's Participation*. Save the Children.
- Percy-Smith, B. & Thomas, N. (2010) *A handbook of children and young people's participation: Perspectives from theory and practice*. Oxon/NY: Routledge.
- Shier, H. (2001) Pathways to Participation: Openings, opportunities and obligations. *Children and Society*, Vol. 15, Number 2, 2001, pp 107-117.
- Shier, H. (2010) Children as Actors: Navigating the Tensions. *Children and Society*, Vol. 24, pp. 24-37.
- Theis, Joachim (2003), 'Rights-based Monitoring and Evaluation', *Save the Children Discussion Paper*.
- Treseder, P. (1997), *Empowering Children and Young People*. Children's Rights Office and SCF.
- Wright P., Turner C., Clay D. and Mills H. (2006), *The Participation of Children and Young People in Developing Social Care*. Social Care Institute for Excellence.

Appendix 1 – Methodology

Phase 1: Enquiry into Participation Frameworks

Selecting Frameworks for Analysis

In order to consider a variety of frameworks of participation, the project steering group generated an initial list of possible sectors and organisation types within which frameworks of participation would be extant. The research includes frameworks that were all-age focused as well as frameworks that were specific to children and young people ('CYP'). A limited number of frameworks were considered for scrutiny premised on the view that there are large similarities between many frameworks, that some frameworks are already widely used, and that there are a number of other existing reviews and a body of writing and theoretical consideration on the area. For these reasons, it was agreed that a worthwhile degree of analytical saturation would arise from looking at a small number of frameworks in line with the timeframe and the purposes of the research.

In practice, we made a list of some 18 organisations working with frameworks of their own or leading as support organisations for frameworks and their use more widely. As the research progressed, ten were selected for closer scrutiny to allow for local Scottish, regional UK and international experience of framework use. The frameworks were also selected to allow us to gain from experience from across educational, arts-based, health-related domains as well as across third sector organisations (NGOs, International NGOs, charities), governmental and other statutory bodies.

For the desk-based enquiry into frameworks, data were collected on how each framework attempted to address the scope (What is being done?), quality (How is it being done?) and effects or outcomes (What is being achieved?) of CYP's participation (Lansdown, 2011) through considering the:

- definitions of participation (what are the frameworks' scope and purposes)
- principles (for example safety, transparency, or educational development, inclusiveness, equity),
- key elements (for example, levels and standards, and the specification of criteria for evaluation),
- processes of implementation (timing, places of participation, meetings, etc)
- measures, indicators and measurement (process measures and summative measures, levels of attainment),
- the manner of the accounting for types and levels of participation (typologies, ladders, levels, etc),

- models of evaluation (for example, child advisory groups, focus groups)
- types of outcomes considered (outcomes for children, staff, parents, organisations, community, intergenerational relations)
- adaptability, usability and transferability (whether these frameworks can be made locally meaningful in a given context in diverse contexts such as care homes, youth clubs or schools).

Analysis of Frameworks

The analysis of frameworks was informed by two areas of concern. The first concern was to find a way to scrutinise existing frameworks to assist in comparing them so that this would assist in answering the research questions. A pilot analysis of one framework generated an initial set of framework elements (for example, 'Principles') that were later added to and applied to the entire set of frameworks. This allows for a comparison of these elements. 13 cross-framework elements were settled upon and used in short 1-page analyses of each of the ten frameworks. In line with the research questions and research aims, the elements chosen included 'monitoring and evaluation' and the 'role of CYP' in framework use. The analysis of frameworks was supported by both the interviews and the desktop study of on-line documents that described the frameworks in question. Including additional elements of 'challenges', 'opportunities' and 'comment' allowed a more interpretive use of qualitative data generated in relevant interviews that could be harnessed into these summary analyses.

Phase 2: Interviews with Stakeholders

Telephone interviews were planned for the enquiry alongside a desktop study of frameworks. These were seen to be valuable because they would provide stakeholder views on the way the frameworks had been developed within these organisational settings, the benefits and challenges of their use, and other factors affecting approaches to monitoring and evaluation. In addition, there would be an opportunity in interviews to request comment from these key stakeholders on what they considered appropriate for Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People to consider in any development of a national framework in Scotland.

Initially, the plan was to conduct three telephone interviews in line with the timescale and budget for the work. Having conducted these, the researcher felt that the analysis was considerably enhanced by the interview process. In consultation with Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People research steering team, it was agreed to increase the scope to include a new minimum target of eight telephone stakeholder interviews. In practice, a list of 16 possible respondents was generated. 12 of these possible respondents were contacted for interview. Ten interviews were conducted. (All 12 agreed to be interviewed but two of these had made contact too late in the project's lifetime for their inclusion.)

Within the scope and timing of the study, it was impossible to consult directly with CYP in any viable manner. However, attention was paid to adults' impressions of their concerns and agency in the use of frameworks.

To structure the interviews, a schedule of questions was created for the respondents to consider, where possible in advance of the interview. Questions were framed that allowed enquiry into respondents' sense of:

- A. the rationale for the choice of framework / how it came to be used
- B. the purposes of its use
- C. any informing principles or theories
- D. the main effects and outcomes
- E. the methods and tools used to evaluate progress
- F. the process of involving CYP in this work
- G. the kinds of challenges and opportunities they experience (e.g. participation of key minority groups or younger children) and how they overcome them
- H. any comment they would make as informants for the work of Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People in this area.

In covering these areas (A-F) reference was made to Wright et al's (2006) set of four important interconnected areas of CYP's participation:

1. Culture: the ethos of an organisation
2. Structure: the planning, development and resourcing of participation evident in an organisation's infrastructures
3. Practice: the ways of working, methods for involvement, skills and knowledge which enable CYP to become involved
4. Review: the monitoring and evaluation systems which enable an organisation to evidence change affected by CYP's participation.

These four areas interrelated with (A) – (F) (in the above) and formed the basis of the semi-structured telephone interview.

Interview Data Analysis

All interviews were fully transcribed by a professional research support worker. The audio files were listened to by the researcher and used as supporting and triangulated evidence for the analysis of the selected frameworks. Subsequently, the digital transcripts of the interviews were analysed using the cross-framework themes (generated by the desktop analysis of the frameworks in phase 1).

Structure of the Analysis

The analysis of frameworks is structured by:

- A. Describing and analysing how each of these ten frameworks are structured and used attending to the following elements:
 - Remit and background
 - Structures
 - Role of CYP in the framework / organisation
 - Overarching rationale
 - Scope of Decision Making
 - Principles
 - Main Outcomes Sought
 - Monitoring and Evaluation
 - Role of CYP in monitoring and evaluating
 - Criteria
 - Opportunities
 - Challenges
 - Comment
- B. Providing a cross-framework summary comparison in tabular format.
- C. Analysing the data from the desktop study and the interviews via themes and tensions that emerged.
- D. In the conclusion, there is a summary of some of the key ideas and a discussion of some consequences.

Ethics

Respondents from the selected organisations were provided opportunity to give informed consent both orally and in writing. Anonymity, and a degree of non-traceability were offered to interview respondents; this was ensured by using no identifiers in the data from interviews (only identifying each respondent as a 'stakeholder') and by drawing together selected extracts from many different interviews on a thematic basis. Full transcripts and the names of those interviewed remained with the individual author and researcher at the University of Stirling throughout the research. This proposal was subject to scrutiny through being submitted to the Stirling School of Education's ethics committee for approval.

Where possible, the analysis for each organisation's framework was shared with the respondents after the interview for further comment and confirmation for accuracy. The report itself was also shared with respondents before a final version was decided upon.

The researcher had undergone Disclosure Scotland clearance. The British Educational Research Association's ethical code was adhered to as a minimum requirement. No children or young people were involved directly in the study and the work was conducted in a manner that complied with the procedures of Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People.

Appendix 2 – Cross-Framework Analysis

In this section, there is a summary comparison of the frameworks. In this cross-framework comparison, the focus is on solely eight (of the total 10) frameworks. These eight were chosen for cross-framework comparison because they are the ones most obviously in use *across service types and in varied contexts*.

Tables 2a and 2b, below, presents a summary comparison of aspects in two main areas:

- Main Features (Statements of standards or principles, Reach, Guiding theory, Distinctive Drivers, Key Outcomes)
- Structures for Development, Monitoring and Evaluation (the availability of toolkits, training, self- and external monitoring, CYP's involvement and engagement in M&E).

Table 2a

Comparing Frameworks – Main Features						
	Statement of standards	Reach	Guiding theory	Distinctive driver	Key Outcome sought	CYP focussed
2. Involved	Aims (4), Objectives (2), Values (4) & principles (4)	Regional / Local Authority	'Star' model (after Treseder)	LA commitment	Improved services, responsive realisation of rights	Yes
4 Hear by Right	7 Sets of standards and 49 indicators	UK – widely used	Hart's (1992) ladder	Voluntary – many services	Improved services through realisation of rights	Yes
5 Ask First (N.I.)	8 Principles + 32 'actions'	Northern Ireland – public bodies	UNCRC	Public Authorities +Section 75	Children active in public policy decision making	Yes
6. Funky Dragon (Wales)	11 Principles	Regional UK - centralised	Treseder's (1997) model + UNCRC	Assembly – inclusive democracy	Improved services; realised CYP rights	Yes
7. Scottish Health Council	3 Standards + 16 criteria	Scotland	Patient led services	NHS indicators procedure	Improved health and wellbeing	Viably
8. Community Engagement Standards (Scotland)	10 Standards	Scotland	Empowerment of community	Government support	Empowerment for communities	Viably
9. Scottish Youth Parliament	Implicit in aims	National SYP and local area forums	Hart's ladder	Devolved government	CYP participate in political process	Yes
10. International M&E Project	2 areas: context, and quality & outcomes	International	UNCRC	Voluntary	Realisation of children's rights	Yes

Table 2b

Comparing Frameworks – Structures for Development, Monitoring & Evaluation						
	+ supporting toolkit	+ support training	+ self-monitoring	+ external monitoring	+ kitemark / awards scheme	CYP with a role in M&E
2. Involved		At local level	Embedded in LA plans	As part of LA systems		Yes. Intergenerational encounter
4 Hear by Right	Extensive tools	Available	Yes – three levels	External scheme	Yes. A costed scheme.	Yes. Child-led
5 Ask First (N.I.)	Seeks development	For Public Authorities	With external support	Via CYP commissioner	A linked scheme	Yes. intergenerational encounter
6. Funky Dragon (Wales)	Various resources	Support as key to inclusion	Yes	Acts as Assembly watchdog	A linked scheme	Yes. child-led monitoring
7. Health Council of Scotland	Toolkit	Yes	Yes – four levels	NHS indicators and local evaluation		Adult-led. Potential for CYP
8. Community Engagement	Pack called 'Voice'	Yes	Yes	Has used case studies		Adult-led. Potential for CYP
9. Scottish Youth Paliament		Yes	Yes	Does internal evaluation		Yes. M&E of the SYP process. Child-led
10. International M&E Project	Extensive toolkit	Seen as key	Yes – extensive framework	In train as part of M&E project		Child-led & intergenerational encounter

Appendix 3 – Individual Framework Analyses

Table 3

	1. Macrobert Arts Centre – A local arts organisation approach to CYP's participation
Remit and background	Arts centre began in 1971. In the past, arts centres generally not seen as accessible to younger audiences. CYP a focus after 1992.
Structures	Creation of 'Young Consultants' group aged 7-18. This group was influential in shaping the provision. Now groups of CYP also apply and act as 'Co-commissioners' working alongside adults creating briefs, shortlisting and programming.
Role of CYP	CYP seen as participants in arts provision, and as partners in organisation change and management.
Overarching Rationale	To provide quality experiences that stimulate expression, entertain and free the imagination within a welcoming, open and flexible environment. Macrobert tries to make children and adults equally welcome but particularly reaches out to children and their families by presenting and working with film, the visual arts, drama, dance, music and new technology.
Decision Making Scope	Over time, CYP have been involved in decisions about refurbishing the building (eg signage), regular and special festival programming, ancillary services (eg a place to 'chill', park buggies, food menus etc), designing communications (a magazine). Management expect CYP's to become more focused on arts aspects as this is seen as core business: artistic decision making.
Principles	There is a 'Children's Charter' (based on UNCRC) and a 'Children's Promise'. Mentions respect, listening, equality, non-discrimination, accessibility, meeting children's needs and needs of families (including the very young).
Outcomes Sought	Richer and deeper arts programmes drawing on and reflective of difference creating greater buy-in from community. Participation in arts in ways that are inclusive of CYP. More recent initiative eg: 'mFEST', an international arts festival for 12-17 year olds planned, devised, delivered by CYP. Improved wellbeing through the arts.
Monitoring and Evaluation	Project-based evaluation – arts focused. Done initiative by initiative. There is a question about the value of an externally driven monitoring approach but peer-to-peer critical friend approach more welcomed.
Criteria	The 'Charter' and 'Promise' are seen as 'touchstones' and are referred to for judgments to be made. These commitments are being reviewed and updated.
CYP roles in monitoring	Using CYP for artistic quality control monitoring now more than looking at logistics (eg food pricing). Fun evaluation approaches.
Opportunity	Understanding how within an organisation, CYP can have an embedded role in decisions. Model replicable in other contexts: eg hospitals, schools, care homes. Fun, arts-based approaches to participation used here are potentially adaptable to other contexts.
Challenge	Translating some artists' in order for it to be understood in CYP's contexts. Being seen too much as a 'children's centre'. Management considering broadening out the promise to all but ensuring that CYP not excluded in this process. Focusing on and deciding on what is core for the focus.
Comment	Some form of toolkit seen to be effective in making change happen more widely in other contexts especially now resources are tight.

Table 4

	2. Involved - Scottish Borders. (Framework of the Scottish Borders Children and Young People's Planning Partnership, CYPPP)
Remit and background	The Scottish Borders Children and Young People's Planning Partnership (CYPPP) brings together representatives from agencies providing services for children, young people, and their families: eg police, health, education, voluntary sector, Scottish Borders local authority. Approach is distinctive and far-reaching commitment by this LА though other LАs have youth forums too. Lead agent is a LА employee.
Structures	There are 5 local CYP groups (called 'HYPPE' – Helping Young People Participate and Engage) (similar to other LА's youth councils). They look at current issues as they arise. Young people as members of groups are chosen with respect to the issue. At times, panels may drive issue choice too, eg bullying. Moves now to have more embedded child-adult partnership approach involving all-age groups in creating change.
Role of CYP	There is a clearly structured approach to CYP. Framework does not use Hart's hierarchical ladder but has its own 'star' model of participation.
Overarching Rationale	Focus on encouraging the child as partner with adult in accountable change process including face-to-face intergenerational encounters. Having a voice and catalysing change as members of the community.
Decision Making Scope	All services and inter-agency aspects. Underpinned by desire to change the way people work and the way they think, especially adults. Sees need to create intergenerational meeting places.
Principles	Includes accessibility, inclusive places, methods and materials, tools for creating change.
Outcomes sought	Improving all services and improved levels of CYP's participation (via recognition of their rights). Otherwise, each agency does an Agency Implementation Plan.
Monitoring and Evaluation	Has a priority and implementation planning process (on-going). Seeks documents and language that is accessible for all ages.
Criteria	Looks to use the language of children's rights and outcomes of children's services plan to do this work. Separate CYP strategic monitoring group (14-21 yr olds) heads of service report to these.
CYP roles	Yes. Through HYPPE and separate monitoring group.
Opportunity	Children as scrutiniser. Embedded child-adult approaches that changes relations and services in a sustainable way at local level; other LАs could copy. Model has potential to and experience of challenging and holding LА elected members to account.
Challenge	Time, resource, and commitment. Participation officer role seems key. Changing adults' ways of working in diverse sectors. Deep cultural shifts required. Being creatively adapted to locale and contextualised.
Comment	No active sharing network of participation practices across LАs or beyond.

Table 5

	3. National Theatre of Scotland – A National Arts Framework for Participation through Outreach Approaches
Remit and background	Began officially Feb 2006. Theatre company that facilitates partnership approaches to theatre and performing arts development: creating large-scale and more local smaller-scale events across Scotland. Takes a partnership approach, promotion in embedded ways sometimes through schools, colleges, and community groups.
Structures	Adult-led, arts organization that concentrates on commissioning and outreach approaches for all ages. In the process of reconvening a youth advisory group that will work with the existing board of adults. Works with playwrights, designers, directors, youth theatres and many other artists.
Role of CYP	Delivered some age-specific programmes, some intergenerational projects, workshops and performances. Uses mentoring throughout some projects – eg 'Exchange' programme. Some primary schools programmes too.
Overarching Rationale	Artistic excellence and audience participation. Participation in the arts is also for improved wellbeing and community development. Performance and participation are both valued.
Decision Making Scope	Focus is on the decision making in programmes on the arts. Creative consultation often involves pupils and CYP participants.
Principles	Community-based participation connected to engagement and empowerment in culture and arts.
Outcomes Sought	Various: centrally experiences in arts and creativity but also careers advice on creative industry. Some programmes have outcomes specific to some subgroups: eg children in care, asylum seekers, dementia patients.
Monitoring and Evaluation	Built into partnerships and does evaluation as part of all projects. Has a youth advisory group being formalised. Had a Youth Board in the past.
Criteria	Generated against each project in specific ways by various forms of evaluation.
CYP roles in monitoring	In an embedded way. Some programmes are youth-led.
Opportunity	National reach. Networking and building on a wide variety of groups including CYP. Uses a variety of participation approaches including social networking and other social media too. Sees Curriculum for Excellence as a key opportunity in schools. Conceives of learning in a broad way.
Challenge	Delivering services without a theatre building. Working across Scotland. Expensive approach at times. Working with some less amenable staff in some organisations / schools. Working with secondary schools in particular. Not all CYP have a voice or access to culture and arts experiences.
Comment	Would find it useful to refer to a national standard for CYP's participation and to model this for others. A national standard and exemplars of good practice would potentially create expectation for all organisations.

Table 6

	4. Hear by Right National Youth Agency (NYA) (England)
Remit and background	Used in youth work generally and used widely in the UK in many other contexts too. Framework is promoted by the NYA.
Structures	This is a structured approach to CYP's participation. Hear by Right has seven standards and has an associated self-assessment and planning tool. No expectation to address all standards; organisations can choose what to focus on (outside of 'shared values' of CYP's participation).
Role of CYP	Uses Hart's ladder. Suggestive of the idea that the top rung is 'the ultimate'.
Overarching Rationale	Children's rights to be involved in matters that affect them. This helps improve services in more responsive ways.
Decision Making Scope	Service delivery. Changed services for CYP. Less obvious mention of changed adults or relations– e.g. improved working life or improved relations between generations.
Principles	UNCRC. That participation is valued, there is equal opportunity, visible commitment to CYP's participation, & effective systems and policies for it.
Outcomes Sought	Asks the generic question 'what's changed for CYP?' in any given context.
Monitoring and Evaluation	Framework has extensive monitoring and evaluation approach. Each standard has seven indicators associated with them (making 49 indicators).
Criteria	Seven 'indicators' for each standard which are leveled. 20 of these considered more 'core'. Also has an awards scheme (that builds on the use of the framework, Hear by Right). Some 20+ organisations so far have gone for bronze, silver or gold (which requires a visit by staff). Fees are from £550 (for bronze).
CYP roles in monitoring	Yes. CYP reflect on changes achieved through the monitoring approach.
Opportunity	Commonly used in youth-oriented organisations. Allows various other types of organisations (e.g. police service, youth justice) to use it too. Training is provided for staff to use the framework. Some LAs commission services to CYP only if they have awards at certain levels reached. Adaptable for use in various contexts but with support. It is more than a set of principles – monitoring is key.
Challenge	To engage with the entire framework could be too daunting or onerous. Information required is very detailed for organisations that are not CYP focused and this can be daunting. Requires a locally embedded person to lead this. Local government have funded the scheme in the past but funding the framework and award scheme is challenging.
Comment	Starts with CYP's participation but can start on wider participatory approaches (e.g. museums considering visitors more generally).

Table 7

	5. Ask First Northern Ireland Participation Network's Framework
Remit and background	A Participation Network was established four years ago with the remit of supporting public bodies in effective engagement with CYP. 'Ask First' framework created: non-statutory set of standards for government public bodies (endorsed by many). <i>Children in Northern in Ireland</i> manages and houses the Participation Network which is fully funded by the government.
Structures	Framework is seen as a developmental tool to help bodies draw up engagement strategies with CYP. Model involves firstly targeting organisations that are positive about using the standards. Focus on (increasingly top level) decision makers in governments and public authorities.
Role of CYP	CYP involved in informing the design of the framework through a feasibility study ('Turning up the sound', 2004). Direct engagement by CYP with decision makers is a core part of the standard.
Overarching Rationale	The framework is a tool for helping departments think about and design approaches to participation. It provides a benchmark for training.
Decision Making Scope	Various public bodies (but not charitable youth work for example).
Principles	Inclusion, respect, direct engagement between decision makers and CYP, UNCRC, rights based. Participation is to be ensured at the earliest stages of a service development, and CYP are to be supported and involved using the right kinds of methods, provided with the right level of knowledge and information, and with relevant feedback.
Outcomes sought	Participation of CYP in public policy decision making.
Monitoring and Evaluation	Not seen as the role of network. Commissioner for CYP monitors UNCRC progress: thus there is a separate formal role / responsibility for overall monitoring.
Criteria	No explicit criteria. No compunction to use the standards but widespread take-up by most public bodies and the N.I. Executive Departments.
CYP roles in monitoring	The role of CYP in monitoring is not expressly mentioned. Direct contact between CYP and decision makers makes this possible.
Opportunity	Section 75 of the N.I. Act obliges government officials to consult with key groups including children (under an 'age' category). Getting it right for children means getting it right for others too. The framework is non-statutory and not legally enforceable; the network takes a critical friend approach that is seen to work in N.I.
Challenge	At an early stage. Even if CYP's participation was statutory, their commitment of all bodies to this was seen as questionable. Needs champions.
Comment	As more public bodies and Departments are supported by the Participation Network to develop engagement strategies based on the standards, a cohesive and consistent system of involving CYP in public decision making across N.I. is hoped for.

Table 8

	6. Funky Dragon - Framework of the Children and Young People's Assembly for Wales.
Remit and background	In 1990s there had been a lot of concern nationally about care standards in some care homes (see 'Lost in Care' report). Welsh Assembly created in 1999. Children's Commissioner set up. Listening to children seen as having new importance. Save the Children and other charities initiate the CYP assembly, a charitable org.: Funky Dragon.
Structures	Convenes representatives from local authority (statutory orgs, charities and schools) on a CYP Grand Council which meets with Welsh Assembly Government Ministers and Officials on a regular basis (100 CYP four times a year) to put across the views.
Role of CYP	Funky Dragon is 'young people led'. Under 18s as trustees (hopes to reinstate this). Participation standards devised with CYP.
Overarching Rationale	To make sure that the views of CYP are heard, particularly by the Welsh Assembly, and to support participation in decision-making at national level. Focus on the young person as partner in democratic decision making nationally.
Decision Making Scope	Decisions that affect young people – broad scope.
Principles	1. Treseder's (1997) model. 2. Standards: Showing Respect; Involving CYP in organising things; Making sure adults don't take over the consultation; Fun; Not making it too intense; Paying attention and taking notes – don't talk: listen; Liaising with decision makers; Finding ways to make us heard in public; Letting us know what is going on; Talking afterwards and explaining things; Evaluating and learning. 3. UNCRC – Articles 12 (right to express views), 2 (without discrimination), 6 (optimum survival and development) and 3 (best interests of the child). Also 13, 15, 17 (on information access, expression of views, association and protection from harm).
Outcomes sought	Improved democracy. Effective, targeted for CYP, credible services and implementation of UNCRC. Personal, social and political development of CYP. Gains for young people, community & adult-child relations.
Monitoring and Evaluation	Built into the framework as integral process. Loosely conceived. Separately, a 'Young inspectors' project (Save the Children) uses the standards for monitoring. A 'kite marking' process is being considered too. This is a challenge as it is a large task and potentially expensive.
Criteria	The 'standards' are referred to for judgments to be made.
CYP roles in monitoring	The main on-going work of the groups is to monitor the Assembly. In addition, there is a 'Young inspectors' model at national level being developed for working with other organisations.
Opportunity	Accessible framework; child friendly; portable across context. Local authority CYP partnerships exist. Funding mechanisms use the standards. A stand-alone framework helps ensure inclusion.
Challenge	Definition of participation – standards meets this and has an educative role. Cost of monitoring. Eg: Health not as 'on board' as some other services. Need for training for staff for implementation. Earlier 'wave of goodwill' for CYP's participation seen to be waning.
Comment	Level of use of standards more widely is not known. They anticipate a move towards being outcome focused.

Table 9

	7. National Health Council's Participation Standard – (Scotland)
Remit and background	2007 'Better health, Better Care' Government action plan. National Standards were devised in 2011 for ensuring the public take part in "planning and providing services" (SHC 2010).
Structures	Local Health Boards lead this. Public Partnership Forums support the structure. National structures in NHS Boards. General community engagement to be encouraged particularly around service changes.
Role of CYP	Not explicitly for any sub-group. Most NHS Boards do not currently have a clearly structured approach to CYP as members or as advisors. (There are a couple that do this however). Any point of contact with service users and carers could involve CYP.
Overarching Rationale	Focus on the patient as 'partner', getting the public involved in planning and service delivery, as well as involving staff so that this will "lead to more effective and high quality healthcare" / "makes a positive contribution to health outcomes". "Patient-focused public involvement". Rationale is to make services responsive and informed by users.
Decision Making Scope	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Care and services provided in partnership with patients 2. Participation in service planning and improvement. 3. Participation in local Corporate Governance through the Boards
Principles	Inclusion (of staff and all kinds of service users); Dignity and Respect, Diversity; Mutuality; Human Rights.
Outcomes sought	Improved health and wellbeing
Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>There is a 'Self-assessment framework' and a Toolkit available. National data is being collected from NHS Boards. Four levels of attainment: Developing, Implementing, Evaluating, Improving.</p> <p>Assessment panels: lay and professional (not CYP). Local officers, national analysts. Some elements of peer review.</p>
Criteria	<p>Criteria for each of 1, 2, 3, above. Eg: NHS staff provide multi-format, accessible information and advice that is independent</p> <p>There is a comments and complaints procedure and a recognition of advocacy in partnership with others to meet the needs of carers.</p>
CYP roles in monitoring	Potentially at a number of levels. No clear role required in monitoring however.
Opportunity	Scope for monitoring nationwide. Comparative data.
Challenge	Collating data that is comparable and valid. Surfacing the child as community member, patient and service user or carer. Working effectively with CYP in these processes.
Comment	Children and young people (as service users) may be catered for within the model. It is still early days (introduced 2009-2010). There is mention of children in the Toolkit. Some examples exist of CYP involvement.

Table 10

	8. Community Engagement Standards – (supported by SCDC, Scottish Community Development Centre)
Remit and background	Commissioned by the Minister, the Scottish Community Development Centre (SCDC) led the facilitation of the development of the National Standards for Community Engagement (2005). From 2005-2007, SCDC conducted a national support programme to embed and apply the standards. Later, in 2010, the VOiCE planning and reporting tool was developed to help communities plan, conduct & evaluate engagement.
Structures	SCDC was the contracted group that developed the Standards.
Role of CYP	If the standards are adhered to, the involvement and inclusion of CYP would be assured.
Overarching Rationale	Community empowerment through engagement / involvement with the relevant parties and improvement in the design and delivery of public services through that engagement. The standards can be used in a number of ways including planning & (self-)monitoring – they are mainly a 'good practice' tool.
Decision Making Scope	Decisions about how community development happens. When and when CYP are engaged as part of this is unknown.
Principles	A set of principles is offered; includes terms such as fairness, equality, inclusion, clear purposes, commitment to learn and develop skills, shared agendas, the principle that all parties have knowledge, and the importance of information sharing.
Outcomes Sought	Improved community engagement practices.
Monitoring and Evaluation	VOiCE, which is underpinned by the Standards, provides a recording and reporting system for planning, monitoring and evaluating participation at community level. There are over 800 users of VOiCE. There is no other monitoring approach by Government but 'VOiCE is referred to in the self assessment material for 'Best Value 2' audits. it was felt it would be impossible. Scottish Government did evaluate the standards in 2007 using a case study in-depth approach to understand improving practice. Use of the standards is not compulsory for communities. Further research on the impact of VOiCE may be needed.
Criteria	Each one of the standards has a set of indicators.
CYP roles in monitoring	Yes, potentially, as part of community participation. No empirical accounts.
Opportunity	Provides an all-age approach. Endorsed by Scottish Government, Fire Officers service, ACPOS, COSLA, NHS, SCVO, Scottish Health Council and others. Principles can apply across context.
Challenge	Possibilities of CYP being excluded or forgotten. Principles seen as needing to be contextualised in new contexts. 'Purpose' is key for understanding how the standard might work in a given context. Techniques and approaches may be very different in different contexts. Principles and standards not a silver bullet.
Comment	This standard is somewhat embedded in legislative and auditing procedures in many organisations. The Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill (SNP Manifesto) which sets out in part to improve community participation relates. New Equality Act creates duties for public bodies to engage with those affected (includes 'age' as a category among nine in all). Language not so child-friendly.

Table 11

	9. Scottish Youth Parliament
Remit and background	Scottish Youth Parliament (SYP) was established on 30 th June 1999 just before the first meeting of the Scottish Parliament. The SYP is a company limited by guarantee with charitable status. SYP seeks to represent CYP across the country and enable their participation in local and national decision-making. SYP engagement can be with the Members of the SYP (MSYSPs) but can also involve work with Scotland's wider youth population, the people who work with young people and key organisations and institutions in the youth work sector.
Structures	Hart's Ladder (version thereof) – 'top rung' seen as ultimate. The organisation sets out to be youth-led and involves up to 200 young volunteers (MSYSPs) aged between 14- 25 who are elected to represent young people in their local area and different voluntary organisations from across the whole of Scotland. They hold three national meetings a year. They conduct campaigns on issues which are important to young people through parliamentary and public petitions, media campaigns, outreach work and talking with decision makers. MSYSPs seek to represent others for which they receive training. SYP also provides training and outreach work to organisations and conducts research. Now financially supported via Government (Unified Voluntary Sector Fund).
Role of CYP	The SYP is "designed by young people, led by young people and for the benefit of young people". All of the voting members of the Trustees board are 25 and under; non-voting members are older.
Overarching Rationale	To offer young people in Scotland a collective national youth voice, increasing young people's participation. The vision is of a stronger, more inclusive Scotland that empowers young people by truly involving them in the decision making process.
Decision-Making Scope	Wide ranging. Tasks are aligned to Scottish Government policies, strategies and priorities.
Principles	Active democratic practice for CYP.
Outcomes Sought	Greater participation and voice for Scotland's young people on a national and international stage.
Monitoring & Evaluation	An annual workplan has outcomes and outputs, and an impact assessment. There is an annual engagement and consultation with partners and stakeholders to understand impact.
Criteria	The Scottish Government's National Performance Framework contains outcomes the SYP hopes to impact: e.g., Curriculum for Excellence (capacities), improved life chances, well-designed, sustainable places, strong, resilient and supportive communities, a strong, fair, and inclusive national identity, high quality public services.
CYP roles	Yes. There are procedures for this.
Opportunity	Working independently to keep an eye on policies at governmental level decisions. Can set up campaigns. These can have impacts.
Challenge	Working closely with government and critiquing it. Being a youth-led organisation, some members may lack experience at times. Being non-party-political.
Comment	Strong youth-led ethos and history. Youth worker support. Focus on CYP 'voice' in the national democratic processes.

Table 12

	10. International Pilot Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating Participation
Remit and background	'Oak Foundation' funded international project. Framework for CYP's participation (led by Gerison Lansdown) and toolkit (led by Claire O'Kane) in the process of being piloted by INGOs, local NGOs and other agencies focused on CYP in variety of countries - Nicaragua, Guatemala, Nepal, India, Vietnam, Nigeria, Zambia and Ghana. Pilots ongoing to March 2012. [Participation Unit in Save the Children Wales is developing their own M&E framework based on this approach.]
Structures	The framework has two levels: (a) the environment for CYP's participation, (b) the scope, quality and the outcomes of it. Each level has criteria or indicators attached to them for monitoring and evaluation purposes. Approach recommends attending to the need for legislation, time, information, commitment, reference groups, CYP as researcher/ evaluators, sensitization of adults, and commitment to monitoring and evaluation.
Role of CYP	Seen as key. But the rights of CYP are seen as reciprocal with those of others.
Overarching Rationale	CYP's rights (UNCRC). Meeting the UN Millennium Development Goals. Knowledge, skills, competencies and confidence for CYP. Civic engagement. Good governance by the duty bearers.
Decision Making Scope	Many contexts. M&E framework sees to get beyond short-term projects to enhance CYP's participation as embedded in institutions in sustainable ways.
Principles	Names principles and standards such as: Transparency, voluntary participation, respect, relevance, child-friendliness, inclusivity, training for adults, safety, accountability.
Outcomes Sought	Participatory and respectful environment for CYP. Mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating scope, quality and impact of CYP's participation.
Monitoring & Evaluation	CYP in monitoring and evaluation. Confidential reporting for CYP when needed. Capacity building for CYP. Calls for child-sensitive indicators and child-friend processes and reporting. Recognition of the need to learn from mistakes.
Criteria	These are listed against each level. Extensive listings. Criteria for (A) the environment for CYP's participation (B) the Scope: looking across a programme cycle, (C) Quality: 30+ indicators for 'Quality' of CYP's participation. (D) Impact: Outcomes criteria divided between 'process outcomes' (across children parents, staff, organization, community contexts) and project-specific outcomes (various)
CYP roles in M&E	Yes. Three levels: adult consultative, collaborative, child-led. Sees the value of all of these approaches in different contexts and the importance of collaboration with adults yet the need for increased levels of self-direction by CYP over time.
Opportunity	International comparisons. Learning from developing countries. Learning from countries that have progressed the agenda further.
Challenge	Utilising such an extensive framework in new contexts.
Comment	The framework is used by volunteering organisations that see this work as critically important.

Appendix 4 – Acronyms Used

ACPOS	Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland
COSLA	Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
CYP	Children and Young People
INGO	International Non-governmental Organisation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSYP	Member of the Scottish Youth Parliament
LA	Local Authority
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
N.I.	Northern Ireland
NHS	National Health Service
NYA	National Youth Agency
SCDC	Scottish Community Development Centre
SCVO	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
SHC	Scottish Health Council
SNP	Scottish National Party
SYP	Scottish Youth Parliament
UNCRC	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
UK	United Kingdom

Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People

85 Holyrood Road

Edinburgh

EH8 8AU

Tel: 0131 558 3733

Young People's Freephone: 0800 019 1179

Fax: 0131 556 3733

Web: www.sccyp.org.uk

Twitter: @RightsSCCYP

www.sccyp.org.uk