

**Dr Tracy Kirk**

**Failure to meet International Human Rights Obligations: SQA and COVID 19  
Submission to the Scottish Parliament Education and Skills Committee  
March 2021**

This piece of research is inspired by the many young people I have worked with and spoken to over the last year. Their voices outline the issues in a much better way than I ever could - these can be found after the executive summary. Many of these young people have asked to meet with the Deputy First Minister and the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) to ensure that the mistakes made in 2020 are rectified and not repeated. This group of young people, described by the Priestley review as small numbers' who have 'created a great deal of controversy',<sup>1</sup> met with Clare Adamson MSP, Jamie Greene MSP and Rona Mackay MSP on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> January as part of an outreach event for the Education and Skills Committee. The young people would like to repeat their offer to meet with the SQA and the Deputy First Minister.

This research brief is intended to inform an understanding of key legal issues which the SQA still appear to be having difficulty with. To be clear, the issues discussed here are legal obligations that the SQA and the Scottish Government have now – the matters contained in this paper are not dependent upon the incorporation of the UNCRC into domestic law. The failure to appreciate obligations under international human rights and the Equality Act 2010 have previously been identified by the Priestley Review, CYPs, SQA Where's Our Say?, and I but as yet no positive action has occurred.

From the outset, it is important to state that those due to sit exams in 2020 and 2021 deserve better than they have been given so far. This group of young people quite literally need the SQA and the Scottish Government to do the right thing to ensure their future prospects are not undermined for many years to come. The First Minister stated on 5<sup>th</sup> August: 'where an individual felt they had been disadvantaged by the SQA due to personal circumstances, they can appeal',<sup>2</sup> we now need this to be the case to prevent the students of 2020 and 2021, and their younger counterparts, becoming the COVID generation.

If Scotland truly wants to be the best place in the world to grow up in, it is important to consider how the rights of older children can be realised. This is something Scotland can be world leaders in but to do so we must engage with the fact 16 and 17 year olds are allowed to vote in Scottish elections,<sup>3</sup> they are old enough to consent to marriage,<sup>4</sup> have sexual intercourse,<sup>5</sup> and are no longer subject to most parental rights and responsibilities.<sup>6</sup> However, they are not able to directly appeal to

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 30.

<sup>2</sup> Nicola Sturgeon, Daily News Briefing,

<sup>3</sup> Scottish Elections (Reduction of Voting Age) Act 2015, s.1.

<sup>4</sup> Marriage (Scotland) Act 1977, s.1.

<sup>5</sup> Sexual Offences (Scotland) Act 2009

<sup>6</sup> Children (Scotland) Act 1995, s.1-2. The only exception here is the parental responsibility to provide guidance to their child which lasts until a child is 18, under s.1(b)(ii).

the SQA, they do not receive direct communications from the SQA and they have had to rely upon advocacy to ensure their rights are front and centre in 2020 and 2021. We must do better if we want human rights to underpin our approach in Scotland.

## Executive Summary

Here I have summarised the key points to aid the committee, with further details outlined after the views of young people.

- The SQA have breached, and continue to, breach the Equality Act 2010. Students who were disproportionately disadvantaged by the SQA processes of 2020 were identified by the Priestley Review, SQA Where's Our Say, CYPSC and I. However, no action has been taken to rectify this.
- The SQA process of 2020 has adversely impacted the lives of students – this has been amplified by the Deputy First Minister advising that appeals were under review.<sup>7</sup> He stated, when responding to Iain Gray MSP while appearing before this Committee in November: *'I am perfectly happy to consider the issue but, equally, Mr Gray must accept the caveat that there must be an evidence base to enable the issue to be judged'*.<sup>8</sup> However, despite evidence being available for all the young people quoted below, no such appeal has been forthcoming.
- Some students have, in the last few weeks, had emails from the Deputy First Minister's office stating that 2020 appeals were still under review;<sup>9</sup> they have lost places at Scottish universities because no appeals process has been forthcoming, and they have also seen the SQA advise there would be no change to the appeals process for 2020.<sup>10</sup> This lack of clarity despite ample support offered by those advocating for a rights based approach highlights how Scotland is treating these young people.

Myself, SQA Where's Our Say and CYPSC have already called for the Deputy First Minister to direct the SQA to accept 2020 appeals where:

1. There is evidence available that did not form part of the centre's assessment (for example returned unmarked coursework, or failure to take account of exceptional personal circumstances e.g. bereavement, illness, being looked after, disability, etc...)

---

<sup>7</sup> John Swinney MSP, Evidence to Education and Skills Committee, Examinations Diet 2020 and 2021, after 10:50am, 11 November 2020, accessible here:

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=12937>

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> We are happy to share these with the Committee if this would be helpful.

<sup>10</sup> SQA Letter to the Education and Skills Committee, 19 February 2021, page 7 accessible here: [https://www.parliament.scot/S5\\_Education/General%20Documents/20210219Joint\\_reponse\\_from\\_SQA\\_and\\_Education\\_Scotland.pdf](https://www.parliament.scot/S5_Education/General%20Documents/20210219Joint_reponse_from_SQA_and_Education_Scotland.pdf)

2. There is evidence that the centre's estimated grade was a downgrade from previous attainment and/or the teacher's estimate to UCAS and in support of the young person's personal statement.

- In terms of the 2020 failures, the Deputy First Minister could rectify the breaches in the Equality Act 2010 by making an order under section 9 of the Education (Scotland) Act 1996. Not to do so undermines the long held commitment to rights and wellbeing which the Scottish Government are so passionate about.
- The continuing failure by the SQA to accept they have breached the Equality Act 2010 will lead to the same groups of young people being discriminated against in 2021.
- The SQA still do not appear to appreciate the individualised element of assessment and the need to hear from students disproportionately disadvantaged. This includes their mention of 'a meeting with CYPCS' and 'some conversations with young people'.<sup>11</sup> The SQA have a duty to speak to young people about their futures. The evidence from young people below highlights the failures of the SQA.
- SQA must ensure that their assessment model for 2021 is truly individualised. This includes clear direction on how grading will take account of different learning opportunities for young people and the different learning needs of students after lockdown. Universities have taken steps to ensure there is no detriment caused to students due to COVID 19 and this is something that should be in place for SQA students now.
- The SQA should not be using the excuse of needing to 'consult' on the appeals process for 2021 in correspondence to this Committee in February 2021.<sup>12</sup> This is a failure to appreciate the significance of an appeals process as well as a failure to appreciate the very real impact SQA processes are having upon the mental health of our young people.
- The 2021 process should take an individualised approach with clear mitigations for those who have been disproportionately disadvantaged by COVID and online learning, as previously advocated by Oliver Mundell MSP.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Fiona Robertson, Evidence to the Education and Skills Committee, Covid-19: learning and Teaching in the Senior Phase, 13 January 2021, accessible here: <https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=13053>

<sup>12</sup> SQA Letter to the Education and Skills Committee, 19 February 2021, page 7, accessible here: [https://www.parliament.scot/S5\\_Education/General%20Documents/20210219Joint\\_reponse\\_from\\_SQA\\_and\\_Education\\_Scotland.pdf](https://www.parliament.scot/S5_Education/General%20Documents/20210219Joint_reponse_from_SQA_and_Education_Scotland.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> Oliver Mundell MSP, Covid-19: learning and Teaching in the Senior Phase, Education and Skills Committee, 13 January 2021, accessible here: <https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=13053>

- In 2019 there were 11528 appeals requested.<sup>14</sup> In 2020 there were 664 appeals requested.<sup>15</sup> In an exceptional year where an exceptional response was required by the SQA, we should all be seeking answers for those young people awaiting redress due to exceptional circumstances that were beyond their control.

## Young people and their views of SQA process in 2020 and 2021

This section has been anonymised. However, all the young people in group 1 have offered to meet with the SQA and Deputy First Minister.

Group 1: individuals who were adversely impacted by 2020 SQA exam process who continue to ask to meet with the SQA and the Deputy First Minister.

Group 2: a group of final year students at a secondary school in the West of Scotland.

The Committee have previously supported these young people to share their views. In addition, Iain Gray MSP and Daniel Johnson MSP have spoken about the importance of these views several times within the Chamber of the Scottish Parliament.<sup>16</sup>

### Group 1:

#### Student A:

I was fortunate to be offered the chance to study Medicine at St Andrews University in 2020 and I was looking forward to studying for my final exams to achieve the grades I needed to meet the offer. **I feel that I have been robbed of that chance through no fault of my own and there is no pathway to resolve this damaging issue that will affect Scottish students in the long term.** There was no option to prove myself apart from evidence in prelims that I wasn't aware that accounted for anything.

---

<sup>14</sup> Scottish Qualifications Authority, appeals Report 2019 Summary, (Dec 2019) accessible here: [https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files\\_ccc/Results\\_Services\\_Report\\_Statistical\\_Summary\\_2019.pdf](https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files_ccc/Results_Services_Report_Statistical_Summary_2019.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Scottish Qualifications Authority, Appeals Report 2020 Summary (Dec 2020) accessible here: [https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files\\_ccc/appeals\\_report\\_summary\\_2020.pdf](https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files_ccc/appeals_report_summary_2020.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> Daniel Johnston MSP, First Minister's Questions, Scottish Parliament, 2 September 2020, accessible here:

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=12782&i=115579>; Iain Gray MSP, Scottish Qualifications Authority National Qualifications 2020-21, Scottish Parliament, 7 October 2019, after 16:03, accessible here:

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=12878>; Iain Gray MSP, United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Incorporation) (Scotland) Bill: Stage 1, Scottish Parliament, 19 January 2021, after 17:17, accessible here:

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=13062&i=118209>;

**I feel worse off as the government haven't listened to me and my individual circumstances.** I and others feel as if we have been ignored and slipped through the cracks of the education system.

Scotland's approach for the Curriculum say they want to help us to become successful learners and confident individuals. In my situation becoming a confident individual has been compromised as I have lost the right to a fair examination which has prevented me from my career path and completely knocked my confidence in striving to follow what I want, how is this fair?

Nothing has been put in place to protect the rights of children and young people in a similar situation to me. Why should I have to change my career path because of a situation completely out of my hands? How can students put their confidence into the SQA and the government to become successful individuals if there is no clear pathway set in place for the future.

### Student B:

The SQA in 2020 and continuing into 2021 have caused myself and many others **unnecessary anxiety and stress**. Last year, they let down the majority of Scottish young people on results day and have not provided a system for appeal, leaving many young people like myself without any help or method of appealing. When results were overturned to match teacher estimates, the appeal system was changed to one that was extremely limited and really only focused on 3 areas of correcting administration mistakes, not an appeal system at all!

As a young person going through these final vital years at school, no one has seemed to care to engage on how I have been directly affected. I was not consulted by my school as a pupil last year and the same has happened this year. I've had no teaching since the end of last year, nothing face to face as yet and just emails about assessments being due on our return, which isn't known, so just a need to keep studying. How does it seem fair or right to treat young people like this, especially after 11 months?

I am working independently during the day with work set by teachers, don't really have much communication with them and then I'm expected to continue in the same environment (lucky to have my own room) and then focus on extra study for subjects that are almost not real and that I don't know when I'll be tested on them. I'm worried that we'll be back in school for 2 weeks 'face to face' teaching then expected to sit our assessments.

Going forward this year I feel that the SQA has not provided a clear method of assessment and how grades will be given out with respect to ranking etc. Considering National 5 exams were cancelled in October and Higher exams in December **there has been a lack of communication about how they are going to assess pupils this year**. Equity across Scotland is worse than ever, some schools are having more class time at the moment than others. My school is large and so has to split classes, so less face to face for pupils. Each school will have their own standard for assessment and ranking and given that last year I was very unfairly

treated and, I believe, marks downgraded to 'fit' the ranking I feel very anxious about how this will unfold.

**Ultimately, for almost a year I have not been in control of my own path at the end of 13 years of school education and I quite possibly will not have a voice should my results go against me again.** I believe that if exams had happened last year, barring a disaster, I would definitely have better grades and may even be sitting with an unconditional for University right now with none of the uncertainty that I have at the moment. Since exams are cancelled again but assessments/prelims happening, then should we all at least be sitting the same assessment as set by SQA, after all the CEO Fiona Robertson said in her evidence to Ed Skills Committee in January that since they (SQA) would be issuing the certificates then they would need to make sure that standards were met.

#### Student C:

I am a 2020 school leaver and I never received the grades my teachers said I would achieve formally on my UCAS form and verbally at parent's nights as well as in class throughout the year. As a result of this, I have been denied a university interview invite for dentistry. I asked my school for an appeal; however, this was denied and after going through all of the complaint's procedure stages, nothing has materialised that would enable me to receive the grades I worked so hard for. Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child state that young people must be involved in decisions which affect them, and I feel especially let down by the SQA as they expressly directed teachers not to have conversations with their students about their estimated grades and personal circumstances that may have hindered their results in assessments and prelims. The delivery of grades last year seemed to be estimated on the basis of the prelim score and not that of previous grade attainment, personal circumstances and the formal teacher estimate which is put on the UCAS form. **My hopes for 2021, is that the SQA will implement an appeals system** that will comply with Article 12 rights and involve young people being able to directly appeal their grades from this year and last.

#### Student D:

**The SQA has given me worry and anxiety over the exam and appeal process from 2020 and 2021.** I am unsure when I need to submit evidence and what kind of quality the evidence must be. Last year I was let down by the SQA, I had to drop a subject because I didn't have enough evidence, **this year I am hoping for a better appeal process because many unis only accept first sittings and without an appeal process many people's futures can be hindered.**

#### Other comments:

In terms of the SQA processes of 2020 and 2021, both groups mentioned the **lack of redress** as an example of a time where their voices are ignored.

One young person in group 2 stated that the 2020 SQA process had been 'a kick in the teeth'. There were discussions about the feelings experienced on exam results day 2020 and how this impacted upon mental health.

Another young person in group 2 stated that the lack of direct plan for 2021 and the failure to help those impacted by 2020 processes left them scared and uncertain. The student said they wanted certainty but that the **Scottish Government and SQA ‘don’t understand it is our future, not statistics’**.

## Legal Analysis

This section looks at some of the legal issues relating to the disproportionate disadvantage faced by our young people during 2020 and 2021. The focus on the Equality Act 2010 is intended to help the SQA appreciate the issues concerned. The recent paper published by them on the UNCRC missed the points outlined here which have been communicated to the Committee previously.<sup>17</sup>

## Breach of Equality Act 2010

The Priestley review highlighted that those most adversely affected by the 2020 alternative certification model included: children with disabilities, young carers and care-experienced young people, and those with extenuating circumstances.<sup>18</sup> Most of these are groups are protected by the Equality Act 2010. The SQA acknowledged this in October 2020 they stated: ‘provided the SQA’s duty to provide reasonable adjustments under Section 96 of the Equality Act 2010 continues to be met, no different impacts on different children and young people have been identified’.<sup>19</sup> There have been different impacts on different young people – the evidence provided to the committee by young people, SQA Where’s Ours Say?, CYPSC and myself confirms this. Indeed, the Priestley review itself highlighted this.<sup>20</sup> However, The SQA have not engaged with the Priestley Review correctly. As a result, there is a very real prospect of this happening again, indeed as I write this on 24<sup>th</sup> February, these young people still do not have a form of redress.

There has been no recognition of this group by the SQA, the Deputy First Minister or the Scottish Government. On 7 October, Mr Swinney said that the Scottish Government ‘did not get it right for all young people’ but that they had apologised and acted to fix this situation.<sup>21</sup> Unfortunately, this is not the case for all young people as highlighted by the Priestley report. Crucially, those who are protected under the Equality Act 2010 have not had the right to redress which the law demands they have

---

<sup>17</sup> SQA, Appeals and the UNCRC, SQA, January 2020, accessible here:

[https://www.sqa.org.uk/files\\_ccc/Appeals-and-the-UNCRC.pdf](https://www.sqa.org.uk/files_ccc/Appeals-and-the-UNCRC.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 39.

<sup>19</sup> 2020 Alternative Certification Model: Child Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment, August 2020, page 3. Accessible here: [https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files\\_ccc/2020-sqa-alternative-certification-model-child-rights-wellbeing-impact-assessment.pdf](https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files_ccc/2020-sqa-alternative-certification-model-child-rights-wellbeing-impact-assessment.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 39.

<sup>21</sup> SQA Awards 2021: Deputy First Minister’s speech, 7 Oct 2020 accessible here: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/deputy-first-ministers-speech-sqa-awards-2021/>



## Failure to provide redress

The Priestley review made clear that those who were disadvantaged represented 'small numbers' who have 'created a great deal of controversy'.<sup>22</sup> This surely should help the SQA appreciate the substantial difference an appeals process would make for these young people.

An appeals process would provide the necessary mitigation for the disproportionate disadvantage faced by this group, consistent with the Equality Act 2010. However, despite the exceptional circumstances of 2020, the SQA processes have failed to adapt to ensure no student is adversely impacted through no fault of their own. The fact students needed to ask their schools to put in appeals despite the schools being the potential discriminator was raised by Daniel Johnston MSP in September.<sup>23</sup> However, there seemed to be a lack of understanding on the part of the Scottish Government and SQA on the importance of direct appeals.

In 2020 there was a total of 664 appeals requested. Of these, 557 appeals were accepted. 97 were brought forward on the ground of centre discrimination. Only 2 appeals were brought on the ground of SQA error. The SQA's own figures show that only 6.1% of those appeals resulted in either no-change or a lower grade being awarded. Surely this highlights the important role an effective appeals process can provide to the long term chances of our young people.

The lack of appeals process was emphasised by the Priestley Review which stated that the 'decision to limit the grounds for appeals seems to be both unnecessary and counter-productive'.<sup>24</sup> Further, the independent CRIA highlighted that 'gaps in data mean that it is hard for the Government to be confident that its decisions are delivering on human rights obligations'.<sup>25</sup> This was reiterated by the Priestley review which emphasised that 'a lack of access to equalities data is evident in correspondence between the SQA and the government'.<sup>26</sup> There was also confirmation in the Priestley review that an internal government email acknowledged that 'SQA do not hold equalities data and therefore cannot examine the 2020 approach for impact on protected characteristics'.<sup>27</sup> Surely, that should be enough for the SQA to appreciate the need to prevent history repeating itself.

To be frank, the SQA do not have the data they require and therefore they cannot say they are acting in compliance with the Equality Act 2010. Evidence provided to

---

<sup>22</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 30.

<sup>23</sup> Daniel Johnston MSP, Education and Skills Committee, Wednesday 16 September, Page 32, accessible here: <https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=12825&mode=pdf>

<sup>24</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 30.

<sup>25</sup> Independent Children's Rights Impact Assessment on the Response to COVID-19 Scotland, Observatory of Children's Rights, July 2020, page 4 accessible here: <https://cypcs.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/independent-cria.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 33.

<sup>27</sup> M. Priestley, M. Shapira, A. Priestley, M. Ritchie, C. Barnett, Rapid Review of National Qualifications Experience 2020, September 2020, page 33.



the committee by CYPSC, the Priestley Review, SQA Where's Our Say? And I show the lack of compliance with the human rights of children.

If the SQA has acquired this data, it would be helpful to know how they have done so and how they are mitigating against repeated failures in 2021. It would also be helpful to know how they plan to redress the failures in 2020. Mistakes happen, especially in a pandemic, but we cannot allow SQA mistakes to adversely impact the lives of our young people. Transparency should be the default given difficulties in 2020 and the legal obligations the SQA have.

## Human rights summary

To be clear, the SQA alternative grading process and the appeal process are simply not human rights compliant. This has been compounded by a lack of redress, an international human rights mechanism which seeks to ensure that there are mitigations put in place for those who have been disproportionately disadvantaged. This has not occurred. Unfortunately, the SQA have tried to justify this lack of appeal by outlining the ways appeals are handled in other countries.<sup>28</sup> This approach is surely incompatible with the Scottish Government commitment to ensure Scotland becomes the best place in the world to grow up. It certainly fails to appreciate the international human rights obligations which Scotland already have.

Importantly, it would be possible for the Deputy First Minister to exercise his powers under section 9 of the Education (Scotland) Act 1996 to 'give SQA directions of a general or specific character with regard to the discharge of its functions and it shall be the duty of the SQA to comply with such directions'. This would allow the Deputy First Minister to advise the SQA to act in a manner which is compliant with international human rights by placing the child at the centre of the process. This is also consistent with the CRC and the Getting It Right for Every Child (GIRFEC) framework.

## Ensuring fairness in 2021

It is important that the SQA urgently consider how fairness can be achieved in 2021 assessments. Several members of your committee raised the importance of taking account of individual circumstances when Fiona Robertson appeared before this committee in January.<sup>29</sup> However, there was a reluctance to answer this question.

It is no secret that life has been different for all of us since 2020. This clearly means that students have interrupted periods in their education including working from homes with differing levels of support; variable study environments; lack of access to materials due to digital poverty; difficult family circumstances including bereavement and additional caring responsibilities; as well as variable periods of self-isolation prior to school closures.

---

<sup>28</sup> SQA, Appeals and the UNCRC, SQA, January 2020, accessible here: [https://www.sqa.org.uk/files\\_ccc/Appeals-and-the-UNCRC.pdf](https://www.sqa.org.uk/files_ccc/Appeals-and-the-UNCRC.pdf)

<sup>29</sup> Covid-19: learning and Teaching in the Senior Phase, Education and Skills Committee, 13 January 2021 accessible here: <https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=13053>

All of these circumstances have occurred at a time when these young people have been unable to socialise with their friends or take part in different activities which help them to develop and transition from childhood to adulthood.<sup>30</sup> This must be borne in mind to ensure that we appreciate the responsibilities upon the SQA and the Scottish Government to ensure no student has their life chances impacted through no fault of their own. Many universities across the UK have taken this approach. SQA Where's Our Say and I have advocated for this since August 2020, and we know Ross Greer MSP has advocated for this too. A similar approach should be utilised by the SQA.

Ultimately, we need the SQA to appreciate the legal and moral responsibilities it has to the young people who are examined by them by providing a system which is individualised, with a direct appeal process available for those who require it. Mitigation against disproportionate disadvantage must occur now. It is clear from the SQA's treatment of those who continue to suffer as a result of the 2020 results, that rectifying mistakes is not high on their priority list. This approach cannot be allowed to continue. It is the lives of young people at risk.

I would be very happy to speak with the committee about how the rights of these young people could be realised. I specialise in the intersection between other disciplines (including, biology, neurology, education and sociology) and to ensure the transition to adulthood achieves what is required for society and importantly for the young people themselves. The need for the law to reflect the unique position this age group finds themselves in has never been more important, especially as COVID continues to have an extreme impact upon them. As the incorporation bill becomes law, understanding of this group will be required to ensure that policy and practice reflects the requirements contained within the Convention.

---

<sup>30</sup> This is an area a lot of my research covers – the intersection between biology, neurology, sociology, education and law to ensure the rights of older children, contained within the CRC and elsewhere, are realised. Very happy to share more if this is of interest.