

APPENDIX

Author(s): Katrin Kriz, Jenny Krutzinna, Tarja Pösö and Marit Skivenes

Title of publication: The Invisible Child: A Comparative Study of Newborn Removal Judgments from a Child Equality Perspective (CEP)

Year: In press

Journal / Publisher: International Journal of Children’s Rights

Contents

Coding scheme “Condition of the child” (whole case reviewed, but for Norway “facts section” and “county board reasoning section”) 1

Coding scheme “Condition of the child” (whole case reviewed, but for Norway “facts section” and “county board reasoning section”)

Code	Code description
Description of child	<p>This code covers how much the child is described. Descriptions do not have to be first hand, they can rely on reports or statements from institutions/foster parents to describe the child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing – the child is not described or assessed • Very little – the child is only briefly mentioned with one or two sentences and little information/general information – E.g. “the child is – similar to all small children – dependent on close attention and care”. • Some – the child is described a little more –a paragraph or so, and the description concerns <i>this</i> child. E.g. “The child welfare worker explained to the court that there had been focus on the food intake of the child. When in the mother’s care, the baby’s weight gain was too low, but this changed when the care centre took a more active role in the baby’s feeding. The child did not give many signals on what it needed, and the centre noticed that the child, with time, became quieter, made fewer and fewer sounds and that the child turned away from its mother.” • A lot – several paragraphs and information that is specific to this child. E.g. the judgments contains a description of the child’s physical condition, special features of the child (i.e. the child was born premature, with x health concern, completely healthy, with withdrawal symptoms etc.), the physical and/or emotional needs of the child, the child’s behavior, development etc.

APPENDIX TO KRIZ, K., KRUTZINNA, J., PÖSO, T. AND SKIVENES, M. (IN PRESS). THE INVISIBLE CHILD: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NEWBORN REMOVAL JUDGEMENTS FROM A CHILD EQUALITY PERSPECTIVE (CEP).

General/specific descriptions of needs	<p>Is it general descriptions of babies and for example their needs, or is it specific descriptions of the concerned baby in the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General • Specific • Both general and specific • Not mentioned
Pre-birth condition mentioned	<p>E.g. if the child has been exposed to risk before birth such as drugs, smoking, medicine, etc, but also if the pregnancy is described as being normal, or if there has been any issues during pregnancy that is likely to have influenced the fetus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No
Condition at birth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not mentioned • Premature • All well • Weight • Withdrawal symptoms and if the baby tests positive for drugs. Nicotine is only included here if it is a serious case of nicotine dependence/serious harm from nicotine. • Other
Risks/neglect in first days	<p>The child experienced lack of parenting skills and capacity, including risk or neglect, in the time between birth and first placement, by the hand of its parents. Includes instances where others (such as health care workers or staff at mother-child Centre) intervened to prevent harm to the child. Includes instances where the parents were unable to prevent risk to the child posed by someone else.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Not mentioned • NA (where child never was cared for by its birth parents)
Requirement of care	<p>Whether or not the decision-maker/court/board mentions what the baby requires in terms of care. E.g. “the child is vulnerable and requires special care”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentioned • Not mentioned