

# Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## **SUFASEC**

### **Let's Exchange Learnings**

**26 October 2025**

Learning



**Country: Thailand**

**Implementing Partner Name:**

**The Life Skills Development Foundation (TLSDF)**

# Learning Question 1:

*Which child-centred strategies have the greatest contribution to the engagement of children in SEC/ OSCE/ SRHR related social norm change in their communities? How can the participation of children affect existing dialogues on SEC, OSCE and SRHR?*

## Description of the Learning:

*[Summarise here what is the key insight? Provide a concise description in 3-5 sentences]*

- Add any learning documents in this [Folder](#) (under the appropriate country)

**Child-centered and participatory strategies—such as peer learning, child-led campaigns, and safe spaces—greatly enhanced children’s confidence and ownership in addressing SEC, OCSEA, and SRHR. Children became active messengers, influencing peers and initiating open discussions on sensitive issues. However, stronger links with families and communities are still needed to sustain norm change beyond schools.**

## Context and Background:

***[Brief description of the situation, project, or challenge that led to this learning]***

**Under the SUFASEC program, TLSDF empowered children and youth in Northern Thailand to promote child protection and rights. Learning emerged from youth-led activities, Safe Zone initiatives, and child-friendly Outcome Harvesting that revealed both personal empowerment and the challenge of limited family engagement.**



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## What Worked Well:

*[Successful approaches, tools, or strategies used]*

a) **Child-led and peer-to-peer activities enhanced engagement:** Child-led activities such as advocacy booths, peer-learning games, and student-led campaigns successfully motivated children to take ownership of the learning process. These participatory methods built confidence, teamwork, and leadership among youth.

b) **Safe zone/youth corner supported expression and inclusion:** The Safe Zone and Youth Corner encouraged open dialogue, particularly among LGBTQ+ students, allowing them to express their identity freely and discuss sensitive topics without fear. These spaces helped normalize conversations about gender, sexuality, and rights.

c) **Child became active messengers and advocates:** Through activities like storytelling, community campaigns, and even participation in national forums (e.g., APriGF 2025), children began to raise awareness and speak up for their peers. Their voices created new entry points for discussing SEC, OCSEA, and SRHR in schools and communities.

d) **Experiential and creative learning approaches:** Using games, art, and storytelling to explore child protection issues helped children understand complex concepts more easily and made discussions more accessible to peers.



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## What Did Not Work/Challenges:

*[Barriers, mistakes, or difficulties encountered]*

a) **Limited community and family linkages:** Most child-led initiatives remained within the school context. Few activities successfully reached families or communities, partly because “community” was perceived as abstract or difficult for children to engage with directly.

b) **Weak family understanding and support:** Many parents still lack awareness or comfort discussing SEC/SRHR topics, which limits the sustainability of norm change beyond school. Some children still face resistance or silence at home when discussing these issues.

c) **Limited skill-building for norm change:** While trainings improved confidence and knowledge, children had few opportunities to develop advanced advocacy skills, such as negotiation, campaigning, or influencing adults and decision-makers.

e) **Time and school priorities:** Students often struggled to balance SUFASEC activities with school obligations, reducing participation continuity and follow-up actions.



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## Recommendations/Implications for Future Work:

*[What should others consider doing or avoiding in similar contexts?]*

### **a) Strengthen child-led and participatory approaches:**

- Establish “Child-led Campaign Labs” within schools, where students plan and implement advocacy projects under mentorship from teachers and TLSDF staff.
- Provide micro-grants to support student-led initiatives in schools and communities.

### **b) Build advanced advocacy and communication skills:**

- Develop a Youth Advocacy Toolkit focusing on persuasion, negotiation, and public speaking.
- Create mentorship programs linking trained youth with community leaders or policymakers to strengthen real-world advocacy.

### **c) Strengthen community and family engagement:**

- Organize Parent–Child Dialogue sessions to improve mutual understanding of child rights and protection.
- Connect school-based youth clubs with District Quality of Life Committees (QoL) to expand child participation in local structures.

### **d) Integrate SUFASEC approaches into school systems:**

- Integrate SUFASEC methodologies into Life Skills and Guidance curricula to ensure sustainability.
- Train teachers to serve as facilitators of child-centred learning rather than one-way instructors.

### **e) Ensure sustainability through monitoring and learning:**

- Develop a Child Change Tracker or Outcome Mapping tool to measure behavioral shifts over time.
- Collect and document Child Voice Stories to serve as evidence for policy advocacy and future learning cycles.



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

# Learning Question 2:

*How will school-based interventions improve students' knowledge of SEC and SRHR? Which school-based interventions under the SUFASEC program contribute to changes in students' behavior and attitude towards SEC and SRHR?*

*[Summarise here what is the key insight? Provide a concise description in 3-5 sentences]*

**School-based interventions improved students' knowledge, attitudes, and protective behaviors toward SEC and SRHR through interactive learning and peer-led activities.**

**Children applied lessons to protect themselves and help peers, though opportunities for real practice and curriculum integration remain limited.**

## **Context and Background:**

*[Brief description of the situation, project, or challenge that led to this learning]*

**SUFASEC introduced participatory methods—such as classroom games, training on grooming and online safety, and Youth Corners—to make SEC and SRHR education engaging and practical. Findings show strong learning outcomes in schools but highlight the need for sustained teacher facilitation and family involvement.**



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## What Worked Well:

*[Successful approaches, tools, or strategies used]*

a) **Interactive and participatory learning methods:** Activities such as Kahoot games, information booths, and peer-to-peer sharing made learning about SEC and SRHR enjoyable and easy to remember. Students engaged more actively and showed improved understanding of sensitive topics.

b) **Training on grooming and online safety:** These sessions effectively increased children's awareness of sexual exploitation and online risks. Many students reported that they now know how to block or report inappropriate contacts and can help friends do the same.

c) **Student leadership and peer support initiatives:** Student leaders and child clubs became key motivators for others, spreading protective messages across schools and promoting openness about SEC and SRHR.

e) **Safe Zones and Youth Corners:** These spaces provided safe, inclusive environments for students to express themselves, ask questions, and seek peer support—especially beneficial for LGBTQ+ students.



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## What Did Not Work/Challenges:

*[Barriers, mistakes, or difficulties encountered]*

**a) Limited time and competing school priorities:** Teachers and students often faced tight schedules, limiting participation and continuity of activities.

**b) Lack of practical skill application:** While knowledge improved, many students had few opportunities to practice what they learned through real-life exercises, simulations, or advocacy projects.

**c) Inconsistent integration into school curricula:** Some teachers were unsure how to link SUFASEC content (e.g., SRHR and child protection) with existing subjects or curricula, making activities feel “add-on” rather than embedded.

**d) Low family engagement:** Family participation remained minimal, reducing the potential for reinforcing positive behavior and attitudes outside school.



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children

## Recommendations/Implications for Future Work:

*[What should others consider doing or avoiding in similar contexts?]*

### **a) Integrate SEC/SRHR into Life Skills Curriculum:**

→ Embed SUFASEC content into formal Life Skills or Guidance lessons so that learning becomes systematic and continuous throughout the school year.

### **b) Increase practice-based learning activities:**

→ Include role plays, case studies, and student-led projects to strengthen real-life application of protection and communication skills.

### **c) Develop peer support networks:**

→ Formalize “Peer Support Groups” or mentorship programs where trained student leaders guide others, expanding peer-to-peer learning beyond a single classroom.

### **d) Strengthen teacher capacity as facilitators:**

→ Train teachers to act as facilitators rather than lecturers, supporting student participation and monitoring behavioral changes effectively.

### **e) Engage families in school-based initiatives:**

→ Organize joint workshops or family days on SEC and SRHR topics to help parents understand, support, and sustain the knowledge and values their children gain at school.



Down to Zero

Fighting sexual exploitation of children