BALANCING RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN EDUCATION GOVERNANCE: LEGAL IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA

Justina Henry ODION
Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education
National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja
E-mail: justinahenryodion@gmail.com / nou257686691@noun.edu.ng
ORCID: 0009-0005-2443-2961

ABSTRACT
A school runs on more than its timetable; it runs on a web of legal rights and responsibilities binding every stakeholder inside it, whether or not anyone has read the underlying statute. Using doctrinal legal analysis and thematic synthesis, this paper works through the rights, responsibilities, and, where relevant, the regulatory authority of six stakeholder groups: students, teachers, school administrators, parents, host communities, and government. The analysis draws on Nigerian legislation, Supreme Court and National Industrial Court decisions, international human rights instruments, and current scholarship, organised around Stakeholder Theory, Educational Governance Theory, and Social Contract Theory. Its central claim is that education systems work best when rights and responsibilities are held in balance: rights without responsibilities breed entitlement without accountability, while responsibilities without rights breed obligation without protection. Case law, including Garba v. University of Maiduguri on fair hearing and Lagos State Government v. Asiyat AbdulKareem on the limits of government's authority, shows this balance being tested and restored in practice. Legal literacy emerges as a genuine determinant of effective school administration, shaping compliance, accountability, equity, due process, and safety. The paper closes with practical implications for school leaders and policymakers seeking safer, fairer schools.

Keywords: School Administration, Education Law, Stakeholder Rights, Accountability, School Governance

INTRODUCTION

Every school runs on rules, whether or not anyone in the building has read the statute those rules come from. The law protects students while checking misconduct, which is what allows teaching and learning to happen and a learner's conduct to be properly shaped. Ogharen (2022) found that administrators who understand education law make fewer decisions that infringe on the rights of students and staff. Those infringements are often what end up in court, frequently on grounds of negligence.

Much of the existing literature treats legal literacy as one competency among several, alongside instructional leadership, financial management, and community relations (Section 2), without asking a prior question: what does the law require of each party to the education relationship, and how do those requirements interact? This paper takes up that question across six stakeholder groups: students, teachers, school administrators, parents, host communities, and government. Three questions guide the discussion: (1) What legal rights and responsibilities apply to major education stakeholders in Nigeria? (2) How do these obligations shape school leadership practice? (3) What governance challenges arise when rights and responsibilities fall

out of balance? The argument that follows is simple: rights without responsibilities breed entitlement without accountability, and responsibilities without rights breed obligation without protection. That balance is what the case law in Sections 6 and 11 shows being tested and restored in practice.

Literature Review

Three threads in the Nigerian scholarship on school administration bear directly on this paper. The first is the constitutional and statutory footing of the right to education, resting on the 1999 Constitution (Section 18), the Universal Basic Education Act (2004), and the Child Rights Act (2003); Cranston (1973), in the classic treatment of what a right actually is, frames rights as entitlements a person can claim against others and, ultimately, against the state. Taiwo and Govindjee (2011) note that education resists tidy categorisation as either a civil/political or a social/economic right, since it functions as both, which means the obligations it generates run correspondingly wide, from due process in discipline to simply keeping a school running.

The second thread is legal literacy as a driver of administrative practice. Ogharen (2022) found that administrators who understand education law are markedly less likely to make decisions that expose their schools to litigation; Ossai, Okokoyo, and Asabor (2026) reach a related conclusion from a different angle, finding legal awareness a measurable determinant of how well a Nigerian secondary school is governed, not merely how well it avoids lawsuits.

The third thread is accountability owed to specific stakeholders. Ojelade, John-Akinola, Adefolarin, and Oluwasanu (2025), surveying students and teachers in a southwestern Nigerian city, found real gaps in both groups' knowledge of the Child's Rights Act and argued that closing that gap through teacher training is essential in practice. Oni and Soji-Oni (2024) find active parental engagement tied to better discipline and academic outcomes, while Abiodun-Oyebanji and Akintayo (2024) and Gyang and Gusen (2021) trace host communities' long-standing role in providing land, security, and infrastructure, and the governance stake that carries.

Two gaps motivate the present paper. Legal literacy keeps turning up as important, but few studies lay out systematically what the law asks of each stakeholder group side by side, and the literature engages statutes far more than the case law that has actually interpreted them. Sections 6 through 11 try to close both at once.

Theoretical Framework

The claim running through this paper, that education governance works best when rights and responsibilities are kept in balance, rests on three complementary theories. Stakeholder Theory, as Freeman (1984) developed it, holds that an institution answers to more than a single principal; it owes something to the full network of parties who affect, or are affected by, what it does. Applied to a school, this is why rights and responsibilities cannot be confined to the relationship between administrator and student alone: teachers, parents, host communities, and government each hold a legitimate stake, and each stake runs in both directions. Educational Governance Theory, as Bush (2020) sets it out, extends this by treating school governance as distributed rather than sitting in one office: formal authority belongs to the administrator, but legitimate governance also depends on collegial, political, and cultural processes involving the other stakeholders, which is the six-stakeholder structure this paper follows. Social Contract Theory, in its classical form, supplies the underlying logic: government provides education and its scaffolding; schools provide safe places to learn; parents support their children's learning; and students respect the rules that make this possible. Each party's rights depend on, and generate, a

matching responsibility to everyone else in the chain, and that reciprocity is really what this paper is about.

METHODOLOGY

This paper takes a doctrinal and analytical approach, working from primary legal instruments, appellate case law, and existing scholarship rather than new empirical data. The six stakeholder groups examined are not an arbitrary choice; the Universal Basic Education Act (2004) and the Child Rights Act (2003) each assign distinct duties to these same parties. Instruments were chosen on two grounds: applicability to basic and secondary education, and established use in the scholarship reviewed in Section 2. The paper draws mainly on federal legislation; state-level education laws vary across Nigeria's thirty-six states and fall outside what it can cover, a limitation worth taking up in future work. Case law was selected where a decision speaks directly to a stakeholder's rights or responsibilities, prioritising Supreme Court authority and, for employment disputes, the National Industrial Court. The analysis sorts stakeholder obligations into four governance themes: access and equity, professional accountability, institutional authority, and protection of rights. Each stakeholder section identifies the relevant rights, responsibilities, and, where the case law shows one, the tension between them.

Meaning of Rights and Responsibilities

A right, in Cranston's (1973) classic formulation, is an entitlement a person can claim against others, and, where the state is the guarantor, an entitlement enforceable through law rather than left to goodwill. Nigeria's right to education is built on exactly that footing: the 1999 Constitution (Section 18), the Universal Basic Education Act (2004), and the Child Rights Act (2003) each turn what might otherwise be a policy aspiration into a legal claim, while international instruments, namely the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the ICESCR (1966), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), and the African Charter (1981), supply the wider foundation each stakeholder's rights, discussed below, are drawn from. Responsibility, in turn, is the obligation to carry out assigned duties and account for the outcome; it cannot be delegated away, and it too is often legally enforceable under the same instruments and the TRCN Code of Conduct (2004). Every stakeholder occupies a defined role whose obligations cannot be transferred to another party: a parent does not hand over parental responsibility by enrolling a child in school, and government does not exhaust its own responsibility merely by establishing schools.

Rights and Responsibilities of Students

Rights of Students

Students are both the primary beneficiaries of the education system and active participants in it. Drawing on the constitutional and statutory instruments identified above, they hold fair hearing in disciplinary matters, and freedom of thought, conscience, expression, and association within the school setting; a statutory entitlement to free and compulsory basic education, while access to senior secondary education is progressively supported through national policy frameworks (Universal Basic Education Act, 2004); equal access to higher education based on merit, with a route back through fundamental education for those who missed primary schooling; quality education in both public and private schools, backed by the right to seek redress where that quality is denied; and a qualified academic freedom, narrower in scope than its fuller application in tertiary education, to pursue knowledge and hold reasoned views within the school's

disciplinary and curricular authority. These are not aspirational statements. Where a school violates these rights, the Child Rights Act (2003), Section 36 of the Constitution, and the Universal Basic Education Act (2004) between them give a student real grounds to sue, and litigation on these grounds is not rare.

Responsibilities of Students

Students are expected to know the rules of the institution they attend and to keep them. Not knowing the rules is no defence for breaking them, though no student should be punished twice for the same offence. This includes the responsibility to obey school rules, respect constituted authority, maintain discipline and order, and uphold the dignity of the school community.

Tension: Discipline and the Right to Fair Hearing

The sharpest tension here sits between a school's authority to discipline and a student's right to be heard before that authority is used against them, and Nigerian courts have drawn the line more than once. In Garba v. University of Maiduguri (1986) 1 NWLR (Pt. 18) 550, students expelled after campus unrest were found by the Supreme Court to have been denied fair hearing. The university had ample power to discipline them; the problem was that it had effectively punished them for a crime, arson, looting, assault, without their ever standing trial for it. Treating a disciplinary panel as a stand-in for a criminal court was itself the violation. Esiaga v. University of Calabar (2004) 7 NWLR (Pt. 872) 366 sits on the other side: a student merely suspended while a hearing was pending, not yet charged with anything, had suffered no breach, since a precautionary suspension is a holding measure, not a punishment. Put together, the boundary is fairly clear. Suspending a student while facts are established is lawful; treating a student as already guilty is not, and that is what Section 8.2's requirement of lawful, proportionate discipline looks like in practice.

Rights and Responsibilities of Teachers

Rights of Teachers

No education policy delivers without teachers who are qualified, supported, and motivated. In Nigeria, what teachers are owed and owe in return is set out across the 1999 Constitution, the TRCN Act (2004), the TRCN Professional Standards (2011), and the National Policy on Education (2013). Okechukwu (2025) observes that teachers who understand both their rights and responsibilities are better positioned to fulfil their professional obligations. Teachers hold professional recognition: TRCN registration confers legal status, protects against unlawful competition, and permits designations such as MTRCN or FTRCN; fair compensation reflecting professional standing and the academic freedom to choose teaching methods and exercise professional judgment; protection from arbitrary discipline or bias, with a right to appeal and to work free from harassment; and continuous professional development through ongoing training and TRCN activities.

Responsibilities of Teachers

Alongside these rights, teachers are responsible for ethical conduct and commitment to students; effective instruction, fair assessment, and orderly classroom management; and ongoing professional growth and mentorship of students' development.

Tension: Protection from Arbitrary Discipline and Accountability for Misconduct

A teacher's right to be protected from arbitrary discipline (Section 7.1) and the responsibility to answer for real misconduct (Section 7.2) sit right next to each other, and Nigerian labour tribunals have had to work out where one ends and the other begins. In Tomarah v. Executive Chairman, Post Primary Education Board, Delta State & Ors (Suit No. NICN/ASB/13/2020, 29 September 2023), a secondary school teacher had her salary suspended over unproven allegations of absenteeism and financial misconduct. The National Industrial Court found the suspension unlawful. It was not that the Board lacked the power to discipline her; rather, it had suspended her pay before investigating or proving anything, and the court reinstated her with full back pay and damages. The lesson is exactly what Sections 7.1 and 7.2 describe: the power to discipline a teacher is real, but it only holds up if proof comes before the sanction, not after it.

Rights and Responsibilities of School Administrators

Rights of School Administrators

Administrators derive their rights from employment terms, the 1999 Constitution, and public administration law (Ogharen, 2022), including the right to exercise institutional authority over discipline, student management, staff supervision, and daily operations; the right to institutional support, meaning adequate staffing, resources, and legal guidance from supervisory ministries; the right to fair treatment and redress where a decision against them breaches natural justice; and the right to be consulted before policies significantly affecting their institutions are made above their level.

Responsibilities of School Administrators

Administrators' key responsibilities (Ogharen, 2022) are lawful, procedurally fair, and proportionate student discipline; protecting students' rights by providing a safe and orderly environment, since unlawful punishment or arbitrary exclusion violates the Child Rights Act (2003), a gap Ojelade et al. (2025) trace largely to unfamiliarity with what the Act requires; lawful staff management, including ensuring teachers are TRCN-registered and disciplined only through due process; financial accountability in managing public funds; and implementing government policy in good faith while advocating through legitimate channels for students and staff.

Rights and Responsibilities of Parents

Parents occupy a legally recognised position in the Nigerian education system, with the Universal Basic Education Act (2004) framing their role as a joint custodial one with the school, in which neither party can transfer its responsibility to the other (Nwagwu, 2004).

Rights of Parents

Parents hold the right to free and compulsory basic education for their children (Universal Basic Education Act, 2004); to demand quality and uniform education standards (Constitution, Section 18); to be informed of their child's progress, since open communication is tied to better outcomes (Oni & Soji-Oni, 2024); and to participate in school governance through Parent-Teacher Associations, with legal redress available where children's rights are violated (Ossai et al., 2026; Child Rights Act, 2003).

Responsibilities of Parents

These rights are matched by responsibilities carrying real legal consequences when neglected: ensuring enrolment and attendance, non-compliance with which is liable to prosecution (Universal Basic Education Act, 2004, s.2); providing basic needs such as books and uniforms, though socioeconomic barriers persist; cooperating with teachers and administrators on discipline; and engaging actively with the school and advocating for children's rights. Oni and Soji-Oni (2024) tie all three of these to measurably better discipline, academic, and governance outcomes.

Tension: Parental Involvement and Professional Autonomy

Parents' right to be informed and to participate (Section 9.1) can come into tension with the professional judgment administrators and teachers are entitled to exercise (Sections 7.1, 8.1), particularly over curriculum, discipline, or grade placement. Nigerian law resolves this by treating parental and school responsibility as joint rather than competing: since the Universal Basic Education Act (2004) allows neither party to transfer its responsibility to the other, what parents hold is a right to be consulted, not a right to override professional decisions. School leaders should treat parental engagement as an accountability mechanism to be structured, through PTAs and regular reporting, rather than an intrusion to be managed defensively.

Rights and Responsibilities of Host Communities

Host communities are among the most overlooked stakeholders, yet their role is historically significant: communities have long provided land, accommodation, and safety for schools, which gives them a legitimate governance stake (Abiodun-Oyebanji & Akintayo, 2024).

Rights of Host Communities

Communities hold the right to participate in school governance, particularly at the basic education level (Gyang & Gusen, 2021); to be consulted before decisions significantly affecting their schools are made; and to transparent management of contributed land, labour, or funds, and to relevant, context-responsive education (National Human Rights Commission, 2019).

Responsibilities of Host Communities

In turn, communities are responsible for providing a safe environment, protecting schools from violence and vandalism; supporting governance through board participation, levies, and voluntary labour; protecting school infrastructure, which communities with a genuine sense of ownership tend to maintain far better (Gyang & Gusen, 2021); and respecting professional authority while promoting a culture that values education (Abiodun-Oyebanji & Akintayo, 2024).

Authority and Responsibilities of Government

Education in Nigeria is both a constitutional mandate and a statutory duty of government, but government's position here differs in kind from every other stakeholder discussed so far. A student or teacher holds rights; government holds constitutional authority and statutory responsibility. That distinction matters, since authority can be challenged in court as unlawfully exercised in a way a settled right ordinarily cannot be, as Section 11.3 shows.

Government's Constitutional Authority and Regulatory Powers in Education

Government holds constitutional authority to establish, regulate, and supervise educational institutions (Constitution, First Schedule, Part II, s.4, Items 27–30) and to set minimum education standards (Constitution, s.18); statutory power to enact and enforce laws and policies governing school administration (Universal Basic Education Act, 2004); and power to collaborate with international bodies on global education standards (United Nations, 1966, Article 13).

Responsibilities of Government: Legal Obligations in Education

Government is responsible for providing free, compulsory, universal basic education (Universal Basic Education Act, 2004, s.2); protecting children's right to education and dignity (Child Rights Act, 2003, s.15); funding, equipping, and maintaining schools, and training, employing, and regulating teachers through statutory bodies (TRCN Act, 2004); and ensuring non-discrimination and equal access regardless of gender, ethnicity, or religion (Constitution, s.42).

Tension: Regulatory Authority and Students' Constitutional Rights

Government's authority to regulate schools has a ceiling: the constitutional rights of the students those schools serve. In Lagos State Government & Ors v. Asiyat AbdulKareem & Ors (SC/910/2016, 17 June 2022), the Supreme Court struck down a state ban on wearing the hijab in public schools, holding that it violated Muslim students' constitutional rights to freedom of religion and to freedom from discrimination. Government can regulate school uniform and conduct (Section 11.1), but that power gives way the moment it collides with a right the Constitution has already promised the student. This means that implementing a ministry directive in good faith, as Section 11.2 requires, does not protect a school if the directive itself is unconstitutional.

Synthesis: Rights, Responsibilities, and Authority Across Stakeholders

Table 1 draws together Sections 6 through 11, distinguishing rights properly so called from the institutional authority or statutory power government, and to a lesser extent administrators, actually exercise.

Stakeholder	Core Rights / Protections	Core Responsibilities / Obligations	Legal Basis (Illustrative)
Students	Fair hearing; freedom of thought, conscience, expression; statutory entitlement to free, compulsory basic education; redress for denial of quality education	Comply with school rules; respect constituted authority; uphold school dignity	Child Rights Act 2003; 1999 Constitution, s.36; Garba v. Unimaid (1986)
Teachers	TRCN professional recognition; fair compensation; protection from arbitrary discipline; continuous professional development	Ethical conduct; effective instruction; fair assessment; mentorship	TRCN Act 2004; TRCN Professional Standards 2011; Tomarah v. PPEB Delta State (2023)

School Administrators	Institutional authority over discipline and operations; institutional support; fair treatment; consultation on policy	Lawful, proportionate discipline; protection of students' rights; lawful staff management; financial accountability	1999 Constitution; UBE Act 2004; Child Rights Act 2003
Parents	Free, compulsory basic education for their children; information on progress; participation in governance	Ensure enrolment and attendance; provide basic needs; cooperate on discipline; advocate for children's rights	UBE Act 2004, s.2; Child Rights Act 2003
Host Communities	Participation in governance; consultation before major decisions; transparent management of contributions	Provide a safe environment; support governance; protect infrastructure; respect professional authority	Customary and statutory community-participation frameworks
Government	(Authority, not rights; see Section 11) Constitutional authority to establish, regulate, and supervise institutions	Provide free, compulsory, universal basic education; protect children's rights and dignity; fund and regulate teachers; ensure non-discrimination	1999 Constitution, ss.18, 42; UBE Act 2004; Lagos SG v. Asiyat AbdulKareem (2022)

Implications for Educational Administration

Pulling the analysis together, a few practical implications stand out for anyone actually running a school. Legal literacy matters directly: administrators who understand education law make fewer decisions that expose their schools to liability (Ogharen, 2022), regardless of whether they're aware of that obligation. Public funds must be managed transparently, and no student should face discrimination, as Lagos State Government v. Asiyat AbdulKareem (2022) affirms. Discipline should never proceed without a fair hearing, as Garba v. University of Maiduguri (1986) and Esiaga v. University of Calabar (2004) together establish, and employing an unregistered teacher is a criminal offence under the TRCN Act. A student who does not feel safe is not really in a position to learn, and Nigeria's international education obligations are not decorative. This is not a checklist to complete once. Legal awareness is a habit of practice, and that habit is what separates schools run defensively from schools run well.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to work through what six stakeholders, students, teachers, school administrators, parents, host communities, and government, are actually owed under Nigerian education law, and what each owes in return. Read through Stakeholder Theory, Educational Governance Theory, and Social Contract Theory, and checked against real case law rather than left as abstraction, the analysis keeps arriving at the same conclusion: rights without responsibilities produce entitlement without accountability, and responsibilities without rights produce obligation without protection. Good governance depends on holding that balance, and

Nigerian courts, from Garba v. University of Maiduguri to Lagos State Government v. Asiyat Abdul Kareem, have had to step in more than once to restore it once practice let it slip.

Nigeria's legal protections here have genuinely grown stronger over the past two decades, from the 1999 Constitution and the Child Rights Act (2003) to newer instruments such as the National Senior Secondary Education Commission Act (2022). The problem, as Nwagwu (2004) pointed out over twenty years ago and as Ogharen (2022) and Nwoke et al. (2024) keep finding today, was never really a shortage of good laws. It has always been about how unevenly those laws get applied. Ossai et al. (2026) find legal awareness a measurable driver of how well a school is governed. Administrators who understand the law and build real partnerships with parents and host communities are better positioned to turn compliance into outcomes students actually feel. That said, it depends on everyone in the chain, from government down to the individual student, taking their own rights, and the responsibilities attached to them, just as seriously.

Declarations
Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.
Funding: This research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

Abiodun-Oyebanji, O. J., & Akintayo, A. I. (2024). Community involvement: Key indicator for effective secondary school administration in Southwestern Nigeria. In *Educational management and quality assurance* (pp. 379–392). Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan.

African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. (1981). Organisation of African Unity.

Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1999) (as amended). Government of Nigeria.

Cranston, M. (1973). *What are human rights?* (2nd ed.). Taplinger.

Esiaga v. University of Calabar (2004) 7 NWLR (Pt. 872) 366 (SC).

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2003). Child Rights Act, 2003. Government Printer.

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2004). Universal Basic Education Act, 2004. Government Printer.

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). *National policy on education* (6th ed.). NERDC Press.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Garba v. University of Maiduguri (1986) 1 NWLR (Pt. 18) 550 (SC).

Gyang, T. S., & Gusen, J. M. (2021). Community participation in the development of secondary schools in Plateau State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Secondary Education, 9*(3), 86–90. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsedu.20210903.12

Lagos State Government & Ors v. Asiyat AbdulKareem & Ors, SC/910/2016 (SC, 17 June 2022).

National Human Rights Commission. (2019). *Right to education*. NHRC.

National Senior Secondary Education Commission Act. (2022). Laws of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Nwagwu, N. A. (2004). *Educational administration in Nigeria: Problems and prospects*. University of Benin Press.

Nwoke, C., Oyiga, S., & Cochrane, L. (2024). Assessing the phenomenon of out of school children in Nigeria. *Review of Education, 12*(3), e70011. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.70011

Ogharen, B. B. (2022). The imperative of education law in secondary school administrative practices in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 12*(2), 324–332. https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0055

Ojelade, O. E., John-Akinola, Y. O., Adefolarin, A., & Oluwasanu, M. (2025). Students' and teachers' perspectives on the Child's Rights Act in a southwestern Nigerian city. *Journal of Social and Educational Research, 4*(1), 69–77. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15698766

Okechukwu, E. (2025). Teachers' rights and responsibilities and societal expectations. *UNIZIK Journal of Educational Laws and Leadership Studies, 1*(1), 213–218.

Oni, A., & Soji-Oni, T. (2024). Unlocking the potential of Nigerian schools through effective parental involvement. *Journal of Quality in Education, 14*(24). https://doi.org/10.37870/joqie.v14i24.442

Ossai, A. G., Okokoyo, I. E., & Asabor, M. B. (2026). The perceived influence of education law on the administration and governance of secondary education in Nigeria. *Frontiers in Education, 11*, Article 1786349. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1786349

Taiwo, E. A., & Govindjee, A. (2011). Globalization and its effects on the emerging jurisprudence on the right to education in South Africa and Nigeria. In *Globalization, international law and human rights* (pp. 111–146). Oxford University Press.

Teachers Registration Council of Nigeria. (2004). *Teachers' code of conduct*. TRCN.

Teachers Registration Council of Nigeria. (2011). *Professional standards for Nigerian teachers*. Federal Ministry of Education.

Teachers Registration Council of Nigeria Act. (2004). Cap T3, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria.

Tomarah v. Executive Chairman, Post Primary Education Board, Delta State & Ors, Suit No. NICN/ASB/13/2020 (NICN, 29 September 2023).

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. UNGA Res. 217 A (III).

United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. OHCHR.

United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. UNGA Res. 44/25.