Child Protection in Crisis
Network for Research, Learning & Action

The following document is a summary of the key discussions that took place during the August 24-26th CPC Network Strategic Planning workshop in New York City. It provides a brief summary of presentations and conversations, and list recommendations that emerged both during the workshop as well as from conversations that continued after the workshop and through the evenings. All Power Point presentations are attached as a separate file and maybe useful to refer to.

_____

Day One:

<u>Organization Learning and the Role of Networks</u>

Neil Boothby opened with a presentation on how organizations learn, and the role of networks in promoting learning (see Ppt 1). Participants were organized into their respective country and task force groups and discussed what learning is and how it takes place – is it tacit or explicit, is it possible to blend these two? Can "judgment free" learning space be created so we can openly review failures as well as success? Conversations brought out the challenges of documenting learning, identifying lessons and applying them in useful ways, challenges with only working on programs that are easy to measure, and that child protection is in a "transformative state" compared to other sectors—and thus there are degrees of ambiguity and uncertainty that will need to be addressed over the next several years.

The groups recognized that there were no commonly used definitions or criteria for several key components of learning: good practice, best practice, innovation, and even learning. How are these defined, how have other fields worked within the constraints? INEE was used as an example for how minimum standards were created and are now institutionalized. Several PLG countries noted that innovative practices are not "incentivized", thus the programs and research are leaning towards standardization that prevents innovation. Yet within all of these challenges to documenting, learning and implementing 'good practices' – the needs of those we work for, the communities and children, have to be a central focus.

Three different network structures—with centralized, decentralized and mixed pattern communication and learning directions--were presented. While it was noted that the current CPC Network is most similar to a "hub and spoke" model (with the Secretariat being the hub and the PLGs and Global technical groups being the spokes), it was also noted that more active communication and learning exchanges (such as regional meetings, country to country personnel exchanges and the global classroom) are taking place. The challenge is how to ensure that the various spokes work together and are encouraged and supported in their plans to collaborate. This structure was discussed in much further detail during Day 3 with recommendations emerging from these deliberations.

Functional Analysis Exercise

Shanon McNab presented the Network Functions Approach – a way for the PLGs and Global Working groups to reflect on their activities and frame them in a more structured and strategic fashion. The six functions that a network can play were the following: Learning and Facilitating; Investing and Providing; Convening; Filtering; Amplifying; and Community Building (see Ppt 2 for descriptions of these functions).

The various groups presented their thoughts on how they were currently functioning, and opened up to talk about how they could either assist other groups or discussed where their gaps were and the need for further support from the Network. These conversations were used to inform changes to the respective 3 year Strategic Plans.

Evaluation

Jane Warburton discussed the Oak Foundation's plan to conduct an external evaluation to answer the following questions:
- What is the level of connectedness of priorities – are they local, context specific, or are many area experiences similar?
- What is the structure and organization of the various components of the network and how do they contribute to the network goals (form and function)?
- What has been learned as a result of the activities of the network? Who is doing that learning? Practitioners, Government officials, etc? How has sharing lead to learning?
- How does learning translate into policy and practice? What do we know and what has this network shown us? What can we do to be more predictive in the future?
- There are other groups and networks that come together – how has this network related to them?

Jane asked the participants to email her with any additional items to look at or indicators to use for the overall evaluation that will begin shortly.

There was a final discussion on indicators of success of the work of the Network which began with a reflection of the mission statement '*Emphasizing learning, the CPC Network undertakes innovative research and builds evidence to affect change in child protection policy and practice'* (See Ppt 3). This mission statement suggests three potential domains on which the Network may usefully have impact: **evidence**, **policy** and **practice**. Some draft quantitative indicators were suggested for each domain as a basis for reflection.

It was clear from feedback that although some saw evidence and policy as domains of impact in their own right, most saw indicators at this level as outputs or outcomes only relevant with respect to impact on practice itself. Nonetheless, many suggested additional 'process indicators' regarding the working of the network (e.g. groups connected, gaps/priorities identified, making material available, preparing policy briefs, joint initiatives, inter-country exchanges, etc.).

Recommendations and Next Steps

Learning and Practice Criteria:

- *Secretariat will follow up with country and global groups to solicit their feedback regarding the level of felt need to develop a common definition of learning and/or to create clearer guidelines for good practice determinations.*
- *If members see this as a priority, the Secretariat will further solicit recommendations regarding the process whereby these issues would be moved forward with members.*

Knowledge Transfer model:

Program Learning Groups (PLG)
- *The network will seek to support integrated models in PLG countries. The creation of a high level integrated knowledge transfer model is a key PLG objective—and what distinguishes PLGs from other country level activities (such as agency-specific evaluations, assessments and research, which are also important for program learning).*
- *PLG principals will review the role and membership of PLG steering committee to ensure key decision makers are engaged.*
- *It is recommended that a new task force be established to support the engagement and development the capacities of Universities in PLG countries to become competent knowledge brokers as a critical component of the desired integrated knowledge transfer objective (see Task Force recommendations below).*

Global
- *Global groups are encouraged to examine their abilities to affect practice and policy change objectives as well and rethink membership and structures accordingly and include these changes, if any, in their 3 year strategic plans.*

Secretariat
- *The Secretariat will gauge the interest and priority level of the proposed policy change capacity development workshop which could be offered to PLG steering committee and technical working groups at the country level, as well as members of global task forces.*
- *Plans to develop and implement such a program will be developed (or not) accordingly.*

Network Function Exercise:

- *PLG and Global task forces will revise their 3 year Strategic Plans according to the working conversations and presentations while viewing their plans through the Network Function lens.*

Evaluation – Oak Foundation:

- *Jane Warburton will identify a consultant to move the Oak evaluation forward as soon as possible.*
- *Feedback from Network members on proposed questions is encouraged.*
- *The Secretariat will follow up with workshop participants to gauge their interest in developing a set of learning-change evaluation indicators for the next three years—and if interest exists,*

Day 2

The second day of the Strategic Planning workshop consisted of mainly presentations and panel discussions with the goal of determining what tools/skills/capacity exist and how to transfer that knowledge into support to achieve PLG priorities. All presentations are attached – the list of those presentations is below:

1. Systems Mapping Panel (Mike Wessels, David Lamin and Lindsay Stark presented on their experiences working in Sierra Leone and Indonesia): Within the field, there is a tendency to look at structure from the top down. The suggestion was made that we take a functional analysis approach, instead of asking 'how should things work?" we should really ask "how do things work?" and use a bottom up approach and simply ask people "what do you do when problems arise?" Several members of the workshop presented their experiences with the research and discussed these challenges and the findings. See the recent report on Community Based Systems Mapping in Sierra Leone for more details on this experience (See Ppt 4).

2. Engaging Universities Panel: There was a series of presentations on this subject:

Patrick Onyango: Uganda has been successful in creating an undergraduate course in child protection, a 3 month practice oriented professional certificate in child protection and a 9 month certificate for those without an O level degree. See attached presentation for process as well as lessons learned through the experience (See Ppt 5).

Phillip Cook: IIRD argues there is a need to radically rethink our orientation to CP research and education. University's training and advocacy need to make space for reflection, and have classroom time that is community based. IIRD is focusing on knowledge (what is the knowledge in the field right now?), skills-building (looking practically at the tools that people can use to think about a spectrum of interventions), and the 'self' component (reflect on our own attitudes and beliefs, but also how we listen to children). There are several challenges that CP is facing but to start, we need to find what needs of children resonate and that people can identify with – aligning child rights with how people think about dignity and justice.

Santi Kusumaningru: CP knowledge is owned by the international community (NGOs, UN and INGOs) but the question remained, do any of these organizations have mechanisms that ensure transfer of knowledge to future generations? Thus, the creation of the Center on Child Protection at the University of Indonesia was seen as relevant and necessary in Indonesia. The success of the center is due in part to its high level advisory board, and its curriculum and operational research projects, however capacity of professors in CP is not clear.

Sarah Lilley: Save the Children supports learning and mentoring to preparing child protection practitioners. For six years, the UK government funded 10 candidates each year to spend one year in a

training program to become CP practitioners. Each of the trainees had a mentor throughout their work and in total 70 trainees completed the program. The funding has been cut this year, but the recognition is now that the entry level is filled, it is the mid to senior level professionals who need specific training programs.

3. Challenges and Methodological Approaches to Collecting Data on Child Protection (Lindsay Stark, Joyce Wanican and David Lamin): There are common impediments to conducting assessment evaluation and research, such as financial constraints, time limitations, logistics and limited human capacity but the unique challenges within CP are that we are trying to gather accurate information on topics that are often sensitive or even taboo. Discussions took place around the complexities of the toolkit from Lindsay, David, Joyce and others. The panel's conclusion was that this is a complex methodology but the learning that is happening in various PLG countries (Liberia, Uganda, Indonesia) through the CPC Network is working to help gather better, more accurate data (See Ppt 6).

4. Advancing Child-Sensitive Economic Strengthening (Josh Chaffin): The CPC Livelihoods and Economic Strengthening Task Force recently published their first draft of a comprehensive 'Review of the Evidence' – a look into what is being done in the field of livelihoods and economic strengthening within child protection. One of the key limitations found was there is very little research on crisis contexts. The report contains a list of potential questions for further research as well as recommendations for practitioners in the CP field (Presentation is available at following link:

http://prezi.com/1i8yy5ijtpf8/es-slides-for-cpc-workshop-ny/)

5. Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation in Uganda (Joyce Wanican): The current situation sexual abuse related to children in Uganda has been identified as a significant problem, and due to legal structures, is not being addressed in the formal arena. Despite some of the data presented, there is still a lack of data on prevalence and magnitude of the problem as well as a lack of knowledge of the root causes of sexual abuse and exploitation especially those involving primary caregivers. The existing capacities and response mechanisms to handle these challenges are not fully understood nor is how to handle cases of sexual abuse involving primary care givers without harming the other children involved. The Ugandan PLG has conducted a pilot community mapping exercise and is currently working on another pilot to use mobile technology to report cases of abuse (See Ppt 7).

6. Children Without Family Care (John Williamson): Unlike several other areas in the CP field, there is extensive literature on child development and residential care, and the negative implications on children's short and long term development. Key questions remain: *Can the number of children be estimated in an emergency? And/or how many children are in need of reunification? How many children are in residential care? How many children live on the streets? Why does institutional care persist and in some countries proliferate despite substantial evidence regarding its impact?* Families and family-based care are imperfect, but on the whole they are better than the alternatives. Any type of care, family-based or residential, can be implemented badly and damage children. It is clear, though, that the available literature on child development indicates that families have better potential to enable children to establish the attachments and other opportunities for individual development and social connectedness than does any form of group residential care (See Ppt 8).

7. Children on the Move: Piloting a Mobile Assessment Tool (Sarah Lilley) - A recent pilot study conducted by Save the Children and Columbia Group was discussed. The challenges of dealing with children on the move are that most programs are static, gathering data on real numbers is quite difficult and it is very challenging to measure the impact on interventions with such mobile populations. A new methodology was used to assess the reasons for movement by using an innovative 'mobile' method to collect data. The data was collected in both South Africa and Thailand, using a 'seed' respondent and coupon structure to find respondents and then semi-structured, participatory survey instruments to collect data. Though the tool was deemed useful, the sampling strategy was not as successful. Indonesia is currently undertaking a pilot, an internal review of the process is being conducted, a field manual is being drafted, and further testing in the field will help to strengthen the data collection (See Ppt 9).

Day 3[1]

After a preliminary discussion of capacity development, workshop participants were divided into country and global level groups to discuss how the Network could best support their respective learning needs, and to link global and country level learning more closely together. **The following provides a very brief overview of these discussions. Recommendations regarding the structure and role of the Network follow:**

Country Groups
- Secretariat should
  - Send monthly updates from country and global groups and quarterly progress reports; sharing learning that is taking place in various settings.
  - Identify and circulate key resource and learning documents with brief summaries of each.
  - Work with PLGs and in country academic institutions such as the proposed Ugandan Centre of Excellence, to turn research into effective policy documents (how to connect PLGs with policy TA).
  - Organize periodic SKYPE calls among members of different groups to encourage cross country and thematic learning; promote with PLG leaders sub-regional and regional learning events and with global leaders, global learning events as well.
- Individuals who are working on CP in countries without PLGs should be included in the work.
- An annual learning event was proposed that would bring practitioners and selected academics in the region together.
- Building capacity is important in most countries – development of global curriculum should be a priority because many countries will be on board and will need such a curriculum.
- To build in-country capacity in a sustainable manner, Columbia University should position itself strategically to mentor and build the capacity. In the case of Uganda the proposed Center of

---

[1] The original agenda was modified to ensure more plenary discussion time per requests from workshop participants.

Excellence in Child Protection would in-turn build capacity of local practitioners and academics in research, evidence based practices, methodology and quality standards.

Sub-regions need to share knowledge and learning – for example the recently developed curriculum should target a regional market and together with the Center of Excellence, can have a regional influence, by contributing towards the growth of a cohort of skilled CP actors in the region as well as supporting responses to emergencies in the region.

Global Groups
- Structure and connective tissue – the Secretariat needs to play that role. Not a driver of agenda, but eyes and ears.
- Would like priorities to be driven from the field – recognizing that global technical groups can also offer ways to address issues that are being raised in the field globally but are not necessarily a priority of the PLG countries.
- Clearly state and establish the strategic priorities.
- Formalize a way to create new task forces – per shifting priorities and realities – that still allows for sharing of knowledge and dissemination of findings.
- Network should facilitate members making connections.
- More clearly articulate the role of 'members'; what does this mean to be a member?
- What is the role of the Network in synthesizing? What is the role in primary research and capturing secondary research already being done? How is that information shared back?
- Dual role of Columbia University – strong Secretariat doesn't mean they are necessarily a pushing force—this may be needed at this point.
- Secretariat should be a link, bringing PLGs and Task Forces together, and keeping all informed (given realities of the field and the voluntary nature of membership)

Recommendations and Next Steps

Based on these deliberations as well as ideas and recommendations gleamed from the first two days discussions, dinner meetings, and suggestions from other child protection actors who were unable to attend the New York workshop, the following recommendations regarding the CPC Network's structure and roles are offered to help guide the Network's development over the next three years.

Program Learning Groups

- *Program Learning Group: PLGs are an intensive and focused effort to effect change through an integrated knowledge transfer model—and as such are a CPC Network priority. PLG structures need to include steering committees (a structure for senior decision-maker engagement) and technical working groups (program and practice experts). Engagement of academia is a key component of an integrated knowledge transfer model—supporting their participation in PLGs and increasing their capacities over time—is a priority activity as well.*

- *Current PLG countries include: Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Liberia, and Uganda. There is also a new Middle East initiative based in Amman, Jordan, that is intended to evolve into a more substantial and sustained regional research and capacity building effort—a regional PLG approach.*
- *New requests to support PLGs have been received from operational agencies in Rwanda, Zimbabwe and the DRC, where individual learning projects have taken place. Decisions regarding responding to these requests will be made in consultation with existing country and global groups, the global Steering Committee members and donors.*

Task Forces

- *It is recommended that the Network use "task force" as opposed to global technical working group to describe its global work strands.*
- *Tasks forces may come and go as needed; they will be lead by network members, not the secretariat; it is recommended that they include relevant agencies within PLG countries as well as global agencies.*
- *It is further recommended that the task forces link to PLG work plans to the extent possible; that they consider the Network's practice and policy change objectives and structure their membership and activities accordingly.*
- *Existing task Forces include: Economic Strengthening and Livelihoods; Psychosocial; Measurement; and, Assessment and Evaluation.*
- *Workshop discussions and other deliberations have resulted in a recommendation that several additional tasks forces be established to both ensure linkages with other initiatives and also to increase support for Network priority areas. The creation of the proposed new tasks forces will depend on "final agreement" of the proposed chair person and their respective agency and or interagency partners.*
- *The recommended task forces include:*
    1. *Child protection systems work: (chaired by Sarah Lilley through the interagency community of practice)*
    2. *Children without family support: (chaired by John Williamson and Bill Bell through the Better Care Network)*
    3. *Emergency response capacity development: (chaired by Katy Barnett through the CPWG—and thus involving representatives of key agencies within the CPWG--and supported by John Williamson, DCOF, and Mike Wessells and Neil Boothby, Columbia University);*
    4. *University engagement: (chaired by Neil Boothby-CU, with Santi* Kusumaningru*, UI; Phillip Cook-IICRD—Eddy Walakira, Makarere; Open University, Sri Lanka, and other interested Universities as they become identified).*
- *It is further recommended that the various methods work strands be merged into one task force and diversify its membership to include researchers from PLG and other crisis affected countries (Les Roberts, Lindsay Stark and Alastair Ager, CU).*

Coordination and Information Sharing

- *Coordination between global and country level groups, learning agendas and technical support relationships require more thought.*
- *Some country level leaders, while approaching offers of support, have also expressed concerns about being "overwhelmed" by communications and inquiries.*
- *Global groups, in turn, have also requested clarification on how to relate effectively with country efforts.*
- *The Secretariat will solicit advice from country and global leaders and propose a "coordination" plan to be reviewed and revised as needed by group leaders.*
- *A mechanism needs to be established to ensure synergies between the different global task forces and well as application of learning to country level efforts.*
- *Creation of a "child protection innovation fund" within the Secretariat to promote PLG and Global Task Force linkages should be considered. Such an incentive would encourage but not dictate closer planning, collaboration and support of the Network's different parts.*
- *The Secretariat will solicit further ideas from workshop participants and develop recommendations based on these inputs.*

Secretariat

Both country and global groups would like the Secretariat to play a more active connective and communicative role. They believed that the "hub and spoke" model needs to be strengthened, not decentralized, at this time. This does not mean that all communications need to go through the Secretariat. To the contrary, country groups stressed the need for more active communication and learning dissemination within their own countries, as well as with countries in their respective sub-regions; and global groups also stressed the need to more actively link with PLG country agendas as well. Nonetheless, the consensus viewpoint that emerged on the final day is that the Network would benefit from stronger coordination and communication.

Columbia University's Dual Roles

Participants involved in country level PLGs and research projects acknowledged Columbia University's essential role in supporting the development of their knowledge translation structures (coordinators, steering committees, technical working groups, child protection centers, etc) and learning agendas and activities. Several country level participants went as far to say that Columbia University has assembled a unique team with both "academic" expertise and child protection experience.

Some participants who work at a global level, however, while also appreciating Columbia University's active role, pointed out that the Network may be too identified as a Columbia University endeavor per se as opposed to, for example, an inclusive Network for the Child Protection Sector at large. While it is agreed that Columbia University brings value added to the CPC Network as an actor, there are also questions about how it balances its research and capacity building responsibilities, on the one hand, with its coordination responsibilities, on the other.

While no definitive answer emerged during the course of the New York planning workshop, these deliberations, as well as consultation before and after the workshop itself have helped to shape the following recommendations:

- Columbia University dual role—as Secretariat and as Actor—will be separated as clearly as possible[2]
- The Secretariat, consisting of a fulltime coordinator; a fulltime program development officer; and, a part time director, will dedicate their time to the tasks described above.
- As an actor, Columbia University is involved in a range of technical support activities as well as Network task forces. It is recommended that these groups and activities be structured outside the CPC Network's Secretariat like other global technical working groups. No faculty, other than the CPC Director (Neil Boothby who is also a CU Professor) will "sit" inside or directly advise the Secretariat or its staff. This will better ensure the Secretariat focuses on the Network holistically, while also encouraging inclusive participation and prominent leadership roles for network members across the board.
- It is recommended that the CPC director share the existing terms of reference for the Secretariat's Coordinator and the communication-development officer positions with PLG and global Task Force leaders and solicit feedback.   A review committee will be established to determine with the CPC director who the Network's new Coordinator and Communication-Development officers will be.[3]

Steering Committee

Participants were generally familiar with the proposed terms of reference for the new global Steering Committee. Several participants expressed the hope that the Steering Committee would respond to the perceived (urgent) need to sort out membership issues, including:

- What does it mean to be a member? For example, is Save the Children a member—and if so will its Children on the Move initiative become a Network Task Force and champion learning in this area?
- How should the CPC Network connect with other inter-agency endeavors, such as the Better Care Network? Should CPC invite BCN to join as a task force leader of learning around children without family care—or should they two endeavors continue to proceed independently?
- Similar issues were discussed in regards to the parallel interagency and CPC Network's work on child protection systems. A dinner discussion resulted in a recommendation that the interagency initiative serve as the global task force on child protection systems (which CPC members would feed into to and benefit from). Is this a Steering Committee or Secretariat decision?

---

[2] Given Columbia University requirements, a faculty member must serve as principle responsible for grants. The Program on Forced Migration and Health also provides in kind office space, administrative support and financial oversight. There will, therefore, always be some degree of "overlap." Such overlap, however, can be minimized through the recommendations provided.
[3] This assumes funding will be available to support these positions.

In addition to clarification of the above, participants expressed the hope that country and global level steering committee members would find (and structure) ways to support one another's respective roles. While operating on different levels—country and global—several common Steering Committee roles and responsibilities may be identified:

- Guidance on governance
- Strategic guidance on priorities
- Raising the Network's profile
- Linking -diversifying donor support

Resource Mobilization

Resource mobilization is seen as the key to the CPC Network's ability to serve as a vital learning vehicle for the child protection community. Consistent and predictable funding is required to ensure core Network functions continue as well as to its country and task learning components. Country group participants cited Columbia University's role in mobilizing resources for their respective learning agendas as critical to the success of PLG efforts in these countries. Some global groups have also benefited from Secretariat acquired funding; however, others have not.

It was agreed, in moving forward, that the primary responsibility for resource mobilization must rest with the leaders (and the host agencies) of the country and global groups. Assuming continued funding for its development officer position, the Secretariat will also continue to play an active role in identifying funding for the Network's new 3 year learning agenda.

Participants also noted (see above) that a key role of country and global level Steering Committees (or Advisory Group in the case of Indonesia) is to raise the Network's profile, expand the donor base, and mobilize additional financial resources.

Moving Forward

1. The Secretariat will solicit suggestions/feedback on these notes from those who attended the workshop: this will help to inform the larger 3 Year Plan and also serve as a benchmark for network developments to date.
2. The global Steering Committee will discuss the questions raised relevant to their role and provide feedback and suggestions to Secretariat and Network members.
3. PLGs and global task forces will revise their respective 3 year plans and provide them to the Secretariat by September 20, 2011. The Secretariat, in turn, will develop the Network's 3 year global plan, and also edit, brand, and produce country and global group plans.
4. There remain a number of unanswered organizational and technical questions. These will be pursued over time through exchanges with relevant individuals and organizations over the next several months. The Secretariat will take responsibility for soliciting recommendations, and providing feedback.
5. Finally, the global Secretariat is currently supported by the Oak Foundation through a grant that terminates the end of September 2011. The evaluation discussed by Jane Warburton on day

one needs to be completed before Oak is able to consider subsequent funding. Even if the Oak Foundation decides to refund the Network, there will be a several month gap in support for Secretariat functions. Central communication and coordination after September 30, 201 will be limited.