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I. Measurement of child protection – systems approaches

- Definition of a child protection system

- Shift towards systems thinking in child protection work globally

- Systems mapping
  - Bottom-up mapping of individuals’, families’ and communities’ child protection systems (Wessells et al.)
  - Mapping of formal systems (Maestral)
  - Combination of formal systems mapping with utilization/perceptions from communities (Child Frontiers)
UNHCR Framework and systems approaches

- UNHCR’s Framework for the Protection of Children
  - “marks an institutional shift from mainly targeting categories of children at risk towards a systems approach to protecting children.”

- Definition of child protection system in UNHCR’s framework: “A child protection system includes functions undertaken by a range of formal and informal actors to prevent, mitigate and respond to the risks faced by children.”

- UNHCR ExCom 2007 Conclusion:
  - National child protection systems and refugee children
CPI in the context of systems measurement

- **Goal:** Develop and implement a Child Protection Index [CPI] in humanitarian settings, to demonstrate ‘proof of concept’ that a well-implementing child protection system can protect refugee children from harm.

- Build on previous definitions, discussions and research on measurement of child protection systems.

- Gaps in previous attempts at systems mapping:
  - Does a strong child protection system actually result in changes for children, families and communities? If so, what changes?
  - What are the *impacts* of a strong child protection system, or changes in the child protection system?
Research logic model

Research Area 1: Strength of System

**Goal:** Develop CPI to measure strength of CP system, based on UNHCR’s Framework

**Sources of data:** Key informant interviews, surveys

**Assessed at:** T1 and T2

Research Area 2: Outputs and Outcomes

**Goal:** To measure knowledge, attitudes, reduction of vulnerability, access to key services, i.e. reunification with family

**Sources of data:** Key informant interviews, surveys, focus groups

**Assessed at:** T1 and T2

Research Area 3: Impact Areas

**Goal:** Measure changes in: exposure to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation; psychosocial well-being

**Sources of data:** Key informant interviews, surveys, focus groups

**Assessed at:** T1 and T2
II. Child Protection Index

- Based on indicators in the Framework

- Key components of system:
  - Services
  - Utilization
  - Policies and procedures

- Data primarily drawn from key informant interviews; some items based on findings from surveys
Index Development

- Pilot CPI in Rwanda included 141 items

- Subjective and objective items – i.e. What is the quality of referral pathways for children and adolescents who have experienced violence? - Low quality; Medium quality; High quality

- Rwanda pilot results resulted in following refinements:
  - Reduction to 48 items
  - Shift to objective measures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Policies and procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there communal spaces that meet the Child Protection Minimum Standard for adolescents to meet? (Yes/ No)</td>
<td>% of adolescents who experienced sexual violence who reported their experience (reported by adolescent, to anyone)</td>
<td>For UASC, what durable solutions are currently available: resettlement, local integration, voluntary repatriation, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following activities do the community-based child protection mechanisms do in this location?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Identification of cases (Yes/ No)</td>
<td>% of adolescents who have attended school regularly in Terms 2 or 3 (recent school period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Prevention and awareness campaigns (Yes/ No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are referral pathways for reporting violence and abuse clearly displayed around the settlement? (Yes / No)</td>
<td>% of adolescents reporting they feel safe at school all or most of the time</td>
<td>Are there laws and policies in place against use of corporal punishment in schools that refugees attend? (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring child protection outcomes

- Adolescent and caregiver surveys
  - Adolescents aged 13-17; total 633 adolescents across 3 sites
  - Adolescent survey: Demographics; psychosocial well-being; child protection risks and exposures (experiencing and witnessing violence in household, violence in schools, SGBV); perceptions of safety; knowledge and utilization of services.
  - Caregiver survey: Demographics; socio-economic status; perceived humanitarian needs; depression and anxiety.

- Focus group discussions with adolescents in Uganda
  - Identified priority needs
  - Services and responses needed to address these needs
III. Results from Rwanda and Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rwanda – Kiziba camp MODERATE</th>
<th>Uganda – Kiryandongo LOW</th>
<th>Uganda – Adjumani MODERATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization</strong></td>
<td>18/35</td>
<td>8/35</td>
<td>20/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies and procedures</strong></td>
<td>23/35</td>
<td>21/35</td>
<td>23/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td>20/30</td>
<td>19/30</td>
<td>20/30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Child protection outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rwanda (Kiziba camp)</th>
<th>Uganda – Kiryandongo</th>
<th>Uganda – Adjumani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced physical violence in past year/period of time</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced verbal abuse in past year/period of time</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically forced to have sex in past year/period of time</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt unsafe at home in the past week</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt unsafe at the market or other public spaces in the past week</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uganda findings - Kiryandongo vs. Adjumani

- Significant differences in experiences of violence and psychosocial well-being
  - Experience of physical abuse significantly higher in Kiryandongo vs. Adjumani (42.3% vs. 32.2%)
  - Safety in settlement: percentage of caregivers who had a child who had been injured while walking around the settlement was higher in Kiryandongo than Adjumani (22.7% vs. 10.2%).
  - Adolescents from Kiryandongo reported higher symptoms of depression in the past two weeks, compared to those from Adjumani (8.7 vs. 7.2).
Qualitative findings in Uganda

- Identified problems not explored in surveys
  - Forced and early marriage
  - Discrimination against UASC within households

- Confirmed findings from surveys
  - Problem of violence against children in households
  - Vulnerability of unaccompanied and separated children

- Shed light on issues of quality and appropriateness of child protection interventions
IV. Challenges and next steps

- **Challenges**
  - Weighting of items in CPI
  - Interpretation of system strength
  - Specificity vs. generalizability

- **Next steps - Longitudinal component**
  - How or if system strength changes over time
  - How or if these changes relate to changes in child protection outcomes
  - Linking system strength and child protection outcomes
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• Any questions?

• For more information please contact:
  
  • CPC Learning Network: sarah.r.meyer@gmail.com
  • UNHCR: Joanina Karugaba – karugaba@unhcr.org
  
  • CPC Learning Network webinars: www.cpcnetwork.org/news-and-events/webinars