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Child protection measurement - systems

- Definition of a child protection system
- Shift towards systems thinking in child protection work globally
- Systems mapping approaches
  - 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 2012
  
  “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.”

Note. Emphasis added by presenter
Child Protection Index: 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?
Child Protection Index (CPI) development

- Based on indicators in the UNHCR Framework (2012)
- Key system components
  - Services
  - Utilization
  - Policies and procedures
- Developed through observational checklists and key informant interviews
- Data primarily drawn from key informant interviews; some items based on findings from surveys
Child Protection Index Development

141 pilot items

93 subjective items

48 objective items

16 poorly performing items

32 current items
# Child Protection Index – selected items

<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? i. Identification of cases (Yes/ No) ii. Prevention and awareness campaigns (Yes/ No)</td>
<td>% of adolescents who have attended school regularly in Terms 2 or 3 (recent school period)</td>
<td>Is this country a signatory of the 1951 Convention or does it have national asylum procedures in place? (Yes/ No)</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>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<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>% of adolescents who have attended school regularly in Terms 2 or 3 (recent school period)</td>
<td>Is this country a signatory of the 1951 Convention or does it have national asylum procedures in place? (Yes/ No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Identification of cases (Yes/ No)</td>
<td></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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that draft Child Protection Index is developed, time to test it...
Overall study design, quantitative

Quantitative

Demographics, psychosocial wellbeing, protection risks & exposures, perceptions of safety, service knowledge & utilization

Adolescent & Caregiver Survey

Demographics, socio-economic status, perceived humanitarian needs, depression and anxiety

Adolescent & Caregiver Survey

Demographics, socio-economic status, perceived humanitarian needs, depression and anxiety

Time 2 Follow-up
Quantitative

Adolescent & Caregiver Survey

2012  Time 1

Time 2 (>1yr)  Time 2 Follow-up

Qualitative

Key Informant Interviews & Adolescent FGDs

Child protection role, risks, activities by UNHCR Framework, CPI items (services, utilization, policies), protection priorities

Barriers & opportunities to utilization, perceived service quality, approach to protection risks

Reasons for observed child protection outcomes and system strength change

Key Informant Interviews & Adolescent & Caregiver FGDs

Child protection role, risks, activities by UNHCR Framework, CPI items, protection priorities

Barriers & opportunities to utilization, perceived service quality, approach to protection risks
Overall study design, CPI

Qualitative
- Key Informant Interviews & Adolescent FGDs
- CPI Calculation: system strength
- CPI Calculation: system strength change
- CPI Calculation: impact areas

Quantitative
- Adolescent & Caregiver Survey
- Adolescent & Caregiver Survey

2012 Time 1
Time 2 (>1yr)
Time 2 Follow-up

Note. Outputs and outcome research goals omitted for simplicity
CPI study locations

Rwanda: Kiziba camp
- Household survey with adolescents (13-17) and caregivers/parents (~250 pairs)
- Qualitative interviews and FGD (~150)

Uganda: Kiryandongo & Adjumani refugee settlements
- Household survey with adolescents (13-17) and caregivers/parents (~130 pairs)
- Qualitative interviews and FGD (~50)
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‘No punishment to the perpetrators’

Quantitative

CPI Calculation: system strength

Unsafe: 20.2% (home)
19.7% (school)
10.2% (school-route)
11.8% (camp)
10.1% (routes in camp)

2012 Time 1

Qualitative

Key Informant Interviews & Adolescent FGDs

‘No punishment to the perpetrators’

Ado sources of Insecurity: familial violence, corrupt security personnel, lack of accountability

CPI Calculation: impact areas

CPI 60%
multiple Choice

CPI 78.5%
multiple Choice

CPI 80%
multiple Choice

Unsafe: 25.3% (home)
30.3% (school)
29.2% (school-route)
17.3% (camp)
18.5% (routes in camp)

Time 2 (>1yr)

Ado-CG disconnect + poor structure ≈ insecurity

CG: adolescents irresponsible
ADO: unsafe
Agree: Need to document and prosecute perpetrators, Rwandan police improve security

Time 2 Follow-up

Note. Outputs and outcome research goals omitted for simplicity
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Challenges

- Weighting of items in CPI
- Is service utilization a good proxy for service quality?
- Interpretation of system strength
- Specificity vs. generalizability
Next steps

Longitudinal component (Rwanda analysis, Uganda data collection)

- 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

Based on findings, refine and validate CPI in other locations with a focus on ease of adaptability, data collection, analysis, and interpretation
Thank you

Questions?