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3 Main Points for the presentation

1 Our Research Environment
   - The HSRC.
   - Child Youth & Family Development (CYFD).

2 The development of a conceptual framework for monitoring child rights & well-being in South Africa
   - A little history
   - Why are we doing it?
   - Our Process
   - Approaches to monitoring
   - Steps towards a conceptual framework.

3 Next steps.
1.1: Our research environment: The HSRC

**Status:**
- Parastatal established by Act of Parliament.
- CEO Reports to: HSRC Council; Minister of Sci. & Tech.

**Structure:** 10 National Research Programmes.

**Senior Research Staff** (March 2004):
- 156 (in 10 National Research Programmes).

**Mandate (HSRC Act):**
- To conduct social research that is predominantly user-driven, large-scale, collaborative, policy-relevant and public-sector oriented.
1.2: Our research environment: Child, Youth and Family Development (CYFD)

**Mission:**
To promote social and human development through innovative research on issues that affect young people and family life.

**Goal:**
To produce internationally significant, peer-reviewed research of value to government, non-government, community agencies and the public.

**Senior (long-term) Contract Research Staff:**
16 (in various disciplines).
1.3: CYFD Research Areas

Priority Research Areas
1. ECD & the child care environment;
2. Education policy & learning;
3. Disability studies;
4. Child rights & protection;
5. Youth development, risk behaviour & resilience;
6. Sexuality and reproductive health, (including HIV/ AIDS);
7. Changing families & households (incl. the impact of poverty & HIV/ AIDS);
2: The Development of a conceptual framework for monitoring child Rights & well-being in South Africa
Let’s learn from our history

• Mid 1990s: CWI, UNICEF, NPA and others design strategic planning and monitoring framework’ and train staff. Not implemented.
• 2000: Stats SA mandated to co-ordinate state data on children. Sporadic at best.
Why bother? Six main reasons:

1. We must have an agreed framework for monitoring the situation of children and not an ad hoc process.
2. We must have an agreed set of valid reliable indicators that are collected regularly at appropriate points in time.
3. We must improve data quality, availability and co-ordination: Much current data is *not* a good basis for policy development, monitoring or programming.
4. We have the obligation to track impact of policies and interventions (a variety of spatial levels).
5. To do this we need to improve understanding of the relationships between child outcomes and children’s developmental settings.
6. We have obligations to report to the UNCRC.
Our Process: What are we doing?

- Developing a conceptual framework for *population level* monitoring;
- Framework designed to measure the status of children *and* their contexts over time from small to large area level;
- Developing indicators and measures in *rights, indicator, and well-being domains*;
- Examining the *adequacy of SA surveys & administrative data* as sources of data about children and their situation;
- Validating the indicators and measures;
- Consulting with key role players in government, the NGO sector and research groups throughout the process.
Our process: Draw on related CYFD studies

**Completed 2003-04:**
1. The State of Children in Gauteng (Gauteng Premier);
2. Standards for Psychosocial ECD in SA (UNICEFSA);
3. National SA survey: Partner Violence & Phys. Punishment (Save Sweden);
4. Indicators for nutrition support outcome in Zanzibar (Welcome);
5. The situation of SA Youth (UYF);
6. Quality of Rural Schooling (DOE);
7. Standards for Child Diversion Programmes (NICRO).

**Ongoing:**
1. Child & adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) norms (DOH);
2. Monitoring child rights & well-being (Save Sweden / HSRC);
3. Child protection indicators (UNICEFHQ – commence 2005);
4. Caregiving in HIV affected households (OSSREA / NRF / Norway Gov.)
Approaches to monitoring

Trend:
From survival to development, from well-being to well-becoming, from negative to positive outcomes.

Five emphases in modern monitoring systems:
1. Child Rights;
2. Child Well-being;
3. Child Welfare (and survival);
4. Child Development;
5. Social Development.
3 Stages of Rights-based Monitoring (After Bentley 2003)

• Specification of rights to children (The policy context: the laws that specify what duty-bearers are committed to deliver);

• Provision for delivery of these rights (policies and programmes designed to deliver on the rights);

• Measurement of child outcomes and access (with reference to research evidence and the opinions of children, their carers, & service providers; as well as children’s access to services).
Challenges of a Rights Based System

1. How clear are state’s obligations to children (e.g. are there limitation clauses or not in the Bill of Rights?).

2. What policy documents are appropriate to use when specifying the rights of children?

3. Do we have stable observable and robust enough phenomena to observe and assess whether minimum standards are being upheld?
Linking rights & well-being

Well-being approaches:
• Emphasise the *whole* child (e.g. the Chapin Hall model).
• Cover a range of domains of functioning (health; social development; education etc).
• Are informed by evidence on factors that influence the course of child development.

Linking child rights and well-being approaches:
• Overlaps between understandings of ‘child well-being’ and rights specified in the Bill of rights and CRC.
9 Minimal features of a national monitoring system

1. State pays for a regular data collection & monitoring process.
2. Measures positive and negative child outcomes & the quality of the child’s environment.
3. Is aligned with national and international priorities (e.g. MDGs).
4. Takes account of sources of influence at different points in children’s development.
5. Includes measures that are informed by children’s views.
6. Disaggregates data (area, gender, age, disability, poverty).
7. Tracks poverty and the impact of major epidemics.
8. System is designed to produce child centred statistics.
9. Produces accessible & uncomplicated information (by area).
Alignment: eg 1: MDGs

1. **Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. Indicator:** Prevalence of underweight children under 9 years of age.
2. **Universal primary education. Indicators:** Net enrollment ratio in primary education, and literacy rate of 15-24 year olds.
3. **Gender equality in education. Indicator:** Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education.
4. **Reduce child mortality. Indicators:** Under 5 mortality; infant mortality; proportion of 1 year-old-children immunized against measles.
5. **Improve maternal health. Indicator:** Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel.
6. **Combat HIV/AIDS (&others). Indicators:** HIV prevalence by age, gender, race and province, and condom prevalence rate for 15-24 year olds.
7. **Improve access to basic services. Indicators:** Proportion of population who access potable water, sanitation, electricity, health services and public transport.
Promotion and protection of the rights of the child and young persons. 3 Indicators:

1. Effectiveness of constitutional provisions and institutions to advance the rights of the child and young persons

2. Accession to and ratification of the relevant international instruments on the rights of the child and young persons, and the measures taken to implement them;

3. Consequential steps taken to ensure the realization of the rights of children and young persons.
Steps in the process

Step 1: Identify the rights that are granted to South African children.

Step 2: Identify where children’s rights are provided for as reflected in national policy and law.

Step 3: Cluster children’s rights to form rights domains (using articles of CRC / Bill of rights).

Step 4: Specify a set of indicator domains (grouping of indicators that are classified by sector - e.g. health and safety).

Step 5: Specify types of indicator designed to track the status of children and their
Step 2: Define indicator Types

1. Type 1 indicators measure individual child outcomes;
2. Type 2 indicators measure the quality of the child’s primary care setting;
3. Type 3 indicators are social indicators;
4. Type 4 indicators measure access to services;
5. Type 5 indicators service quality.
Step 3 Formulate Conceptual Framework

OUR APPROACH TO MONITORING AND MEASURING CHILD RIGHTS AND WELL BEING
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CHILD RIGHTS AND WELL-BEING MONITORING

CHILD RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS
Inform the policies, laws & regulations that provide for children

CHILD RIGHTS ARE MONITORED IN 3 RIGHTS DOMAINS
Survival & Protection  Development  Child Participation

IN 4 AREAS OF CHILD WELL BEING
Health & Safety  Education  Economic Security  Social Connectedness

AT 3 MONITORING LEVELS
Individual Child Status  Child’s Context  Child Services
Education Outcomes  Family Support for Learning  School Quality
Step 4: Develop indicators (desk research)

1. Conceptual Framework papers 1 and 2
2. Administrative data
3. Conceptualisation and measurement of child poverty
4. Early Child Development & Services
5. Child Health (including mental health and substance abuse)
6. Education (including special education)
7. Disability
8. Child safety and exposure to violence
9. Children in the justice system
10. Children in care
11. Child labour and trafficking
12. Quality of the child’s home care environment
13. Child abuse and neglect
Step 4: Components of each paper

1. Informed by the CYFD conceptual framework
2. Includes proposals for all 5 Indicator Types where possible.
3. Provides a conceptually sound, evidence-based, concrete proposal for the most practical and cost efficient way to measure and monitor the situation of children on a regular basis.
4. Specifies how indicators are measured (with appropriate numerators and denominators).
5. Identifies data sources and gaps.
6. Specifies data to be collected at three reporting levels based on spatial units – national, provincial and lower (EA; District).
## Preliminary Recommendations for Child Rights and Well-being Indicators

### Rights Domain: *Protection*: Indicator Domain: *Health & Safety*

**Child Labour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Indicat. &amp; Reason for use</th>
<th>Definition Measure &amp; period</th>
<th>Measurement Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elim. worst forms of child labour</td>
<td>% Working Child.</td>
<td>ILO Definition hazard work Annual</td>
<td>Numerator: ( \sum \text{ working children} ) Source: SAYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denominator: ( \sum \text{ child population} ) Source: Statistics South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 5

• Complete and peer review the series: January 2004.
• Compile in a volume for distribution; also produce an abbreviated version for policy makers (depends on funding).
• Present the framework and indicator recommendations to ORC, relevant Clusters, and other stakeholders: March 2005 (Depends on funding).
• Modify following consultation.
• Commence validation of new indicators and pilot measures in each domain (Depends on funding).
• Hope that (at least some sectors) use this approach to track the rights and well-being of children.
• If a national or provincial system convince Treasury to pay for it!
That’s all Folks…