Indicators for children, families and the elderly

Report for the Research Directorate, Department of Social Development, Provincial Government of the Western Cape

Executive Summary

Project Leader: Dr Catherine Ward
        HSRC Project Team: Professor Andrew Dawes, Dr Ingrid Willenberg, Mr Malibongwe Gwele, and Ms Somaya Latief

Contact Address:
Child, Youth Family & Social Development (HSRC)
Private Bag X9182, Cape Town, South Africa
Cathy Ward: Phone - 021 466 7882 (w) 084 601 2244 (mobile)
Fax - 021 466 7989
Email – cward@hsrc.ac.za

HSRC
Human Sciences
Research Council

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TERMS OF REFERENCE

This project builds upon two other indicator sets delivered to the Department in 2006: Indicators for Child Protection (Dawes, Willenberg, & Long, 2006b) and Early Child Development (ECD) (Dawes, Biersteker, & Louw, 2006a). The long-term goal is to provide a suite of indicators to support the Department's monitoring functions and thereby improve intervention targeting, and service access and quality.

On this occasion, the Department of Social Development (DSD) commissioned the Child, Youth, Family and Social Development research programme of the HSRC to develop:

1. Indicators for vulnerable families and relevant services in terms of the National Family Policy (Department of Social Development, 2005);

2. Indicators to measure victim empowerment, including adults (and elders who are abused), children in care, those children removed from illegal labour situations, and children in trouble with the law (DSD jurisdictions only). These indicators will be developed with reference to the Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP).

Annexure C of the National Family Policy (2006) defines a vulnerable family as one that is: "socially isolated, subjected to the least empowering circumstances, who is without support systems and or adult supervision, not linked to resources, does not function due to various challenges and who exposes their family members to circumstances that are detrimental to their development".

Vulnerable families include those who may be most in need of family strengthening services.

For this research, vulnerable families will include families living in poverty who tend to be socially excluded and vulnerable in a number of ways. Poverty conditions may be associated with and be exacerbated by particular forms of *household* :

- Those with young single parents (including pregnant teenagers);

- Skip-generation or elder-headed households;

- Child-headed households;

- Crowded households;

- Families where a member is chronically ill or disabled through HIV/AIDS or for other reasons;

- In the case of children found to be in need of care, alternative forms of family arise such as foster families (which need support), or residential care for some children.

Families in poverty are also more likely to be subject to individual / social pathology risks for which indicators are required. For example where:

- A family member is a victim or perpetrator of crime;

- A family member abuses alcohol or drugs;

- There is maltreatment or abuse within the family;

- A family that includes a child in trouble with the law, a child in need of care or a foster child, and a child removed from harmful labour.

Some geographical areas and neighbourhoods put families at further risk. The project will seek to provide indicators for these neighbourhood-level phenomena which include:

- High violence and crime rates;

- High poverty density;

- Low levels of human and social capital;

- High unemployment;

- A high child-care burden;

- Neighbourhoods low in necessary services for families: primary care clinics, well-baby and family planning clinics; ECD facilities; recreation facilities (parks, swimming-pools, sports grounds, movie theatres); libraries; police stations; etc.

In all instances, we will develop indicators relevant to families as well as to individuals. Indicators will address both service access and quality. In addition, indicators will be developed for identifying "hotspots" at small area level, where victim empowerment is needed. Note that these indicators will be limited to those areas that are the responsibility of the Department of Social Development.

METHODOLOGY

The research process had three main objectives:

Objective 1: To identify data collection processes and the kinds of data collected at each level in the system.

Objective 2: To investigate the flow of data through the various levels of the system (e.g. from facility through the District Office to the Provincial Head Office), and how it is used at each point.

Objective 3: To integrate the information gathered with the requirements of the policy and legal environments to design a set of indicators and provide recommendations for improving the capacity of the province to monitor the access to and quality of services

with regard to child abuse and neglect, children in need of care, children in conflict with the law, family violence, and elder abuse.

The following research activities were carried out to meet the above objectives:

1. Policy and literature reviews were conducted to inform recommendations and indicator development.

2. Data were gathered from DSD staff at facilities, District Offices and Head Office, and also from staff at NGOs and private welfare organisations in the field. The methodology involved a key informant rapid appraisal approach and data was gathered via telephone or face-to-face interviews with individuals. The list of key informants is provided in Appendix A and the interview protocol in Appendix B. As will be evident, they were designed to help us understand what data is collected, at what point, for what purpose and for which level in the system. Comment was also solicited on the challenges associated with data collection and with the flow of information through the system. Suggestions for improvements were also gathered. Visits were paid to facilities at each level of the system so as to gain an understanding of data capture and information flow from the ground up. It should be noted that not all facilities or DSD District Offices were included in this process. Rather, a rapid appraisal using selected facilities and offices was undertaken due to time and funding constraints. It was evident that the issues raised in the interviews soon converged across facilities and districts indicating that a full scoping was unlikely to produce significantly different information to that which we were able to gather.

3. The research team assembled forms used to capture data in terms of the various relevant regulations and Acts – for example, the Child Care Act (see Appendix C for a full list of forms). The reason was to gain an understanding of exactly what fields of information were routinely gathered and what information gaps might be evident.

4. Once the service provider had sufficient understanding of the information collected and the manner in which it flowed through the system, information flow diagrammes were presented to key informants in order for them to check their validity.

5. Recommendations for the measurement of outcome and service input indicators and for information flows were constructed on the basis of:

   • data collected from key informants; the research literature on appropriate indicators for monitoring such services; international, national and provincial reporting requirements, and local legislation and policy monitoring needs in terms of service access, standards and quality.

   • Panels of key informants were also given the opportunity to review and critique the indicators after they had been developed.

- We are grateful to the many staff in a range of departments and facilities that assisted us with this process. They are acknowledged at the end of this report.

APPROACH TO INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT

Five indicator types are used for this project:

Child Outcome Indicators, which measure the status of the child.

Family and Household Environment Indicators, which measure the structure and quality of the child's primary home-care setting. They are particularly important for Child Protection.

Neighbourhoods and Surrounding Environment Indicators measure specific geographical spaces such as neighbourhoods, enumerator areas etc. They are the spaces outside the home where children grow up. This indicator set permits small area indices of child risk and wellbeing to be constructed in order to provide information for policy targeting.

Service Access Indicators describe children's access to child protective services.

Service Quality Indicators measure the quality of Child Protective Service inputs including provisioning.

The indicators draw on evidence as to what children need to survive, be healthy and protected; to develop their potential; to be economically secure; and to participate in society.

MAIN FINDINGS

It is evident that there is an enormous amount of data already within the system, but due to the absence of standardised documentation and a system for collating and managing the data, much of it is not readily accessible.

General findings

There is considerable variation across sites with regard to what data is collected, and how it is stored. There needs to be greater standardisation of documents within the system. Standardisation will make data collection and collation relatively easy. In addition, data needs to be made readily available (across departments, where applicable).

Because many services are outsourced by DSD, much of the data pertinent to children, families and the elderly resides outside of the actual DSD system. There are 222 NGOs contracted to DSD to provide services for 2006/7. However, there appears to be no established mechanism for garnering data other than estimates of total numbers of clients served. Much valuable data is therefore inaccessible. Again, ensuring that DSD-funded NGOs complete the same data forms as DSD employees and units are required to complete, will make data collection and collation relatively easy.

Existing data is not (with the exception of certain reports on children in trouble with the law) used to generate reports that can assist planning or situation analyses. The data currently in the system is very seldom routinely aggregated for reporting.

One of the factors that seemed, across the board, to interfere with data collection was that those responsible for completing forms and sending them on to DSD often had no idea why they were collecting the data or how it would be used. Probably the incident most emblematic of this was the person at facility level who told us that the form was completed and handed to "the driver" every month: she had no idea of where it was ultimately delivered. This lack of understanding of the importance of data undermines motivation to complete forms correctly, and hence undermines the data system as a whole. In part, this reflects the intervention focus of staff: the importance of data for service planning and improvement is not understood. It is also, in part, a reflection of the fact that data tends to flow from districts upwards: there is little, if any, communication of data to districts and facilities for planning purposes.

The non-financial dataset does capture a significant amount of data. However a major shortcoming is that the focus is on total numbers and data are not disaggregated by gender, race, neighbourhood, or other important statistics. Important pieces of information are thus missed.

Findings specific to child abuse and neglect

There are dedicated data systems for capturing data related to children who have been abused or neglected. Our previous report (Dawes et al., 2006b) comprehensively addresses the issues around the child protection register and children in statutory care (although we later make recommendations that extend that system slightly, to incorporate an emphasis on services needed by children in care and their families).

Our previous report, however, did not address matters related to children and families receiving family support services. Such services may be regarded as victim empowerment services as they are intended to address child victims and empower families to take better care of their children. However, non-statutory interventions, or family support services, are documented only in the case notes of individual social workers, and not collated or made available more broadly.

A similar situation pertains in the case of children in statutory care – they and their families may need several services in order to ensure successful rehabilitation and reintegration – and in the case of children ageing out of care.

This is a significant weakness in the child protection system. In essence, it means that there is no record of services provided to children and their families. These services (and whether they are being provided or not) therefore cannot at present be monitored.

Findings specific to children in conflict with the law

Because there are dedicated data systems for children in conflict with the law, there is more data readily available. However, this data system is not well co-ordinated across the relevant departments (Education, Correctional Services, SAPS, and Justice), and therefore valuable information may be lost to DSD.

The new Child Justice Assessment Form collects information on numbers of children in care and assessments completed; the facilities provide information on facility occupancy, the facility capacity, new admissions, outstanding assessments, referrals and outcomes of these. Probation officers also maintain a monthly register of offender intake and trial outcomes. The IAS and CYCA systems also respectively maintain information on children internally to the facility, and across facilities. Importantly, this system makes it possible to monitor how long children spend awaiting trial, to ensure that children under the age of 14 are not imprisoned, and to ensure that assessments have been conducted prior to court appearances.

Findings specific to domestic violence

If family violence is the primary reason why people seek help, this may be captured in the monthly caseload report at district level. However, if the primary reason is not domestic violence and the domestic violence is only discovered after investigation, it will not be reflected as a problem on the monthly caseload report. There is no other source of data with regard to domestic violence at present. Additional data may be recorded in individual case files, but is not systematically collected and is not readily accessible.

Findings specific to elder abuse

Claim forms, for subsidy purposes, are routinely submitted by state subsidised homes for the elderly to the DSD Directorate of Fundraising and Planning. This provides information on resident numbers, new admissions, and discharges, and the level of care needs of the residents. As with data on domestic violence, additional data may be recorded in individual case files, but is not systematically collected and is not readily accessible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improve the quality of data at source.

2. Improve compliance with data requirements at all levels through provision of regular feedback and reports to districts and facilities.

3. Ensure that all staff members who provide reports and enter data are familiar with procedures and use the same definitions of abuse, neglect and other such key constructs as required by *their* sector.

4. Provide appropriate human and technical resources for data capture, integration and reporting in all child protection sectors based on an operational assessment of staffing and equipment needs at all levels from Head Office, down.

5. Children and families receiving family support services for child maltreatment, elder maltreatment, or domestic violence, should be closely monitored.

6. The status of children in conflict with the law who are awaiting trial or serving a custodial sentence should be closely monitored.

7. Data in each area should be disaggregated by the appropriate age and other status categories.

8. Improve inter-sectoral sharing and integration of data in each area through the creation of relevant Information Units within the DSD.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDICATORS

Indicators for monitoring factors at small area level, that are associated with family vulnerability

Indicator: Neighbourhood income deprivation

Measure: Proportion of people in a neighbourhood experiencing the following:
- Living in a household that has a household equivalent income below R10 189 per annum;
- Living in a household without a refrigerator.
- Living in a household with neither a TV nor a radio
- Living in a household without access to running water.
- Living in a household without electricity

Indicator: Employment deprivation

Measure: Proportion of unemployed people in a neighbourhood

Indicator: Neighbourhood affluence

Measure: Proportion of affluent residents over 25 years in a neighbourhood

Indicator: Education deprivation

Measure: Proportion of people in a neighbourhood with no schooling at secondary level (highest level is grade 7) or above

Indicator: Household crowding

Measures:
1. Average person:habitable room ratio for: children under 5 years; children under 9 years; single older persons.
2. The proportion of children under 9 co-sleeping with sexualised older children and adults should be determined – this will be possible where a single habitable room is available for the household.

Indicator: Childcare burden

Measures:
1. Proportion female-headed households
2. Ratio of children to adults
3. Ratio of men to women
4. Proportion elderly

Indicator: Violent crime rate

Measures:
1. Murder and attempted murder rate per 10 000
2. Violent crimes to children per 10 000

3. Rape rate per 10 000

Indicator: Young single parents

Measure: Proportion of households where there is a parent aged less than 25, who lives with his/her children in a household where there is no other adult

Indicator: Skip-generation/elder-headed households

Measure: Proportion of households where the household head is aged 60 or over, there is no other adult (aged 18-59) in the household, and the other household members are under the age of 18

Indicator: Child-headed households

Measure: Proportion of households where the household head is aged under 18

Indicator: Access to services

Measures: Access to facilities is determined by response to the question: Are the following located in the neighbourhood?
- A primary care clinic
- A well-baby and family-planning clinic
- A primary school
- A high school
- Recreation facilities (parks, swimming pools, sports grounds, movie theatres)
- A library
- A police station

And:
- Whether the household has access to a telephone (Denominator: Number of households in the neighbourhood.)

And:
- The number of children that can be accommodated in neighbourhood childcare facilities (Denominator: Number of children under 6 living in the neighbourhood.)
- The number of children that can be accommodated in neighbourhood after-school and holiday-care facilities (Denominator: Number of children aged 7–18 in the neighbourhood.)

And:
- The number of supermarkets per 10 000 residents

The number of businesses per 10 000 residents

Indicators for child abuse and neglect: Family support interventions

Indicator: Disposition decisions made after investigation of a report of child abuse or neglect substantiates the report

Measure: Proportion of substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect for which it is decided (a) to invoke statutory measures; (b) to provide family support measures

Indicator: The proportion of services identified as being needed by families, which are actually provided to families needing family support services

Measures:
1. Proportion of children who receive the necessary services
2. Proportion of families who receive the necessary services

Indicator: Service provider contact with families designated as being in need of support

Measure: Number of contacts between the family of origin and social worker, social auxiliary worker, volunteer or provider of specialist remedial or therapeutic services per month per family

Indicator: Success of family support services

Measure: Of those families receiving family support services, the proportion of families for whom a child or children enter statutory care

Indicator: Annual provincial budget allocations to social welfare services for children

Measure: Rand amount allocated for child social welfare services of all kinds per year compared with previous annual allocations

Indicators for child abuse and neglect: Children in statutory care

Indicator: Access of children in care and their families to required services

Measure:
1. Proportion of children in care for who receive the necessary services.
2. Proportion of families of children in care who receive the necessary services

Indicator: Effectiveness of family reintegration services for children placed in care

Measure: Proportion of children placed in care during a specific period, who return to their families of origin and do not enter care again

Indicator: Accommodation of particularly vulnerable groups in the statutory care system

Measure:
1. Evidence of measures introduced by government to capacitate existing service-providers to care for these categories of particularly vulnerable children
2. Number of programmes introduced to care specifically for children who have been extracted from commercial sexual exploitation and / or trafficking
3. Numbers of particularly vulnerable children in the statutory care system

Indicators:
1. Children ageing out of care.
2. Preparedness of children who are aging out of care

Measures:
1. The number of children who "age out" of care (in an audit year).
2. The proportions of these children who have remained in care due to (a) lack of services and/or planning, (b) unavailability of suitable foster or adoptive parents, (c) severe behaviour problems, (d) own choice, (e) coming into care when already in teens (in an audit year).

3. The education and training qualifications of children who age out of care in an audit year.

4. The proportion of children who "age out" of care and who have been through a structured Independent Living Skills programme (in an audit year).

5. The proportion who of children who "age out" of care and have an adequate support system in place on leaving (in an audit year).

Indicators for monitoring the situation of children in conflict with the law

Indicator:	Detention facilities for children are inspected at least once per annum
Measure:	Proportion of facilities inspected twice per year

Indicator:	In all facilities where children are detained, there should be sufficient childcare staff, and such staff should be appropriately trained
Measures:	1. The proportion of child care staff in detention facilities who do not hold the minimum standards of qualification.
	2. Staff: detainee ratios

Indicator:	Children subject to torture and inhumane treatment while in the care of the State
Measure:	1. Number of allegations of torture, abuse, cruel and inhumane treatment of children in conflict with the law
	2. Number of cases investigated alleging torture, abuse, cruel and inhumane treatment of children in conflict with the law
	3. Number of convictions for torture, abuse, cruel and inhumane treatment of children in conflict with the law

Indicator:	Deaths in the child justice system
Measures:	Proportion of children who die in state custody and in programmes or interventions sanctioned by the criminal justice system

Indicator:	Children injured in state custody by those responsible for the child
Measure:	Proportion of children injured while in state custody

Indicator:	Services provided to children in detention (sentenced and unsentenced) in terms of the relevant Acts and regulations
Measures:	1. Proportion of eligible sentenced and awaiting trial children (disaggregate) who are enrolled in formal education
	2. Proportion of eligible sentenced and awaiting trial children (disaggregate) (16 – 18) who are enrolled in education and training
	3. Proportion of children who have access to a social worker or other social services professional during each 6 month period of custody and while awaiting trial
	4. Average number of child prisoner -social worker interviews per annum
	5. Availability of recreational and spiritual guidance in all custodial facilities (based on registration of secure care facilities, and reports of the Inspecting Judge)

Indicator:	Capacity of secure and residential facilities to hold children apart from adults and to segregate genders
Measures:	1. Proportion of facilities which have facilities for male and female children separate from those for adults.
	2. Reports of children being held in contravention of the regulations

| **Indicator:** | Children arrested (by offence category) |
| **Measure:** | Proportion of persons under the age of 18 years recorded as suspects on Case Administration System (CAS) (child population for the denominator), for each offence category |

Indicators:	1. Children in detention in police cells for over 48 hours
	2. Children who are arrested but no further action is taken
Measures:	1. Proportion of arrested children held in custody for more than 48 hours following arrest. The number of children in detention in a particular jurisdiction should be disaggregated in terms of (a) the average number of children in detention per week/month/year, (b) date specific counts, for example at month end or on Mondays, (c) new admissions to police custody, (d) number of children who have been in custody for less than 48 hours, and (e) children in custody for more than one week
	2. Proportion of children who are arrested but no further action is taken

| **Indicator:** | Placements of children prior to first court appearance |
| **Measure:** | Proportion of arrested children released into the care of a parent or guardian |

| **Indicator:** | Children are assessed using a standard assessment system prior to the preliminary inquiry |
| **Measure:** | Proportion of arrested children assessed using the tool |

Indicators	Timely assessment of children prior to first court appearance
Measures:	1. Proportion of arrested children assessed within 48 hours; of arrest;
	2. Proportion of arrested children assessed after 48 hours but in under 7 days from date of arrest;
	3. Proportion of all arrested children assessed prior to first court appearance

| **Indicator:** | Children who at first appearance have legal representation |
| **Measure:** | Proportion of children at first appearance who have legal representation |

| **Indicator:** | Children accompanied by parent/guardian at first court appearance |
| **Measure:** | Child at first appearance is accompanied by a parent/guardian |

Indicators:	1. Average detention cycle time of children awaiting trial;
	2. Children detained awaiting trial in excess of 180 days
Measures:	1. Average detention cycle time for persons under 18 years for each district and regional court
	2. Proportion of awaiting trial children held in prison for more than 6

months

Indicators:	1. Placements of awaiting trial children
	2. Placements of sentenced children
Measures:	1. Awaiting Trial: Proportion of awaiting trial children detained in each of places of safety, prisons, secure care facilities, immigration centres and police cells, or released into the care of parents or guardians.
	2. Sentenced: Proportion of awaiting sentence and sentenced children detained in each of places of safety, prisons, secure care facilities, immigration centres and police cells, or released into the care of parents or guardians.

Indicators:	1. Use of non-custodial measures for children awaiting trial.
	2. Effectiveness of non-custodial measures in securing children's attendance at trial.
	3. Children under the age of 14 years awaiting trial in prison and police cells
Measures:	Range and utilisation of non-custodial means to secure attendance of suspect at trial with regard to:
	1. Proportion of arrested children released into care of parents ;
	2. Proportion of arrested children released on bail and bail amounts for children;
	3. Proportion of arrested children placed under house arrest ;
	4. Proportion of arrested children placed under S 62(f) of the Correctional Services Act.
	5: Children under the age of 14 years awaiting trial in prison and police cells

Indicator:	Children diverted from the justice system (for each type)
Measure:	Proportion of children diverted from the justice system stratified by diversion option

Indicator:	Recommendations for diversion in assessments are accepted by the prosecution service
Measure:	Proportion of cases recommended through assessment for diversion that are accepted by the prosecution service

Indicator:	Geographical accessibility and type of diversion services
Measure:	Types of service available in each magisterial district

Indicator:	Compliance of children with diversion conditions
Measure:	Children who do not comply are those who violate their diversion conditions as set by prosecutor

Indicator:	Compliance with Diversion Minimum Standards in terms of service providers' requirements and programme outcomes
Measure:	Proportion of diversion service providers who meet all the minimum standards

Indicator:	Preliminary Inquiry outcomes
Measure:	Proportion of children whose cases are prosecuted, diverted or converted to a children's court inquiry

Indicator:	Adjudication results of court cases
Measure:	Proportion of cases acquitted, convicted, converted to CCI and diverted (by offence category)

Indicator:	Children appearing at trial with legal representation
Measure:	Proportion of children appearing in court with a legal representative

Indicator:	Child Friendly Courts in place
Measures:	1. Proportion of children receiving requested interpretation services.
	2. Proportion of children who receive legal representation.
	3. Proportion of children whose hearings are held in camera

Indicator:	Sentencing practices in the child justice system
Measures:	Sentence profile of convicted children:
	1. Proportion of sentenced children sentenced to life imprisonment.
	2. Proportion of sentenced children receiving prison sentences of longer than 18 years.
	3. Proportion of sentenced children sentenced to non-custodial options.
	4. Proportion of children sentenced in terms of minimum sentences legislation, (Criminal Law Amendment Act 105).

Indicator:	Staff-child ratios in custodial facilities
Measures:	1. The relevant departments have published staff : child ratios in place.
	2. Ratio of children to care workers in each type of custodial facility (and compliance with norms once they are in place).

Indicator:	References in UNCAT country report to alleged and confirmed cases of torture and ill-treatment where the victims were children serving custodial sentences
Measure:	Number of notations

Indicator:	Educational qualification attainment of children in custody
Measure:	Proportion of children in custody who attend education programmes and who graduate with a certificate

Indicator:	The effectiveness of all services in reintegrating children in conflict with the law
Measures:	1. The proportion of children who are released from each form of sentence or diversion programme who do not re-offend within 18 months of release.
	2. The proportion of persons aged 18-20 years who are re-imprisoned and who served a custodial sentence for an offence committed as a child

Indicator:	Compliance of children with non-custodial sentencing options
Measure:	Proportion of children in non-custodial sentence options who do not comply

Indicators for domestic violence

Indicator:	Number of reports of domestic violence

Measures:

1. The number of reports of domestic violence in the province and in each DSD district, reported to a District Office..

2. The number of reports of domestic violence in the province and in each police precinct made to SAPS. Such reports must be recorded in the Domestic Violence Register (SAPS 508(a) and(b)).

3. Number of applications for protection orders, in the province and in each court.

4. The number of reports of domestic violence in the province and in each DSD district, reported to NGOs in the field.

Indicator:	Each report of domestic violence is assessed, and appropriate action taken on the basis of the outcomes of that assessment

Measures:

1. Proportion of cases where one or more of these actions has been taken for each report of domestic violence.

2. Proportion of cases where children have been removed from the victim's care (i.e., where a Children's Court Inquiry is initiated).

Indicator:	Access to therapeutic services for victims of domestic violence and their children

Measures:

1. The proportion of victims and their children for whom a report of domestic violence has been made, whose physical health has been evaluated by a doctor (or reason for lack of evaluation);
   a. Of those victims and their children undergoing such evaluation, the proportion who have physical healthcare needs;
   b. Of those victims and their children who have physical healthcare needs, the proportion who receive assistance.

2. The proportion of victims and their children for whom a report of domestic violence has been made, whose mental health care needs have been assessed by a social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist (or reason for lack of assessment);
   a. The proportion of victims and their children who are judged in need of counselling on the basis of a mental health assessment;
   b. The proportion of victims and their children who are judged in need of counselling and who receive such counselling from a social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist

Indicator:	Residential shelters (safe houses and second-stage housing) providing services to victims and their children are registered, and registration reflects services actually offered; residential facilities are regularly monitored in terms of their registration category and standards of care

Measures:	1. Minimum standards for shelter services have been developed
	2. Proportion of known services registered, by registration category (safe house or second stage housing)
	3. Of registered services, proportion which are monitored on an annual basis
	4. Of those facilities monitored, proportion which fail to comply with the conditions of registration
	5. Of those facilities which fail to comply with the conditions of registration, compliance notice has been issued and conditions of compliance notice met

Indicator:	There is a sufficient supply of beds in domestic violence shelters for victims and their children
Measures:	1. Proportion (and number) of victims of domestic violence who cannot be placed in a shelter, because of lack of beds, when placement is needed, by reason for refusal
	2. Proportion (and number) of children of victims of domestic violence who cannot be placed in a shelter, because of lack of beds or shelter age/gender restrictions, when placement is needed, by reason for refusal
	3. Average length of time between requesting a bed, and the bed being made available
	4. Register of number of beds available in shelters

Indicator:	Sufficient support services exist to enable victims to enter a safe lifestyle
Measures:	1. Proportion of victims of domestic violence who needed financial support (welfare grants and care dependency grants, where applicable) [Other forms of support?]
	a. Proportion who needed financial support, and who were able to access it.
	2. Proportion of victims of domestic violence who needed legal assistance, advice or training.
	a. Proportion who needed legal assistance, advice and training and who were able to access it.
	3. Proportion of victims of domestic violence who needed police protection (as ordered by a protection order).
	a. Proportion who needed police protection, and who were able to access it.
	4. Proportion of victims of domestic violence who needed housing.
	a. Proportion who needed housing and who were able to access it.
	5. Proportion of victims of domestic violence who needed education and/or training.
	a. Proportion who needed education and/or training, and who were able to access it.
	6. Proportion of victims of domestic violence who needed employment.
	a. Proportion who needed employment, and who were able to access it

Indicator:	Ensure easy access to shelters for all survivors/victims of domestic violence
Measures:	1. The proportion of safe houses in the province that are accessible 24 hours
	2. The proportion of shelters and police stations in the province that have the current list of all shelters

Indicator:	Shelters are physically secured
Measures:	Shelters at all levels (safe houses, second stage housing) must have the following:

- A telephone (land line and cellular)
- Security bars on windows and doors
- Panic buttons
- Exterior walls with locked gates
- 24-hour supervision by either a volunteer, SAPS or a private security company

Indicator:	Extent to which children continue with their education at the shelters
Measures:	

1. Bridging programmes are available for children unable to return to the school from which they came.
2. A childcare programme is available.
3. Proportion of children at the shelter who needed bridging programmes.
4. Proportion of children at the shelter who needed a childcare programme.
5. Proportion of children at the shelters who needed other education programmes, and who were able to access it

Indicator:	There is a standardised intake sheet common to all shelters
Measures:	

1. A standardised intake sheet exists.
2. The proportion of shelters in the province that have standardise intake sheet to guide assessment, admission and referrals

Indicators:	Provincial and District Domestic Violence Structures and staff are in place:

1. District Domestic Violence Officers are in place in every District and have the necessary staff to fulfil their functions.
2. Provincial, District and Local Domestic Violence Committees in place and operational; *or* organisations serving older persons are represented on existing structures.
3. Provincial Domestic Violence Plans are in place.
4. Local Domestic Violence Plans are in place.
5. Local services are based on both the provincial and local Domestic Violence Plans

Measures:	1. A provincial Older Persons Protective Services Plan is in place.
	2. The Provincial Older Persons Protection Committee is established and meets *at least quarterly* (attendance of each sector should be recorded); OR organizations serving the elderly are represented on existing structures.
	3. District Older Persons Protection Committees are established in every District and meet *at least quarterly* (attendance of each sector should be recorded); OR organizations serving the elderly are represented on existing structures.
	4. The number of Districts with Older Persons Protection Officers and the necessary support staff in posts to support local committees, reporting functions in terms of the OPPR, as well as oversight of all District Services (including 24-hour services).
	5. The number of Local Older Persons Protection Committees established in each District that meets as determined by the District Older Persons Protection Officer.
	6. The number of Districts with Older Persons Protective Services based on provincial and local plans.

Indicator:	Annual provincial budget allocations to social welfare services for domestic violence; social worker caseloads for domestic violence are appropriate
Measures:	1. Rand amount allocated for domestic violence services per year, compared with previous annual allocations (disaggregated by type of service, e.g., awareness campaigns, crisis centres, safe houses, second stage housing)
	2. Rand amount allocated to each level of shelter (safe house, crisis centre, second stage housing)
	3. Norms have been established
	4. Caseloads as described above

Indicator:	Ensure that SAPS officers and magistrates are aware of the requirements of the Domestic Violence Act and trained to deal appropriately with victims making complaints of domestic violence
Measures:	1. Of the women who have applied for a protection order, the proportion who do not return for the hearing, stratified by reason for not returning
	2. Of the number of women who did not return for a court hearing, the proportion that seek a repeat order (stratified by reason for seeking the repeat order)
	3. Of the women who applied for a protection order, the proportion where a social worker's report was presented to the court

Indicator:	Ensure that DSD staff members are trained to deal appropriately with victims of domestic violence and their children
Measures:	1. DSD has a protocol in place to describe to their staff the requirements of the Act, the special needs of victims of domestic violence, and their responsibilities
	2. Proportion of staff members of DSD who have been trained to use the protocol

Indicators for elder abuse

Indicator: Older persons' vulnerability to abuse and neglect

Measures:

1. The number of reports of abuse or neglect in each district and in the province, that are made to a District Office, and the proportion of older persons in the province and in each DSD district for whom a report of abuse or neglect is made to a District Office

2. The number of reports of abuse or neglect in each district and in the province, that are made to HEAL, and the proportion of older persons in the province and in each DSD district for whom a report of abuse or neglect is made to HEAL

3. The number of reports of abuse or neglect in each district and in the province, that are made to the Older Persons Protection Register, and the proportion of older persons in the province and in each District reported to the Older Persons Protection Register as having been abused

4. The number of protection orders issued to protect older persons in each district and in the province, and the proportion of older persons in the province and in each district for whom protection orders are issued

Indicator: Older persons in need of care and protection

Measures:

1. Proportion of older persons falling into each category, who are admitted to residential care facilities. Stratify by age group, gender, small area, dementia status

2. Number of older persons seeking shelter from a shelter for the homeless. Stratify by age group, gender, small area of most recent origin, dementia status

Indicator: Computerised Older Persons Protection Registers are established and are functioning at District and at Provincial level

Measure: The OPPR is established in terms of the Older Persons Act, to record data on persons convicted of the abuse of an older person or of any crime

Indicators: Provincial and District Child Protection Structures and staff are in place:

1. District Older Persons Protection Officers are in place in every District and have the necessary staff to fulfil their functions.
2. Provincial, District and Local Older Persons Protection Committees in place and operational; *or* organisations serving older persons are represented on existing structures.
3. Provincial Older Persons Protection Plans are in place.
4. Local Older Persons Protection Plans are in place.
5. Local services are based on both the provincial and local Older Persons Protection Plans

Measures:	1. A provincial Older Persons Protective Services Plan is in place
	2. The Provincial Older Persons Protection Committee is established and meets *at least quarterly* (attendance of each sector should be recorded); OR organizations serving the elderly are represented on existing structures
	3. District Older Persons Protection Committees are established in every District and meet *at least quarterly* (attendance of each sector should be recorded); OR organizations serving the elderly are represented on existing structures
	4. The number of Districts with Older Persons Protection Officers and the necessary support staff in posts to support local committees, reporting functions in terms of the OPPR, as well as oversight of all District Services (including 24-hour services)
	5. The number of Local Older Persons Protection Committees established in each District that meets as determined by the District Older Persons Protection Officer
	6. The number of Districts with Older Persons Protective Services based on provincial and local plans

Indicator: Each report of elder abuse is investigated by the Director-General or a social worker, and appropriate action taken on the basis of the outcomes of that investigation

Measure: Proportion of cases where:
- An investigation has been made;
- Investigations substantiated a case of abuse or neglect;
- Where substantiated, one or more of these actions has been taken for each report of elder abuse

Indicator: Where a report has been made to a police officer, an inquiry is held before a magistrate

Measure: Proportion of cases where a magistrate has held an inquiry where the initial DSD investigation has substantiated abuse or neglect by a perpetrator (i.e., not self-neglect)

Indicator: Outcomes of court inquiries

Measures:
1. The proportion of cases closed with no finding being made;
2. The proportion of older persons placed back with the caregiver under supervision;
3. The proportion of older persons placed in shelters and in each other available form of residential care;
4. The proportion of older persons placed in family care situations;
5. The number of older persons placed, by category of abuse or neglect

Indicator: Each older person who requires services has his/her identity documents in his/her own possession

Measure: The proportion of older persons who require services, and whose affairs have not been placed under guardianship or curatorship, who have their identity documents in their own possession

Indicator: Access to therapeutic services for abused or neglected older persons

Measures:

1. The proportion of older persons for whom a report of abuse or neglect has been made, whose physical health has been evaluated by a doctor;
2. Of those older persons undergoing such evaluation, the proportion who have physical healthcare needs;
3. Of those older persons who have physical healthcare needs, the proportion who receive them.
4. The proportion of older persons for whom a report of abuse or neglect has been made, whose mental health care needs have been assessed by a social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist;
5. The proportion of older persons who are judged in need of counselling on the basis of a mental health assessment;
6. The proportion of older persons who are judged in need of counselling and who receive such counselling from a social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist

Indicators: All services to older persons are registered, and registration reflects services actually offered; residential care facilities are regularly monitored in terms of their registration category and standards of care

Measures:

1. Proportion of known services registered, by registration category.
2. Of registered services, proportion which are monitored on an annual basis.
3. Of those facilities monitored, proportion which fail to comply with the conditions of registration.
4. Of those facilities which fail to comply with the conditions of registration, compliance notice has been issued and conditions of compliance notice met

Indicator: A residents' committee is established by the residents, where more than 10 older persons reside in a residential facility (excluding shelters)

Measures:

1. Proportion of residential facilities where more than 10 older persons reside, which have a residents' committee appropriately established and structured in terms of the Act.
2. Proportion of residential facilities where more than 10 older persons reside, which do not have a residents' committee, by reason for a lack of establishment of such a committee

Indicator: Ensure that those working with older persons are appropriately trained

Measures:

1. Proportion of those working with the elderly and/or in organisations providing services to the elderly, who have received recognised training in working with the elderly
2. Proportion of those working with older persons with dementia and/or in organisations providing services to those who may be demented, who have received recognised, specific training in working with those who are demented

Indicators: Sufficiently high ratios of staff to older persons are also essential for the provision of quality services and for protection of older persons (over-burdened care providers are more likely to be abusive or neglectful); in terms of the Act, all staff members in services for older persons must be screened against the OPPR; services may not employ persons who appear on the OPPR

| **Measures:** | 1. Proportion of services, in each service category, where the ratio of staff to older persons receiving services, is sufficient to ensure adequate care and protection of older persons |
| | 2. Prior to employment, all staff members are screened against the OPPR; no person is employed who is registered on the OPPR |

Indicators:	The Department of Social Development has a protocol in place for dealing with the special needs of older persons and the protection of older persons, and all social workers have been trained in the use of the protocol
Measures:	1. Within the Department of Social Development, there is a protocol for dealing with elder abuse
	2. Proportion of direct-service social workers within the Department, who have been trained in the use of the protocol

Indicators:	Ensure that SAPS officers and magistrates are aware of the requirements of the Older Persons Act and trained to deal appropriately with older persons making complaints of abuse or neglect; ensure that inquiries are held in a timely fashion
Measures:	1. SAPS and the Department of Justice (magistrates) have a protocol in place to describe to their staff the requirements of the Act, and ways of dealing with the special needs of older persons
	2. Proportion of staff members of SAPS and Department of Justice (magistrates) who have been trained to use the protocol
	3. Proportion of police precincts in the province which have at least one officer trained to deal with older abuse and neglect, on duty or on call at all times
	4. Court throughput rate for elder abuse inquiries: The number of days per month when courts sit, divided by number of older persons served per month, for the Department of Justice reporting year
	5. Average waiting period for a court inquiry, in days
	6. Proportion of courts that are accessible to older persons with physical and intellectual disabilities
	7. Proportion of court inquiries where appropriate translation services (including signing) are provided

Indicators:	Annual provincial budget allocations to social welfare services for older persons; social worker caseloads for abused older persons are within the norm
Measures:	1. Annual provincial budget allocation for all social welfare services (excluding old age pensions) to older persons, stratified by at least:
	• Agency social worker salary subsidies (and the number of posts subsidised)
	• Support for statutory services, including placement options for older persons found in need of care
	2. Ensure that there are sufficient services for each level of care needs (level 1, 2, or 3)
	3. The proportion of district-level social workers with a caseload of less than *21 acute cases* of older abuse/neglect at any one time
	4. The proportion of district-level social workers with a caseload of 21-50 acute cases of older abuse/neglect at any one time

| **Indicator:** | There are sufficient placements for older persons who cannot remain where they are |

Measures:	1. Average length of time between the outcome of an investigation which finds that an older person needs removal to a safe place, and the time that the older person is placed in that safe place
	2. Number and proportion of older persons who need removing from their current situation, who are placed in alternatives to shelters or residential care facilities (such as hospitals)
	3. Numbers of older persons refused admission to a facility, with reasons for refusing admission of an older person to a facility; and where that older person was then placed

| **Indicator:** | A Register of Elders in Care is in place in the Province |
| **Measures:** | National DSD accepts that Registers of Elders in Care must be in place in each province; each province has a functional system in place within 5 years of the decision being taken |

| **Indicator:** | Unplanned termination of placements |
| **Measure:** | Proportion of all placements that are terminated due to: (a) abuse; (b) illness or death of caregiver; (c) inability of caregiver to manage elder's behaviour and or illness (specify problem, e.g., obesity, dementia-related behaviour problems, smoking, severe bed sores); (d) rejection by caregiver |

| **Indicator:** | Ensure that older persons give consent for admission to a residential facility, or, where the older person is not able to give consent, consent is appropriately obtained in accordance with the Act |
| **Measure:** | Proportion of admissions to residential care facilities, where consent of the older person is obtained; or where the consent procedures otherwise follow the requirements of the Act |

Indicator:	Caregivers receive training and regular support
Measures:	1. Percentage of caregivers in each province who received regular support from social workers, social auxiliary workers, other caregivers or volunteers in a reporting year
	2. Number of contacts between elder and social worker, social auxiliary worker, volunteer or provider of specialist therapeutic services per month per elder
	3. Percentage of caregivers in each province who have received initial training in a reporting year
	4. Percentage of caregivers in each province who have received ongoing training in a given year
	5. Proportion of older persons requiring day care services who are not receiving them, by reason (e.g., no accessible day care centre available; day care centre full)
	6. Proportion of older persons requiring respite services who are not receiving them, by reason (e.g., no accessible respite care facility available; respite care facility full)

Indicator:	Access of elders and their families to required services
Measures:	1. Proportion of elders in care who receive the necessary services
	2. Proportion of families of elders in care who receive the necessary services

Indicator: Accommodation of particularly vulnerable groups in the care system

Measures:
1. Evidence of measures introduced by government to capacitate existing service-providers to care for these categories of particularly vulnerable older people
2. Numbers of particularly vulnerable elders in the statutory care system