

**CHILD YOUTH FAMILY & SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT
HUMAN SCIENCES RESEARCH
COUNCIL**



**INDICATORS FOR CHILD
PROTECTION**

Executive Summary

REPORT FOR THE RESEARCH DIRECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES & POVERTY ALLEVIATION
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WESTERN CAPE

Principal investigator: Andrew Dawes

Research Team: Ingrid Willenberg & Wabie Long

March 2006

Contact Address:

Child, Youth Family & Social Development (HSRC)

Private Bag X9182, Cape Town, South Africa

Phone: 27-21-466 7862 Fax: 27-21-466 7989

Mobile: 082-422-9940

Email: adawes@hsrc.ac.za

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Department of Social Services and Poverty Alleviation (DSSPA) (the client) commissioned the Child, Youth, Family and Social Development research programme of the HSRC (the service provider) to develop indicators for Child Protection as follows:

Child abuse and neglect; sexually exploited children; children on the streets; and their associated services. Services include children who have been placed in emergency placements, long-term foster care and residential care (these are child protective service options in terms of the current Child Care Act and also the Children's Bill), as well as street children's facilities.

The service provider was instructed to:

Conduct an in-depth analysis of social service delivery in the Western Cape and facilitate a process to identify social service indicators (input indicators) with an emphasis on:

- An analysis of all legislation and policy governing Child Protection that may determine standards of services delivery;
- An analysis of all conventions and international treaties that guide Child Protective Services or set international goals and standards;
- An analysis of the various Child Protection service delivery sectors to determine the indicator domains;
- Developing a set of indicators for Child Protection in the Western Cape.

In addition, the service provider was instructed to:

- Establish what administrative data systems exist to track children and families in the Child Protection system and also identify the data gaps;
- Advise on ways of strengthening the data systems so as to promote the regular monitoring of outcomes in accordance with

Departmental goals and objectives and in terms of specific programmes from time to time;

- Establish methods for the measurement of the status of children, access to services, service standards and service quality (in terms of benchmarks).

METHODOLOGY

The research process had three objectives:

Objective 1: To gain an understanding of the data collected at each level in the system.

Objective 2: To examine the manner in which information moves through the various levels of the system and how it is used at each point along this path.

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 measure the extent of child abuse and related problems, and to monitor access to and quality of services.

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 on all sources of Child Protection information was gathered from personnel working at facility, District Office and Head Office levels across the Social Services, Health, SAPS, Education and Justice sectors using a key informant rapid appraisal approach including individual interviews (face to face and telephonic), focus groups and workshops.
3. The research team assembled forms used to capture data for Child Protection in terms of the various regulations and Acts (e.g. the Child Care Act).
4. Information flow diagrammes were developed and presented to key informants in the Provincial Head Office and to District Office staff in order to check their validity.
5. Recommendations for the measurement of child outcomes, service input indicators and information flows were constructed on the basis of:
 - data collected from key informants; the research literature on appropriate indicators for monitoring Child Protective Services;

international, national and provincial reporting requirements; and local legislation and policy monitoring needs in terms of service access and quality.

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

Key overall findings

1. **All Departments:** There is a substantial amount of administrative data that is captured in a number of sectors, including SAPS, Health, Justice and Education in addition to Social Services that could be used for monitoring child protective services if the data was reliable and validated.
2. **All Departments:** There are few data linkages within Social Services and across provincial departments.
3. **DSSPA:** Although there is a wealth of information, very little is currently processed to generate reports by DSSPA that can assist planning.

4. **DSSPA:** Data collection processes and instruments are not standardised, which compromises reliability.
5. **DSSPA:** Staff tend to be intervention-focussed and seem to lack an appropriate orientation towards data collection and management.
6. **DSSPA:** Districts and facilities feel too little information is provided to them for planning purposes.
7. **DSSPA:** The Department has administrative data provided by street shelters that can be used to estimate this population and its service needs.
8. **Justice:** Data held by the Children's Courts is suitable for monitoring both child status as well as a range of service decisions.
9. **Justice:** The Department can provide data on children's access to court services that reduce secondary traumatisation and improve conviction rates when giving evidence in the criminal courts.
10. **SAPS:** Police data can be disaggregated to precinct level to populate indicators of household and neighbourhood dangers to children.
11. **SAPS:** Area Offices have rape statistics on the number of cases reported at identified police stations; the number of survivors referred to the Victim Support Programme etc.
12. **SAPS:** The Provincial Social Crime Office collects statistics on child physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse and neglect.
13. **Health:** The District Health Information System is used to capture data on child sexual abuse.
14. **Education:** Data on violence to children is collected by the Safe Schools Project, while Labour Relations data may be of use to measure disciplinary actions against educators for learner abuse.

DSSPA: Key findings regarding the Child Protection Register

1. At present, *one* Head Office data capturer has to capture the data sent through on paper for 15 districts.
2. Current data on the CPR *cannot* be regarded as an accurate, valid and reliable record of reported child abuse in the province.
3. Reports generated from the existing data on the CPR would *not* be suitable for planning purposes at district level due to lack of validity.
4. There are inadequate human resources for data capture at both District and Head Office levels.

5. There are information technology limitations at district level.
6. There is inadequate technological support, particularly at district level.
7. A lack of uniformity exists in the relevant forms (i.e. Forms 25 and 1).
8. There is a lack of mandated security controls in Head Office that are in breach of CPR protocol.
9. Mandatory fields are often not completed, resulting in the report not being loaded onto the system.
10. It frequently occurs that, where a group of children have been reported, multiple cases are reported on a single form in violation of the protocol.
11. The data capturer often has to make a judgement as to the nature of the abuse, even though he is not a social worker.
12. The Services field of the CPR is rarely completed – neither can it be updated under present conditions.
13. Suspicions of abuse prior to investigation are supposed to be recorded as well as confirmed cases – agencies are inconsistent in this regard.
14. The Head Office data capturer's security clearance is too low to correct or update reports on the system, or to close cases.
15. A number of threats to the validity and reliability of data currently on the Western Cape CPR are evident from the points listed above. We elaborate further:

15.1 Although the Child Protection Register Manual explains how to enter data into the database, there appear to be no matching corresponding instructions for completing the Form 1 / 25s.

15.2 Within DSSPA, Form 1 / 25s are completed for *all* reported cases. However, between districts, the practice varies as to whether Form 1 / 25s are completed for daytime cases or after-hours cases (but not both).

15.3 Finally, outcomes of investigations are, in practice, almost never reported to the District or Head Office that captures the information. "Closed" cases therefore remain on the database and distort the information that can be generated for reports.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF CHILD PROTECTION DATA

Generic recommendations on improvement of child protection system data collection, information flow, and inter-sectoral integration

1. Improve the quality of child protection information in all sectors by meeting the minimum requirements of a good information system.
2. Improve the quality of child protection data at source.
3. Improve compliance with child protection data requirements at all levels through provision of regular feedback and reports on child protection to districts and facilities.
4. Ensure that all staff that provide reports and enter data are familiar with procedures and use the same definitions of abuse, neglect and related constructs as required by their sector.
5. 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.
6. Children entering statutory care should be closely monitored.
7. Findings of the Children Courts regarding individual children should be recorded in a Standardised Register.
8. Establish a register for all children in statutory care on the Departmental administrative database.
9. Data on children presenting at health care facilities must be disaggregated by the appropriate age categories (0-17; 0-12; and 13-17).
10. Improve inter-sectoral sharing and integration of child protection information through the creation of a Child Protection Information Unit within the DSSPA.
11. Improve standardisation of data collection procedures and instruments.

Specific recommendations on improvement of child protection data and information flow in the Department of Social Services and Poverty Alleviation

1. The Department should ensure that indicators for child protective services are aligned with obligations in terms of International, National and Provincial law and policy.
2. The Department should establish a Child Protection Information Unit.

3. Use administrative data on specific populations to monitor their numbers and services.
4. Make more productive use of child protection data that is routinely collected by the Department.
5. Improve utilisation and dissemination of child protection information from Head Office to the districts and facilities.
6. Improve the Child Protection Register and the CYCA system.
7. A full quality audit should be conducted on the Child Protection Register. This research has shown that there are major problems with the validity of the data.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHILD PROTECTION INDICATORS

Monitoring Exposure of Children to Abuse, Neglect, Commercial Sexual Exploitation, and the Risk of Being on the Street

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| Indicator: | Children's vulnerability to violent crime |
| Measure: | The proportion of children in the province and in each SAPS zone and <i>precinct</i> who are victims of <i>all</i> violent crime (treated per crime category and as a total based score based on the sum across all crime categories) per year. |
| Indicator: | Neighbourhood vulnerability of children to violent crime |
| Measure: | The proportion of children in the province and in each SAPS zone and <i>precinct</i> who are victims of <i>all</i> violent crime (treated per crime category and as a total based score based on the sum across all crime categories) per year. |
| Indicator: | Children's vulnerability to sexual crime |
| Measure: | The proportion of children in the province and in each SAPS zone and <i>precinct</i> who are victims of Sexual Crimes (per crime category and as a total based score based on the sum across all crime categories) per year. |
| Indicator: | Neighbourhood vulnerability of children to sexual crime |
| Measure: | The proportion of children in the province and in each SAPS zone and <i>precinct</i> who are victims of Sexual Crimes (per crime category and as a total based score based on the sum across all crime categories) per year. |
| Indicators: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child Sexual Abuse (CSA) incidence 2. Household and area risks for abuse and neglect |

- Measures:**
1. The proportion of children in the province and in each District reported to the CPR as having been sexually abused in a specific year (no duplicate children). Disaggregate by contact and non-contact abuse types and by gender. Report per 100 000 of the population within each age stratification.
 2. The proportion of children in the province and in each District reported to the CPR and substantiated as having been sexually abused in a specific year (no duplicate children). Disaggregate by contact and non-contact abuse types and by gender. Report per 100 000 of the population within each age stratification.
 3. Proportions of children abused in selected localities (including the home and the suburb).
 4. Number of children found in need of care due to sexual abuse: Record of Commissioner's Findings at Children's Court Inquiries.
 5. Number of children reported to all FCS units in the province for investigation of child sexual abuse stratified by SAPS Area (Each of the thirteen FCS Units submits weekly and monthly statistics to its Area Office).

Indicators: **1. Child Physical Abuse (CPA) incidence**

2. Household and area risks for abuse and neglect

- Measures:**
1. Proportion of children in the province and in each District reported to the CPR as having been physically abused in a specific year (no duplicate children). Report per 100 000 of the population within each age stratification.
 2. Proportions of children abused in selected localities (including the home and the suburb).
 3. Number of children found in need of care due to physical abuse: Record of Commissioner's Findings at Children's Court Inquiries.
 4. Number of children reported to all FCS units in the province for investigation of child physical abuse stratified by SAPS Area (Each of the thirteen FCS Units submits weekly and monthly statistics to its Area Office).

Indicators: **1. Non-circumstantial child neglect incidence**

2. Child abandonment

3. Household and area risks for abuse and neglect

- Measures:**
1. Proportion of children substantiated as having been neglected in the above manner in a specific year (no duplicate children) as recorded on the CPR (when operational).
 2. Number of children under the age of 3 years to have to have been abandoned in a specific year, based on the record of Commissioner's Findings at Children's Court Inquiries.
 3. Proportions of children abused in selected localities (including the home and the suburb).

- Indicator:** **Children referred to a Children’s Court Inquiry**
Measures: Number of Children’s Court Inquiries per Magisterial District in a reporting year.
- Indicator:** **Children referred to a Children’s Court Inquiry in each Social Services District**
Measures: Number of Children’s court Inquiries in each Social Services District (based on data from each court plotted against the Social Services District in which the court is located).
- Indicator:** **Abducted, kidnapped and missing children**
Measure: The proportion children who are victims of abduction and kidnapping in the province and in each SAPS *zone* and *precinct* per year.
- Indicator:** **Children involved in CSE**
Measures:
 1. Number of children reported as being involved in CSE:
 - on the Child Protection Register (CPR);
 - reported to child lines;
 - reported to other relevant NGOs
 2. Number of prosecutions under relevant Acts.
- Indicator:** **Learner on learner violence**
Measures:
 1. The proportion of learners in the province and in each education District who are disciplined by their school for violence to another learner in a reporting year.
 2. The proportion of learners who report physical and sexual violence (including bullying) by a learner while under the jurisdiction of the school using measures designed for the UN Study on violence to children (www.crin.org), or another reliable violence exposure measure.
- Indicator:** **Learners abused by educators**
Measures:
 1. The number of Children who were sexually or physically abused, or subjected to corporal punishment by an educator in a reporting year, based on guilty findings of the Labour Relations Section of the Department of Education.
 2. The proportion of learners who call the Safe Schools Call Centre and allege physical and sexual abuse and the unlawful administration of corporal punishment in school.
 3. The proportion of learners who report physical and sexual abuse and the unlawful administration of corporal punishment in a specific victim survey using measures designed for the UN Study on violence to children

(www.crin.org), or another reliable violence exposure measure.

- Indicator:** **Number of street children who stay in shelters or access outreach programmes (including children subject to commercial sexual exploitation)**
- Measures:**
1. Number of children in registered shelters at the beginning of each month; number of new admissions; Average number sleeping each night (per month) (individual children must be counted so as to avoid double counting of children who pass through more than once in the period);
 2. Number of children who make contact with a shelter in the month but cannot stay due to lack of accommodation;
 3. Numbers of known street children, Day Strollers and children who are new to the streets who are interacted with services in a month;
 4. Number of children in shelters and outreach programmes who have informed the staff that they have stated that they have been involved in commercial sexual exploitation in a month.

Data and Information Systems

- Indicator:** **Computerised CPRs are established and are functioning at District level**
- Measure:** The proportion of Districts in the province that have a fully functional CPR in place.

- Indicator:** **Computerised CPRs are established at Provincial level**
- Measure:** The number of provinces that have a fully functional CPR in place.

- Indicator:** ***A Child Protection Information Unit is established within the Department of Social Services and Poverty Alleviation***
- Measure:** The unit is established in the Research Directorate of the Department of Social Services and Poverty Alleviation, and resourced with the necessary personnel and equipment. If accepted: A time frame is set for this to be done. Resources are sourced for the purpose from Treasury.

Access to and Quality of Child Protective Services

- Indicator:** **Access to a 24 hour Child Protection Service**
- Measure:** The proportion of Social Services Districts that have a 24-hour service situated so that all children in the province would be able to access the service within one hour's travel time (the measure would be based on the road matrix of the District).

- Indicator:** **Family Violence, Child Protection and Sexual Offences Units (FCSs), are**

established in areas identified as high risk for violence to women and children

Measure: The number of FCS Units established in high risk areas for violent crime to and abuse and neglect of children, as identified by the Provincial and District Child Protection Committees in collaboration with the SAPS (on the basis of FCS data) and the Department of Social Services and Poverty Alleviation (on the basis of Department of Justice Children’s Court Inquiry data) – for each Social Services District.

Indicator: **The FCS Units comply with recommended caseload norms**

Measure: The number of FCS Units that have staffing levels that meet the caseload norm.

Indicator: **Provincial and District Child Protection structures and staff are in place**

- District Child Protection Officers are in place in every District and have the necessary staff to fulfil their functions.
- Provincial, District and Local Child Protection Committees in place and operational.
- Provincial Child Protection Committee Plans are in place
- Local Child Protection Committee Plans are in place
- Local services are based on PCPC & LCPC plans

Measures:

1. A provincial Child Protective Services Plan is in place.
2. The Provincial Child Protection Committee is established and meets *at least quarterly* (attendance of each sector should be recorded).
3. District Child Protection Committees are established in every District and meet *at least quarterly* (attendance of each sector should be recorded).
4. The number of Districts with Child Protection Officers and the necessary support staff in post to support local committees, reporting functions in terms of the CPR, as well as oversight of all District Services (including 24 hour services).
5. The number of Local Child Protection Committees established in each District that meets as determined by the District Child protection Officer.
6. The number of Districts with Child Protective Services based on PCPC and LCPC plans.

Indicator: **Educator abuse of learners**

- Physical abuse
- Sexual abuse
- Corporal punishment

Measure: The number of educators disciplined by the Department of Education for each offence in a reporting year.

Indicator: Access to therapeutic services for abused children

Measures:

1. The number of children in the province who presented at a Rape Survivor Centre as a result of sexual assault, in a Health Department reporting period.
2. The proportion sexually assaulted children in the province who presented at a Rape Survivor Centre as a result of sexual assault, and *who received PEP*, in a Health Department reporting period.
3. The number of children who present at specialist tertiary trauma units as a result of physical and sexual abuse in a Health Department reporting period.
4. The number of children who present at specialist tertiary trauma units as a result of physical and sexual abuse and who are referred for social services and or psychological therapy in a Health Department reporting period.

Indicator: Areas from which children come to the streets

Measure: Areas from which children come to the streets are the Social Services Districts and suburbs where the child's home is located. These should be mapped on the GIS system and provided to District office welfare planners so as to render preventive services (particularly strengthening of families in need of support).

Indicator: Street child access to education

Measures:

1. Proportion of children from shelters who have received assessments for placement in ability-appropriate grades (not necessarily age-appropriate grade)
2. Proportion of children from shelters who attend school.

Indicator: Street children who have birth certificates or identity documents

Measure: Proportion of children in street shelters who have birth certificates or identity documents (if they are old enough).

Indicator: Street child facility is registered, and registration reflects services actually offered

Measure: Number of known services registered by registration category (shelter and outreach).

Indicator: Availability of urban street child services

Measure: Number of services in each category:

- Outreach work;
- Soup kitchens;
- Night shelters;
- Residential shelters;
- Children's homes specifically for street children;
- Preventive services.

Indicator:	Street child services in communities of origin
Measure:	Location of registered facilities.
Indicators:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extent to which children’s courts are accessible, child-friendly and adequately resourced for children in care 2. Extent to which children have access to impartial state-funded legal representation when necessary
Measures:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Court throughput rate for Children’s Court Inquiries: The number of days per month when courts sit divided by the numbers of children served per month for the Departmental reporting year. 2. Average waiting period for a Children’s Court Inquiry, in days, for the Departmental reporting year. 3. Percentage of presiding officers who have attended any form of training on childcare and development and family matters for the Departmental reporting year. 4. Length of experience in years of presiding officers in children’s courts for the Departmental reporting year. 5. Percentage of children’s courts with appropriate interpretation services including signing facilities for the Departmental reporting year. 6. Percentage of children’s courts that are accessible to children with physical and intellectual disabilities for the Departmental reporting year. 7. Percentage of contested cases in which child is legally represented at state cost for the Departmental reporting year.
Indicator:	Child-friendly courts in place
Measures:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proportion of courts in the province with properly equipped waiting areas for child witnesses. 2. Proportion of courts in the province with facilities for the disabled child witness. 3. Proportion of Sexual Offences Courts in the province with anatomical dolls available for child abuse cases. 4. Proportion of courts in the province with closed circuit television or other equally appropriate facility. 5. Proportion of courts in the province with intermediaries.
Indicators:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Social worker caseloads for child abuse and neglect are within the norm 2. Family Violence, Child Protection and Sexual Offences Units (FCS) officer caseloads are within the norm 3. Precincts are equipped to deal with child abuse at all times
Measures:	1a. Norms are established for Social Worker and FCS officer caseloads in each

province.

1b. The proportion of District level Social Workers in the province with a caseload of *less than 21 acute cases of child abuse and / or neglect at any one time*.

2. The proportion of FCS officers in the province who have *a caseload of less than 51 at any one time*.

3. The proportion of precincts in the province that have at least 1 officer trained to deal with child abuse and neglect on duty (or on call) at all times.

Indicators: **1. Regular support of foster parents**

2. Training of foster parents

Measures: 1. Percentage of foster parents in the province who received regular support from social workers, social auxiliary workers, other foster parents or volunteers in a reporting year.

2. Percentage of foster parents in the province who have received initial training in a reporting year.

3. Percentage of foster parents in the province who have received ongoing training in a given year.

Indicator: **Service provider contact with the family of origin of a child in care**

Measure: Number of contacts between the family of origin and social worker, social auxiliary worker, volunteer or provider of specialist remedial or therapeutic services (daily care workers and teachers excluded) per month per child in care.

Indicator: **Children committed to statutory care, and their subsequent movement between different forms of care, and out of care**

Measures: 1. The number of children *in ongoing statutory care* per year, in each form of care including: return to biological family, placement within extended family, adoption, indefinite foster care placement, permanent residential care with supportive relationships in the community, shared care, independent living, other, uncertain (giving reasons);

2. The number of children *leaving each form of care* per year, as well as their destination (alternative form of statutory care, biological family, adoption, independent living arrangement etc.);

3. The Average duration of the period spent in statutory care, inclusive of initial phase (in months).

4. The following should also be captured in a checklist, for example as follows:

- Any movement of the child. For example, (a) move to own immediate family, extended family, an unrelated foster family, or an adoptive family; (b) transfer to residential care (specify type); (c) abscondment; (d) discharge from care/independent living.
- Reason why the child is still in care;

- Date of completion of the Care and Development Plan;
- Dates of reviews of the Plan;
- Annual statement of preferred permanency outcome for child;
- Annual statement of level of progress towards permanency. Statements should be summarised as: “plan on track”, “plan partially on track”, “no progress”, “case inactive” or “permanency already achieved” – where, for instance, the child is in long term foster care with relatives and there is no prospect of changing this situation. The latter option should not apply to any form of institutional care.

Indicator: **Placements for children who cannot safely remain where they are**
Measure: Shortage of placement vacancies per category of placement in the province.

Indicator: **Children in emergency placements, by types of placement**
Measure: The number of children (stratified by age: <3 years and >3 years) placed on emergency (form 4) and Retention Orders in terms of section 12(10) of the Child Care Act pending a Children’s Court Inquiry, and by reasons for placement in care, namely: sexual abuse, physical abuse, neglect, abandonment, orphanhood, chronic or terminal illness in a caregiver, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, addiction in the child or a caregiver, and domestic violence. Type of placement must also be specified: places of safety, children’s homes, safe houses/emergency foster homes etc.

Indicator: **Outcomes of Children’s Court Inquiries**
Measures:

1. The number of cases closed with no finding being made;
2. The number of children placed back with caregiver under supervision;
3. The number of children placed in each available form of residential care;
4. The number of children placed in foster care with relatives (kinship care);
5. The number of these for whom poverty is the primary reason for placement;
6. The number of children placed in foster care with non- relatives;
7. The average duration of stay in temporary care.

Indicators:

1. Residential facility child care staff qualifications and experience
2. Social work caseloads
3. Residential facility quality

Measures:

1. Percentage of residential facility childcare worker staff with each qualification level;
2. Percentage of social workers in the employ of the Department and in subsidised NGO agencies who have training in child protection and care work (postgraduate training; certificate courses etc);
3. Percentage of social workers in the employ of the Department, and in

subsidised NGO agencies with more than 5 years in the field of child protection;

4. Number of supervision sessions *per month* attended by social workers in child protective services;

5. Caseloads of social workers managing all types of care and protection cases, both acute and ongoing (to derive averages for the province and each district - based on DSSPA and subsidised agency caseloads);

6. Percentage of facilities, complying with IMC Minimum Standards derived from DQA data.

Indicator: **A Register of Children in Care is in place in the province**

Measure: The DSSPA accepts that a Register of Children in Care must be in place in the province. The province has a functional system in place within 5 years of the decision being taken.

Indicator: **Permanency planning for children in statutory care**

Measures:

1. The proportion of children in statutory care for whom these plans are in place as required by the DoSD, and for whom the necessary services are being implemented, with backup plans in reserve in case primary plan does not succeed (e.g. adoption for younger children, preparation for independent living for older teenagers). The participation of children in formulating plans should be recorded.
2. The proportion of children in statutory care for whom these plans are in place and which are assessed and reviewed as required by the DoSD.
3. The proportion of children in statutory care for whom these plans are in place, and who are in contact with their families or significant others to the extent envisaged in the plan.

Indicator: **Unplanned termination of statutory 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 child's behaviour; (d) rejection by caregiver; and (e) problems between child and foster-sibling.