Regional Knowledge and Leadership Agenda (RKLA 1)

Child’s right to a family environment

Multi-country evaluation of results achieved through child care system reform 2005-2012

Terms of Reference

Focus: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine

These terms of reference are for a formative multi-country evaluation that will assess the impact of child care reform on progressively realizing the child’s right to a family environment. It will also document outcomes at system level that have contributed to such impact as well as review how UNICEF’s regional approach to child care reform that has been developed over the years, has contributed to such results. The evaluation will generate lessons learned on what seems to work and what is missing in the current approach.

The evaluation will be used by the UNICEF Regional Office and Country Offices to communicate and share lessons learned with the UNICEF’s Corporate Management and the Executive Board, donors, and strategic partners on the organization’s role in countries that are in the category of upper middle income or high income countries. It will also be used to communicate results and share experiences and lessons learned from the on-going child care reforms to contribute to the mutual learning of governments and UNICEF on how to best ensure the child’s right to grow up in a family environment.

The evaluation will cover the following countries: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine. It will cover the time-period 2005-2012. This is the period when most reform efforts have been initiated or have intensified at country level.

1. Context:

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) states the priority that “the child, for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality, should grow up in a family environment”¹ and the right that “State parties shall ensure that a child shall not be separated from his or her parents against their will except when (...) such separation is

¹ UNCRC, Preamble.
necessary for the best interests of the child". At the same time, the region of Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS) is known to have some of the highest numbers in the world of children growing up separated from their families. The total number of children who grow up in formal care in the region is estimated at 1.3 million, out of which 650,000 live in residential care. Of these children, some 200,000 have disabilities, and 30,000 are under the age of three.

The high rates of separation in the region are to a large extent due to the legacy of systems inherited from the socialist regimes. Before transition, the paradigm of centrally planned, budgeted state-run systems of protection, usually based on residential care, dominated. Mind-sets based on the common belief that the state could easily substitute family life prevailed in policies and practice. Even if patterns differ slightly from one country to another, generally "child protection systems" in CEE/CIS are capturing children with disabilities, children with chronic diseases or behavioural problems, ethnic minorities, children whose families suddenly, or over a period of time became socially or economically vulnerable (single mothers, mothers who give birth to children out-of-wedlock, parents with mental illness etc.), children to parents who are abusing alcohol, are dependent on drugs or are in prison. Gender dynamics are also thought to be very influential for decisions about institutionalization. This could be for example that young vulnerable mothers may be dependent on the larger family’s views and support and may not be able to take decisions regarding their future and that of their child, high levels of poverty among single mothers or strong cultural norms of “motherhood”, combined with an absence of any support system other than state residential care services being provided when a mother cannot meet the social expectations that are resting upon her. Overall, even if in some countries there are high levels of deprivation of parental rights that lead to the inflow of children into the care system, it is only a very small proportion of children that are placed in residential care because of violence in the family. This means that very few children are actually separated from their parents because it is in their best interests. Therefore it seems that most children who are placed in formal care are there for reasons of poverty and absence of social protection mechanisms and services for families and children. Stigma and discrimination against certain groups of children, such as children with disabilities, with chronic diseases, or belonging to certain ethnic groups and born to parents using drugs or otherwise socially vulnerable also continue to contribute to high separation rates in spite of many efforts to change this practice.

2. What do we want to evaluate

2.1. Description of the regional approach to child care reform

---

2 Article 9 of the CRC
3 UNICEF (2009), “At Home or in a Home”, p. 9
4 TransMONEE database 2012
5 For more information on causes of placement, see library on www.ceecis.org/ccc and among other following publications:
   UNICEF (2005) The situation of child abandonment in Romania, p. 29
6 UNICEF (2012) Children under the age of three in formal care in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, p. 64
Revelations of bad living conditions for children in residential care across the CEE/CIS in the 1990s as well as changes in the child care paradigm, calling for a shift from collective care and control, to responses to individual needs and respect of rights introduced by the then new Convention on the Rights of the Child, forced many actors to react and call for a reform of child care systems in the region. This was combined with the fact that a large number of children were placed in residential care since this was the most predominant service available for vulnerable families and children at risk in the region.

Supporting the reform of the child care system became a major priority for UNICEF in CEE/CIS from 2000 onwards. The objectives of the reform were agreed at the regional high-level conference supported by UNICEF and the World Bank, called “Children Deprived of Parental Care: Rights and Realities” that took place in Budapest, Hungary, in October 2000. The objectives of the reform were contained in an outcome document under the name “The Budapest Statement” that clearly defined the priority to support families and to move towards a progressive de-institutionalization process.

This was the foundation for the approach that came to guide UNICEF’s work in the region on this issue in the following years. Between 2000 and 2005, while UNICEF was also expanding its presence on the ground, work at regional level was geared towards building a regional compact to lead and guide country offices on a common agenda for child care reform. For example, UNICEF and the World Bank undertook the work to develop toolkits for “reformers” in three areas that were considered as possible triggers/entry points for the reform. One focused on the need for improving “gatekeeping” of the system. The second toolkit focused on the development of “standards” for (a new package of) services. A third and last toolkit elaborated on how to “reallocate resources” from residential care to other forms of community-based services. Embedded in the toolkits was the notion of changing mind-sets of professionals, a critical element of the reform process and a priority for the reform. A cross-cutting principle for the reform that was mainstreamed in the toolkits was also the notion of “reform planning”.

To further build UNICEF’s own capacity to support the reform, the UNICEF Regional Office organized several meetings with UNICEF staff in the region, including child protection officers and country representatives, with the aim of building consensus and skills on how to support the reform of the child care system. It was thought that this

---

8 These toolkits represent what was perceived by UNICEF and World Bank and agreed by governments at the time as the main areas for reform of the system that was needed in order for children to be able to grow up in a family environment, supported by the state, rather than separated from their parents by the State. The toolkits can be accessed from the following link: “Changing Minds, policies and Lives = 3 volume toolkits: http://www.cecis.org/ccc/publications/Changing_Minds_Policies_and_Lives_Gatekeeping_2003_ENG.pdf http://www.cecis.org/ccc/publications/Changing_Minds_Policies_and_Lives_Standards_2003_ENG.pdf http://www.cecis.org/ccc/publications/Changing_Minds_Policies_and_Lives_Redirecting-resources_2003_ENG.pdf
9 More documents on this can be provided on demand. Access to published materials from the following link: http://www.cecis.org/ccc/publications/Lessons_learned_from_social_welfare_reforms_and_some_planning_tips_2004_ENG.pdf
10 UNICEF uses a human rights based approach to programming which is based on the rationale that there are identifiable duty bearers who are accountable to uphold and help meet the obligations set forth in the human rights conventions (in this case the CRC). In CEE/CIS UNICEF child protection network defined that these duty bearers exist at three different levels – at the system-level (meaning the state apparatus – government, parliament and its governance and services that it uses to provide for its citizens),
“system” had a clear accountability to ensure the upholding of the rights of the children who grow up in the care of the state and of their families, who belong to the most vulnerable groups in society. Between 2003 and 2005, three regional network meetings of child protection officers were organized to agree on a conceptual framework for reform (focusing on system change), on how to improve monitoring and evaluation of the reform, and to agree on indicators for its measurement. The dialogue between country offices and the Regional Office during subsequent country programme development processes agreed on three main indicators to measure progress of reforms. In 2003, a Regional Management Team meeting of UNICEF in CEE/CIS also discussed the implications of reforms on UNICEF programming.

2.2. Reconstructing the Theory of Change

The subject for the present evaluation is the regional approach to child care reform that UNICEF implemented at country level and that is further detailed below in the TOC and through the schematic illustration of the TOC provided below. The stakeholders that UNICEF engaged with, to support the reform were first and foremost government counterparts, but also NGOs, and other international organizations such as the EU and the World Bank. While reforms started in most countries between 2000 and 2005 (and UNICEF was in most cases engaged in this process from the beginning), the evaluation will cover the period 2005-2012 when reforms started to intensify in most countries. The summary graphic representation details the different components of the Theory of Change that is further detailed below:  

---

society level and individual level. The systemic approach was endorsed by RMTs and through subsequent child protection network meetings and conferences involving major international partners, but most importantly, governments in the region.

11 The indicators were: Rates of children in residential care; Rates of Children in family-based care; and ratio between the number of children in residential care versus family-based care. There was no set regional target. These were defined nationally.

12 For the report from that meeting, please refer to: http://www.ceecis.org/ccc/publications/Creating_a_protective_environment_for_children_in_CEE/CIS_2004_ENG.pdf

13 As Per UNICEF PPP manual: A Theory of Change (ToC) provides a blueprint of the building blocks needed to achieve long-term goals of a social change initiative. It can be viewed as a representation of how results will be achieved in a development undertaking and the markers that will permit measurement of whether or not it remains on track. At its core, a ToC identifies: a) the results a development effort seeks to achieve; b) the actions necessary to produce the results – in terms of outputs, outcomes, or impact of that effort; c) the events and conditions likely to affect the achievement of results; d) any assumptions about cause and effect linkages and e) an understanding of the broader context in which the programme operates.
2.2.1 Impact level results: progressive realization of child rights

A part of the progressive realization of child rights and reduction of equity gaps that UNICEF sought to contribute to achieve was to ensure that children without parental care, who belong to one of the most vulnerable groups in society, would be cared for in a family environment where appropriate and in the best interests of the child. Given the legacy of the systems in CEE/CIS, that were so heavily reliant on large scale residential care, the overall vision for the reform was to reduce the reliance on residential care through a progressive shift towards a continuum of services that had for its primary purpose to support families and prevent family separation, and if this was not possible, to provide alternative family-like or family-based care.
With small variations to accommodate specific national contexts, the impact indicators adopted in many UNICEF Country Programme Documents from 2005 onwards, which were used to measure progress of reforms, included among others:

- No and rate of children living in large scale residential care (reduction needed);
- No and rate of children living in any form of family-based care (increase needed);
- Ratio of children in family-based care versus residential care (improved ratio in favour of family-based care);
- No and rate of children living in formal care (residential care and family-based care – overall reduction was desired).

2.2.2. Expected changes at outcome level: reform of the child care system

The reform of the child care system required an approach tackling a certain number of issues in a coordinated manner. The main issues dealt with in the reform are presented using the UNICEF’s MoRES (Monitoring Results for Equity System) framework developed in 2012. Although it is clear that this framework did not exist at the time the approach to child care reform was developed it is a very useful tool to classify the key areas of expected change. This framework is organized around ten determinants that, if addressed simultaneously or in sequence, are thought sufficient to influence results at impact level. See Annex 4 for a generic MoRES framework in the areas of work covered by this evaluation.

Of these determinants, focus has been on a subset:

1. **Social and professional norms** because there was a concern that these approved of the prevailing situation at the time. Public- and professional opinion, which were also reflected and influenced by Government policies, favoured the use of large scale
residential care and it was thought to be the best way to care for several groups of children (children of “unfit” parents, or children with disability for example).  

2. **Policy and legislative frameworks and standards** for services, since these were not promoting family support or family-based alternative care but only provided a legal space for providing residential care to children. To reform the policy and legal framework it was necessary to introduce and test new services and to change the way services were standardized. Standards were generally focusing on the environmental aspects of services (no. of staff, space, quantity of materials, etc.) and not at all on the expected outcomes of service provision for the children who were beneficiaries.  

3. Changes were also needed in **financial flows and budgets**, because the child care system was driven by the way it was financed and prevailing financing formulas perpetuated the situation and did not provide financial space for new services to be taken up in the public budget. Often, the new services remained underfunded because the costs of bringing them to scale were unknown, mechanisms to re-allocate resources from residential care to new services did not exist, there was a lack of capacity and methodology at local level (where most new services were to be planned, forecasted and funded) to plan and forecast needs for services and based on that make projections for how and by when they should be established.  

4. Changes were also needed in the **governance and quality assurance of the system** to ensure better coordination-, decision-making- and quality assurance processes and mechanisms. This was needed because the introduction of new smaller scale services of a larger variety required a different kind of governance, quality assurance and monitoring systems in order to ensure that decisions on placements were made in the best interests of the child. Since the quality of the services so far provided by the state through large scale residential care was of such poor quality,

---

14 No specific guidance was developed from the Regional Office on how to change social and professional norms. However, the toolkits “Changing Minds, Policies and Lives”, implicitly refer to the importance of changing mind-sets in order to influence change for children. Because of the legacy in the region, where the ideology that prevailed during socialist regimes had so strongly influenced systems and professionals and through these, also societies and individual norms and practices, it was thought that changes in social norms could also be achieved through critical changes in the system, for example through legislative reform, standards and professional guidance for services. Changes in social and professional norms were therefore tackled initially through changes in the system. This has progressively started to encompass also direct work to influence communities and individuals through conventional and social media, public awareness campaigns such as for example the Every Child Needs a Family campaign in Croatia: [http://www.unicef.hr/show.jsp?page=159357](http://www.unicef.hr/show.jsp?page=159357) or Every Child Wants a family – Foster care campaign in Bulgaria: [http://www.unicef.bg/en/campaigns/Every-Child-Wants-a-Family-Foster-care-campaign/12](http://www.unicef.bg/en/campaigns/Every-Child-Wants-a-Family-Foster-care-campaign/12) or the It’s About Ability campaign in Montenegro: [http://www.unicef.org/montenegro/media_16505.html](http://www.unicef.org/montenegro/media_16505.html) etc.  


and because of the low capacity of centrally planned systems to develop and test "innovations" in service provision, it was thought that space needed to be created for new types of private service providers and a "welfare mix" to emerge on the market of service providers. A new division of "labour" was promoted whereby "gatekeeping" was identified as a core function of the state, but other service provision could be carried out by private and public providers alike as long as there were clear rules of the game (e.g. standards, licencing mechanisms, inspections). This work also required improved- and more disaggregated data on children at risk, children in formal care to inform policy making.17

5. **Increased access to new services** (for reference to new services promoted please refer to Annex 3) for family and child support, case management and alternative family-based care was also a very important prerequisite for change to happen in the life of children. In the absence of this there would be no alternatives available even if there were recognition and willingness to provide families and children with a response different from large scale residential care. It was thought that to get to this, it would be necessary to improve the capacity at local level for planning and forecasting the development of new services and linking this with targets for de-institutionalization. This included also introduction of new services and new professions such as social work which could take up the main case management and outreach functions that were needed to reach the most vulnerable groups.18

There was also an assumption that there needed to be a **critical number of changes** in the system to produce the change needed for children and that looking at any part separately would not produce the change in a sustainable manner. It was an assumption then that when a whole system reform is needed there is a need for a plan on how to get to sustainable change and reform of the system (planning).

2.2.3 **UNICEF’s contribution at regional and country levels**

---

17 On governance and quality assurance system see for example:
Resource materials on decentralization, governance and gatekeeping from sub-regional consultation process (3 conferences 2007-2009) at:

18 Resource materials on targeting planning and diversifying social services from sub-regional consultation process (3 conferences 2007-2009) at:
UNICEF has contributed to these reforms both at regional and country levels. At **regional level** UNICEF has developed, built an agreement around, and capacities for driving a regional compact/approach for child care reform. This has included articulation of common objectives of what would be the desired impact of reforms as well as what were the outcomes at system level (as articulated in the TOC) that would influence and support the achievement of such objectives. At regional level the core roles of UNICEF have been to:

- **Enable knowledge exchange and facilitate dialogue between** countries through for example:
  - Capacity building meetings of the child protection network and UNICEF country representatives;
  - Organization of high-level consultations / conferences for taking stock of reforms and articulating road maps/ sharing of experiences and lessons learned. Between 2007 and 2009, a review of progress of reforms against the objectives set in 2000 was made in the series of sub-regional conferences “Child Care Reform - Taking stock and accelerating action”; In November 2012, a Ministerial conference on “Ending the placement of children under three in institutions: Support nurturing families for all young children”;

- **Being a voice for children** through for example ensuring visibility to children’s situations at high level fora and in the media (see for example OneMinuteJr developed for and shared at sub-regional consultations);

- **Monitoring and evaluation** through for example assessments and studies that could inform reform agendas. For example:
  - In preparation for the 2007-2009 sub-regional consultation process, 11 country assessments and/or evaluations of the progress of child care reform were undertaken;
  - Improving the data-collection on core child care indicators through the TransMonEE project (testing and review of indicators was done in 2006 and 2011 based on the global formal care indicators)
  - Specialized studies such as on the status of Gatekeeping (in 2007-2008), Social Protection systems (in 2001) have been disseminated;
  - Interesting reform practices have been identified and documented;
  - A web-based resource site has been developed to facilitate the access of partners and colleagues to UNICEF key documents on child care reform, available at [www.ceecis.org/ccc](http://www.ceecis.org/ccc);

- **Policy advice and technical assistance** – through for example development of tools and guidance (see for example “Changing Minds Policies and Lives” –toolkits) and facilitating access of countries and UNICEF country offices to technical assistance.

---

19 Minutes from such meetings could be shared upon demand
20 For all materials related to these high-level conferences, please refer to: [http://www.ceecis.org/ccc/xindex.html](http://www.ceecis.org/ccc/xindex.html)
21 [http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/media_20824.html](http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/media_20824.html)
26 Reports and papers for such TA mission can be shared upon demand
• **Leveraging support from partners** – through joint regional projects with key partners (see the Changing Minds Policies and Lives” toolkits), shaping regional standards on social services\(^{27}\), initiating regular partnership dialogue (e.g. with the World Bank and the EU\(^ {28}\)), documenting and identifying key entry points with key partners\(^ {29}\) and fundraising for regional and multi-country initiatives\(^ {30}\);

At **country level**, UNICEF has been involved in supporting reform processes in the 11 countries covered by this evaluation. This work is reflected in country programme documents (CPDs) across the region. Strategies and inputs to achieve results have been defined at country level depending on available entry points and the support to this reform at country level has been built over a number of years. However, the focus of country level support has to a large extent been based on the regional consensus to focus on supporting the reform of the child care system. This reform has sometimes been a component of larger welfare and social protection system reform, sometimes with the entry point from the reform of residential care institutions. At country level, UNICEF has been particularly active in:

• **Enabling knowledge exchange** – such as for example providing inputs to development of training curricula, retraining of staff and in some cases introducing University courses for new professions which did not exist in the past (such as Social Work);

• **Being a ‘Voice’ for children and adolescents** – such as for example developing and supporting campaigns and information materials on the issue, informing parliamentary debates etc.;

• **Monitoring and evaluation** – in particular through improving the knowledge base on the situation of children without parental care, progress of reforms etc.\(^ {31}\);

• **Policy advice and technical assistance** – in particular through supporting changes in policy, legislation and standards (for services); engaging technical expertise on, amongst others, reform planning, costing and financing of services;

• **Leveraging resources from the public and private sectors** – for example, engaging in strategic dialogue with international partners supporting the reform (such as EU, World Bank, NGOs), providing inputs to key strategic documents, (for example the EU Progress Reports for Accession Countries);

• **Facilitating national dialogue to align child care system with international standards** – through, for example, bringing together government, private sector and civil society to debate on the issue in national high level conferences / meetings;

• **Modelling/piloting** of new services to inform policy making- and development of standards and work processes for such services. Modelling has also been done to

---

\(^ {27}\) Such as for example Council of Europe’s Recommendation CM/Rec (2011) 12 “Children’s rights and social services friendly to children and families”

\(^ {28}\) Inputs can be shared on demand on contributions to EU Expert Group on the Transition from Institutions to Community Based Care.

\(^ {29}\) http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/10_and_CCR_SEE.pdf

\(^ {30}\) See for example the 2007-2009 regional SIDA supported project “The reform of the child care system in CEE/CIS – taking stock and accelerating action”.

\(^ {31}\) See regional library on the issue at: http://www.ceecis.org/ccc/#
provide inputs on how to enhance child care system management, coordination and planning.

For more information on the focus of the reform in each country as well as UNICEF’s contribution to it, please refer to Annex 2. For more information on UNICEF generic core roles, please refer to Annex 5.

3. **Rationale for the evaluation:**

The evaluation will be carried out at a time when UNICEF as a global player is renewing its focus on achieving greater results for children and wants to focus its attention more specifically on overcoming equity gaps. The evaluation in this area – a child’s right to a family environment – will look at how the reform of the child care system and changes in social norms around the children and families who are often resorting to this type of services, have managed to improve its response to some of the most marginalized and vulnerable groups in society, that being children deprived of parental care. Additionally, it will shed light on how, through such reforms, the most vulnerable of the most vulnerable (that being for example children under the age of three, or children with disabilities etc.), have benefitted from on-going reform. Reducing the vulnerability of children deprived of parental care through a reform of the child care system is an area of work where UNICEF in CEE/CIS has been particularly active in the last decade. The lessons learned from this evaluation will constitute a regional contribution to global learning on strategic programmatic interventions that can produce change for children in a middle-income country environment. Child care system reform is a key leadership area of work for UNICEF in CEE/CIS. The evaluation will be used to share lessons on results achieved so far, remaining challenges and assessment of UNICEF’s contribution to these results.

Furthermore, the organization aims to document remaining bottlenecks to achieving further results. It is thought that reforms that have happened so far may have had only partial success. For example, it is likely that more efforts are needed in the future to focus on prevention of family separation, something which might require shifts in the attention to family welfare and broader social protection policies. More focused attention may also be needed so that the most vulnerable groups of children in the child care system, such as children with disabilities and children under the age of three are prioritized or benefit from new services at least in an equal measure as their peers. Therefore, an additional rationale for the evaluation is that the timing is optimal for deciding on future strategies, keeping in mind that UNICEF wants to strengthen the equity focus in on-going reforms and would also like to reveal any potential unexpected consequences reforms have had to-date which may need to be addressed in the future.

4. **Objectives:**

This multi-country evaluation has the following objectives:
1. Evaluate the extent to which change (impact) has happened in children’s lives as a result of child care reform and changes in social norms:
   a. Reduction in the number of children living in residential care/institutions;
   b. Improvements in the ratio of children in family-based care versus residential care/institutions;
   c. Reduction in the number of children entering formal care;
   d. Increase in the number of children leaving residential care/institutions for a family placement;
   e. The extent to which specific groups who are identified as particularly vulnerable (e.g. children with disability and children under three etc.) have benefited from these reforms.

2. Assess how results were made possible through systems changes as well as changes in social norms and identify which strategies and approaches were the most effective for achieving the change in children’s lives.

3. While recognizing that Governments are leading reform processes and other actors also contribute to these reforms and changes, to assess specific UNICEF’s contribution to these system changes / changes in social norms that are thought to have produced a change in the lives of children.

5. Purpose and use

This is a multi-country evaluation that will be formative and has the following two-fold purpose:

1. Accountability: assess the impact of reforms on children and the contribution of UNICEF’s work and approach in the region both at country and regional levels.

2. Learning: Document and generate lessons learned on what seems to work, what is missing in current approaches, what were un-intended side-effects of reform efforts to date. This will be used to inform current programming, nurture current policy debates and help UNICEF to position itself in these future policies.

The evaluation will be used by the UNICEF Regional Office and Country Offices to communicate and share lessons learned with the UNICEF’s Corporate Management and the Executive Board, donors, and strategic partners on the organization’s role in countries that are in the category of upper middle income or high income countries. It will also be used to communicate results and share experiences / lessons learned from the on-going child care reforms to contribute to the mutual learning of governments and UNICEF on how to best ensure the child’s right to grow up in a family environment.

32 The following indicators are adaptations of the Global indicators for Children in Formal Care
33 Donors would include (but not limited to) : EU, Swedish SIDA, USAID, UNICEF Thematic donors in child protection (such as Netherlands and Norway)
34 Strategic partners would include other international governmental organizations, such as EU, World Bank, Council of Europe as well as non-governmental organizations such as (but not limited to) Save the Children, Every Child, World Vision
6. Scope of the evaluation

6.1. Unit of analysis

The evaluation will be of the regional approach to child care reform (as described later in this TOR in the Theory of Change) that was agreed with governments and fine-tuned over the years in a series of high level conferences. This regional approach has, to different extent and with slightly different entry points in the different countries, been implemented in the countries covered by the evaluation. While the reforms were undertaken and driven by Governments in these countries, the regional approach was conceptualized based on child rights standards and best practices and pushed from UNICEF regional office. It has been implemented through a number of interventions both at regional and country level, supported by UNICEF and other actors, to influence and support the reforms towards a similar direction in these countries. The unit of analysis is therefore the overall reform process in each country and the combined effect of different intervention/programme/projects that were aiming to contribute to such reform.

6.2. Countries to be covered

The evaluation will cover the following countries: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine.

These countries have been selected because UNICEF has supported governments of these countries in several of the reform areas which are outlined in the Theory of Change (country level summary of objectives, results, systemic changes and UNICEF contribution is attached as Annex 2 to this TOR) and the evaluability assessment (see below) concluded that data are available at impact level on some core global child care indicators. In these countries, previous evaluations and documentation of the reform have also noted that there is a reduction in the number of large scale residential institutions, new services are being created and range from family and child support services of various kinds (including day care), to family-based alternative care placement and social work. Individual case assessment and management is also increasingly becoming a method for decision making on placements and for defining a package of support to children and their families. Hence, it is thought that these countries have sufficient experiences of implementing the regional approach to child care reform to provide a picture on its overall impact and relevance.

6.3. Time frame

The evaluation will cover the time-period 2005-2012. This is the period when reform efforts have been initiated / have intensified at country level, demonstrated by earlier

---

35 TransMONEE database 2012
36 For more information on progress in the region, see draft UNICEF report “Child Care Reform in CEE/CIS - A Glass Half Full or Half Empty?” which can be shared upon request.
evaluations and assessments that documented changes in laws, policies, governance structures and other regulatory mechanisms that are influencing the child care system.

6.4. Stakeholder contributions to be considered

There is a recognition that many stakeholders have contributed to these reform processes. Due credit needs to be given to the Governments which are overall the ones responsible for shaping the child care systems and its reform in the countries. Other stakeholders include the EU, World Bank and various NGOs such as Every Child, World Vision, Save the Children, Hopes and Homes for Children, SOS Children’s villages and several national NGOs. It will be necessary to identify any other major actors who have contributed to the reform, including identify UNICEF’s contribution, but it will not be necessary to evaluate each contributors actions separately.

The evaluation will also not need to evaluate Regional Office and Country office contributions separately, but should look at the extent to which these different roles were complementary of each other and assess the extent to which the regional office support and guidance work guided the direction of the work at country level.

6.5. Evaluability assessment

In course of preparing this TOR, an evaluability assessment was conducted with all countries included in the evaluation. All countries concluded that despite some data gaps (mainly related to level of disaggregation of indicators) there are enough data available to conduct adequately the multi-country evaluation. There are reliable data to inform the baseline as well as the situation of children in the most recent years covered by the evaluation. It has to be noted that data sources being different from country to country, trends analysis will be preferred over comparison. In the case of this evaluation, TransMONEE data as well as Ministry data will constitute the major sources of data.

7. Evaluation questions

The evaluation will specifically address the following categories of questions with respect to UNICEF’s contribution to system level changes:

7.1. Impact

1. What impact on the right of children to grow up in a family environment can be observed in the selected countries to date, out of the following indicators?
   a) Reduction in the number of boys and girls living in residential care/institutions;
   b) Improvements in the ratio of children in family-based care versus residential care/institutions;
   c) Reduction in the number of children entering formal care;

---

37 The evaluation questions are grouped according to the Development assistance (DAC) evaluation criteria as defined in UNICEF Guidance on Equity-Focused Evaluations, 2011.
d) Increase in the number of children leaving residential care/institutions for a family placement.

2. To what extent have reforms contributed to reducing equity gaps, meaning targeted and provided support to the most vulnerable families, including (but not limited to) single-headed households, families with many children, poor families, families with a child with disability etc.?

3. Of the groups of children in care, what has been the impact of child care reforms on specific groups (such as their access to new services, priority in de-institutionalization), including but not limited to:
   a. Children with disabilities (if possible disaggregated by boys and girls)?
   b. Children under the age of three (if possible disaggregated by boys and girls)?
   c. Children of ethnic minority (if possible disaggregated by boys and girls)?
   d. Children from especially deprived areas (if possible disaggregated by boys and girls)?

4. To what extent have reforms led to improved quality of life of the beneficiaries of the reform (this question will most likely be possible to answer only in the case of a few of the countries)?

5. Are there any external factors (risks/assumption) that have affected the impact of the reforms and these factors sufficiently taken into consideration in the design of the approach?

**7.2. Effectiveness**

6. To what extent and how have the expected results been achieved? For example,
   a) What changes have happened in the system that influence **social and professional norms, approaches and skills**, making them more conducive to a child care system that aims above all at preventing separation of children from their families and at providing a range of alternative care options (incl. family based care) if separation is unavoidable?
   b) What changes have been introduced into **policy and legislative frameworks and standards** that promote family support and the development of new services where residential care should be used as a last resort?
   c) What changes have been made to **financial flows and budgets** to support the implementation of a child care reform and new policies and legislation in this area? For example is there an increase in government-financed family support programmes and services?
   d) What changes have been made to **governance and quality assurance of the system** to ensure better coordination of all relevant stakeholders, improve decision-making and quality-assurance processes and mechanisms of the system?
   e) What changes have been made to the system to **increase the availability of new services** to support the prevention of family separation and to reduce
reliance on residential care (for reference to the minimum package of new services, please refer to Annex 3)?

f) What changes have been made to make these services more accessible to the families most at risk of placing their children into care? Issues pertaining to accessibility would include, but are not limited to:

- Number and type of specific outreach services that can facilitate the access to services and other support mechanisms for people who are particularly at risk of placing their children in care;
- Geographical distribution and sufficiency of new services in relation to the estimated demand and need;
- Availability of working processes and professional practices that can ensure early identification of risk;
- Efforts to remove financial and other barriers of the most vulnerable to access services and other support mechanisms that can help prevent family separation.

7. In particular, of the new services that were introduced, how effectively have reforms of the child care system linked up with- and/or influenced reforms in other key sectors (such as health, education, social protection) which were also important to ensure a child's right to a family environment. Were synergetic effects maximized?

8. How far have these changes been made in a parallel and/or planned and sequenced manner that is sufficient to produce durable change in the lives of children?

9. Of these determinant areas that are included in the Theory of Change, are there any determinants that have been found to have more effect than others in terms of their contribution to achieving impact on the lives of children?

10. Are there any other determinants (as per the MoRES determinant framework) than the ones listed in the Theory of Change (and above) that were / would have been important to address in order for reforms to have impact on the lives of children?

11. What can be considered UNICEF’s and other key stakeholders main contribution to these changes in the systems and social norms (the different determinants elaborated upon above) which are thought to have produced an effect on the lives of children?

7.3. Efficiency

12. What strategies/core roles of UNICEF have been the most efficient in influencing system change / social norms?
   a) Being the “voice” for children and adolescents (advocating and communicating around key national policies, social issues and mind-sets and attitudes;
   b) Monitoring and evaluation, including assisting in independent assessments of the functioning of the system;
   c) Policy advice and technical assistance;
d) Leveraging resources from public and private sectors;
e) Facilitating national dialogue towards norms and standards in the child care field that are child friendly and respectful of children's rights;
f) Enabling knowledge exchange;
g) Developing and leveraging partnerships.
h) Modelling/piloting of new services to inform policy making.

13. To what extent were inputs invested in the reform or leveraged sufficient to create changes in the systems?

14. How efficiently were UNICEF’s contributions to reform managed and coordinated and converted into results (both in terms of technical know-how and financial inputs)?

15. Which ones of these strategies/core roles (mentioned above) have not been efficient / or have been more efficient than others and why?

7.4. Relevance

16. To what extent was approach as presented in the Theory of Change, relevant for addressing the needs of the most vulnerable families and children in the countries that are covered by the evaluation?

17. What was the relevance of the approach for addressing and improving relevant national policies in the context of supporting implementation of international standards?

18. What was the relevance of the Theory of Change in the context of other key partners (government, international development partners and civil society) were promoting and working on in this area?

19. To what extent is the approach still relevant, given changes that have occurred in the political and systems landscape in the last years or given new knowledge that is emerging on the issue?

20. To what extent, and how, were gender dimensions of the factors leading to abandonment/relinquishment taken into account in the design of interventions and throughout the reform processes?

7.5. Sustainability

21. To what extent are the achievements of reforms (in terms of their impact on children and outcomes at system level) made to date sustainable? What makes them sustainable?
22. What is the risk that the achievements made to date in the lives of children would not be sustainable and what are the measures needed to improve prospects for the sustainability of results?

23. How vulnerable are current successes (in impact and outcomes of reforms) to political changes, e.g. a change in government, or changes in the financial climate such as fiscal constraints?

7.6. Lessons Learned

Based on the findings on the evaluation questions it will also be important to capture the lessons learned from what have been UNICEF’s main strengths and weaknesses in its support to child care reform. Lessons are also expected to capture and elaborate on the most important remaining challenges of that reform, including the challenges and pitfalls on how to shift the financing of the system from residential care to new services; on what has worked and what has not worked with reforms of gatekeeping systems (including on introducing opportunities for private service providers to provide services, development of standards for services, quality assurance mechanisms, streamlining of assessment methods, governance changes of the system); and what seems to be remaining challenges for strengthening the preventative aspects of the system, including what are the specific interventions needed for the most vulnerable groups (single-headed households, children under three, children with disabilities, children of ethnic origin, children coming from particularly deprived geographical areas).

8. Methodology

The approach followed from the outset of the evaluation will be as participative as possible. Stakeholders, including service users will participate in the evaluation through discussions, consultations, provision of comments on draft documents and some will reply to the recommendations made by the evaluation in the management response. In gathering data and views from stakeholders, the evaluation team will ensure that it considers a cross-section of stakeholders with potentially diverse views to ensure the evaluation findings are as impartial (or representative) as possible.

The evaluation will apply the relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. UNICEF being a rights based organization, the evaluation should mainstream gender and human rights considerations throughout. Whenever possible, disaggregation of data by gender, age, ethnicity and social origin, should be made.

The evaluation team will propose the optimal methodology for this evaluation. The methodology should demonstrate impartiality and lack of bias by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using a mixed methodological approach (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory).
to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means. The evaluation could involve for example:

- **Primary data collection in form of organization of a survey among users of services, staff working in services and/or communities.**
- **Primary data collection in form of interviews and focus group discussions with key informants in government, partner organizations (civil society and intergovernmental organizations), service users, staff working in services and/or communities and with different stakeholders in the evaluation (see below chapter on who are the stakeholders).**
- **Secondary data collection and analysis of trends in separation and institutionalization rates available through existing statistical data in the TransMonEE data base ([http://www.transmonee.org/](http://www.transmonee.org/)) and other administrative data available in the government ministries and statistical offices.**
- **Secondary data collection and analysis of existing literature on the reform (from both UNICEF sources and other sources). The following data sources will be made available to the evaluation team:**
  - Previous evaluations qualified as “good” by quality review system (refers to recent evaluations in Azerbaijan, Moldova and Serbia from 2011 and 2012)
  - Recent independent assessments / studies of the child care reform and/or specific components of it (e.g. projects) which were carried out in Romania and Georgia.
  - A library of UNICEF publications and information from key regional events on the topic are available on the UNICEF child care reform resource package ([www.ceecis.org/ccc](http://www.ceecis.org/ccc))
  - Selected translated materials (or in original language) on laws, policies, action plans of governments etc.
  - UNICEF programme materials such as country programme documents, strategies, project proposals; progress reports to the donors.

The stages of the evaluation process will be the following:

- **Inception phase during which a detailed evaluation framework and an inception report will be prepared.** The evaluation framework will build on the Theory of Change and take into account the limitations to “evaluability” pointed out in the section on scope as well as budget and timing constraints. It will provide details on how to respond to the evaluation questions, which indicators to use, sources of verification. The evaluation framework will also guide the desk review. The framework will be contained in the inception report that will define clear criteria to inform a proposal for countries to be visited. The evaluation team will conduct site visits in at least five countries out of those participating in the evaluation. All participating countries should be mapped against the proposed criteria and will be the basis for a transparent proposal of countries to be visited. Final decision of countries to be visited will be made on that basis and in consultation with UNICEF.

- **Comprehensive analysis of available information – desk review:** country situational analyses of child care related issues (including national laws, policies, action plans etc.), country-specific work programmes, including project proposals,
progress reports, log frames etc. Documents to be consulted could be in English or in local languages. It is therefore important to consider that a good mix of language skills will be needed in the composition of the evaluation team, as well as some budgetary resources for translation of key documents.

- **Data collection:** While recognizing that the particular nature of reforms and activities in support thereof may differ in each country, the team will employ a set of site visit protocols to capture the unique characteristics of each country programme as well as their commonalities, in order to help ensure comparability of data across countries and to extract elements of good practice and recommendations for the region as a whole. The site visit protocols are the list of stakeholders and key informants to be consulted in each country, as well as questionnaires and interview guides to be used for field work. In order to maximize the number of countries to be visited, it is suggested to consider the possibility of starting field work with a pilot country mission including the whole evaluation team. Results from this mission will help to consolidate the evaluation framework and overall evaluation approach for the country missions. The subsequent country missions can then take place simultaneously if each country is visited by only one or two of the evaluators.

The methodology will follow the UNEG norms and standards which can be accessed from the link provided below:

http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

**9. Approximate budget**

A detailed budget for the evaluation will be part of the financial proposal from the evaluation teams when they express their interest for the evaluation.

**10. Indicative timeline of major tasks**

The below timeline is approximate and will be adjusted in consultation with the contractor who is selected to carry out the evaluation.

**Internal preparations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of 3 September 2012</th>
<th>First video conference with members of reference group and introduction to the concept note, feedback and conclusions on next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 September 2012</td>
<td>1st draft of TORs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 October 2012</td>
<td>Deadline comments on draft TORs by Regional Monitoring &amp; Evaluation section and Child Protection Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November 2012</td>
<td>Deadline comments on draft TORs by Reference Group, review by regional M&amp;E facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 December 2012</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; draft TORs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 2013</td>
<td>Deadline comments regional M&amp;E quality assurance facility and gender focal point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 February 2013</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; draft TORs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 February 2013</td>
<td>Clearance of TORs by M&amp;E quality assurance facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 February 2013</td>
<td>Sending draft TORs to UNICEF HQ for comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 February 2013</td>
<td>Deadline for comments by UNICEF HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 2013</td>
<td>Deadline for final draft of TORs (for management clearance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 April 2013</td>
<td>Launch of Call for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May 2013</td>
<td>Deadline for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 6 May 2013</td>
<td>Selection of contractor for conducting the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 20 May 2013</td>
<td>Start of contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inception phase of the evaluation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 27 May 2013</td>
<td>Inception meeting for evaluation and start of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 2013</td>
<td>Deadline for inception report (to include commentary on the Theory of Change, evaluation framework for each evaluation criteria and questions, defined indicators, source of information and possible data collection tool if to be developed, updated timeline for country visits as per agreements with country offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 2013</td>
<td>Comments on inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2013</td>
<td>Final version and approval of inception report (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; payment equal to 30% value of the contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May – 19 June 2013</td>
<td>Desk review and preparations for field visits and other regional data collection (such as for example a survey to reach a large number of stakeholders with targeted questions across countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2013</td>
<td>Deadline for submission of tools for data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26 June 2013 Comments on tools for data collection

**Data collection phase:**

26 June – 26 September Country visits: to be conducted to fill knowledge gaps and triangulating information collected through desk reviews

**Reporting phase:**

16 October 2013 Submission of 1st draft report (second payment)

Week of 21 October 2013 End-of-evaluation meeting to present findings and preliminary conclusions, discuss and finalise the recommendations

1 November Submission of final report (final payment upon clearance and acceptance of final product)

**Dissemination phase:**

From 1 November 2013 Management response

1 November – 1 December 2013 Development of communication materials for launch and dissemination (including design and printing of report in line with agreed regional “brand”)

1 December – 1 February 2014 Dissemination

**11. Deliverables:**

All deliverables should be in English.

1. Inception report including the evaluation design/framework agreed upon with UNICEF (prior to field work);
2. Tools / questionnaires (prior to field work);
3. Draft Evaluation Report according to the outline attached as Annex 1 to this TOR. (Draft and final evaluation reports shall exemplify, quote, summarize and analyse extensively from country level findings, but there will be no need for separate country reports);
4. Final Evaluation Report (including an executive summary and a bibliography annex) and separate short feedback on UNICEF’s and stakeholders’ comments (report should comply with UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards attached below);
5. A brief advocacy note (around 5000 words) summarizing key findings of evaluation, policy issues relevant at multi-country level and recommendations;
6. A PowerPoint presentation of the Evaluation Report (to be presented by evaluation team in 2 main meetings following the evaluation: One meeting will the immediate debriefing of the evaluation before finalizing the report and recommendations. The second will be part of the dissemination plan for the evaluation; and

There will not be any separate deliverables for each country included in the evaluation as the main evaluation report is expected to include sufficient information and examples from the countries.

12. Profile and size of evaluation team

The evaluation team should be composed of a mix of nationalities, with local experts from one or several of the countries included in the evaluation and a team leader with an international profile. The team should be led by an experienced evaluator to be supported by at least one or two experts on child protection. The size of the evaluation team is to be decided based on proposals received. Proposals that include a gender balanced team will be given preference.

Competencies required by the team to carry out the evaluation are a combination of a number of years of experience in the subject area and of evaluation methods as per below:

- Advanced university degree in social sciences, law, political science or public policy;
- Comparative knowledge on child rights, child protection mechanisms and child care system design and its reform, social protection and social welfare;
- Familiarity with rights-based approaches and with principles of gender mainstreaming;
- Good knowledge in designing and conducting evaluations;
- Proven ability to conduct interviews, focus group discussions and writing reports for publication;
- Proven experience in conducting desk reviews and field visits;
- Experience from practical, research or evaluation work in the areas of social services/sciences relevant to children, law, political science or public policy work;
- Strong analytical and conceptual thinking;
- Excellent oral and written English language.
- Be proficient in at least 1 local language.

Successful applicant will provide samples of evaluations conducted; those should include, but not be limited to, programme & policies evaluations. A sample of a multi-country evaluation conducted is desirable.

13. Roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in the evaluation
To successfully achieve the expected results of the evaluation, it is essential that UNICEF Regional Office and selected country offices play a supportive role in the implementation process of this evaluation. Concretely, this would mean:

**The Child Protection section of the Regional Office**
- Is the secretariat for the evaluation;
- Prepares the TORs for the evaluation exercise;
- Liaises with evaluation team;
- Are key informants throughout the evaluation process;
- Suggests the best proposal for the evaluation
- Provides initial briefing to evaluators on the framework and expectations of the evaluation and on UNICEF programmes in support of child care reforms;
- Provides feedback on evaluation design and research tools and all reports and deliverables;
- Facilitates contact with UNICEF country offices that are included in the evaluation exercise;
- Facilitates access to complementary background documents to be included in the desk review and to all necessary documents throughout the evaluation process;
- Manages the contract and ensures timely disbursement of funding as per agreed upon payment schedule.

**UNICEF RO Evaluation Management Committee**
- Is composed of the UNICEF Regional Director, M&E Regional Advisor, Child Protection Advisor
- Will ensure that the evaluation process is carried out as per UNICEF policies.
- At specific points in time, the Office of Evaluation at HQ, as well as Programme Division, will also be required to provide input. The UNICEF Regional Advisor M&E will provide technical support to the evaluation throughout the process.

**Reference Group (and its Chair):**
- Are the UNICEF Country Representatives (or their designates) of the countries covered by the evaluation;
- Comments TORs and draft and final evaluation report;
- Is consulted and makes recommendation to regional office management on the best proposal for the evaluation and approves the final composition of the evaluation team;
- Are key informants throughout the evaluation process;
- Will be consulted as need be throughout the evaluation process.

**The UNICEF country offices in 11 countries covered by the evaluation:**
- Liaise with evaluation team;
- Are key informants throughout the evaluation process;
- Facilitate access to other key informants (counterparts) for the evaluation;
- Facilitate consultations for the evaluation team, briefings and de-briefings for governments in the concerned countries;
Facilitate access to all relevant documentation related to the activities, strategies and projects of UNICEF to be included in the scope of the evaluation;
Participate whenever requested by the evaluation team or found necessary by the CO representative (only in exceptional cases clearly explained to the evaluation team) in the meetings with government and other counterparts;
Provide timely feedback on draft and final reports.

External Stakeholders
- Are government representatives and representatives of partner organizations (civil society, multi-lateral and inter-governmental), service users;
- Are key informants throughout the evaluation process;
- Are consulted through workshop when findings will be presented. Some stakeholders will be shared the draft evaluation report for comments
- Facilitate access to other key informants for the evaluation;
- Facilitate access to relevant documentation related to the reform.

Evaluation team
- Overall responsible for successful completion of evaluation (including all steps of development of evaluation framework and tools and methodology);
- Selection and orientation of evaluation team members, data collection assistance (where applicable) and translators (where applicable);
- Collects additional information as needed;
- Manages and carries out all consultations, meetings and interviews with key informants;
- Prepares logistics, organizes travel, financial and other arrangements that are related to the implementation of the evaluation (local translators, data processors, drivers, access to computer etc. are included as part of the logistics to be organized by the evaluation team);
- Submits deliverables and invoices in a timely manner.

Considering that beneficiaries of child care reform are among most vulnerable children and families there are ethical dimensions to be taken into account by the evaluation team with regards to consulting them in the process. Ethical guidance for evaluations can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=980
Annex 1 – Evaluation report structure

Executive Summary

1. Evaluation context, objective and design;
2. Relevance of interventions in support of child care reform as a response to the Child’s Right to Grow up in a Family Environment;
3. Effectiveness of planned and implemented measures and activities;
4. Efficiency in the management of different components of reform;
5. Impact of interventions on system and responsible stakeholders, children and parents;
6. Sustainability of results of system change, results for children and parents;
7. Lessons learned and courses of action for continuation of the reform;
8. Recommendations to different stakeholders.

Annexes including among others:

- Bibliography of documents consulted
- Brief country fact sheets (including timeline of major events of the reform)

Deliverables should be guided by UNEG norms and standards for evaluations. For more references on the standard of the report, please refer to the two embedded documents below as well as the provided link.

GEROS Guidance.xlsx

UNEG UNICEF Eval Report Standards.pdf

http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

Annex 2 - Country level summary of objectives, results and systemic changes of child care system that have contributed to such results and UNICEF contribution.
Annex 3 – Types of services promoted as part of the reform

There are three types of services which have been promoted as part of the reform to respond to the needs of children at risk (considered to be the most vulnerable):

i) The “statutory” or procedural services in charge of case management and gatekeeping;

ii) The family and child support services directly providing services to at-risk children and families, and

iii) The family substitute care, where there are different modalities temporarily substituting the role of the biological family.

i) The statutory or procedural services are instrumental for the gatekeeping function, as they recognize that persons need to be provided with services (ii and iii) and facilitate the provision of those services to which they are entitled. Statutory or procedural services cannot be transferred from the state/government to any other service providers because they decide on entitlements and the use of budgetary resources, provided by the state.

ii) The family and child support (or community-based) services belong to the group of services which prevent family separation while responding to the risks and vulnerabilities that the child/family are facing. The risks and vulnerabilities include disability, behavioural problems of the child or parent(s), child labour, child illicit activities, abuse and neglect of children, dysfunctional family relationships, etc. These services could be divided into a few “generic” groups, that may serve all groups at risk, such as for example:

• Day care\(^{38}\) (including structured activities responding to individual needs, such as informal education or skills and competencies development, occupational therapy and/or leisure etc. depending of the beneficiaries’ profile and age);

• Home based care (family outreach services that include support for domestic chores and/or support for satisfaction of primary needs of dependent/disabled family member such as hygienic practices, feeding etc.);

• Psycho-social support\(^{39}\) to child and/or parents (including guardians and foster parents) through counselling, and/or rehabilitation and/or support to a child and parents for family re-integration:

• Legal aid\(^{40}\) (representation, support for self-representation, mediation for social inclusion etc.);

• Other services: short term protected shelter.

In principle, all these services could be carried out by governmental, non-governmental and private services providers (when the last two should ideally be in contractual or other formal relationship with the government service(es)).

---

\(^{38}\) Can function also as family out-reach service

\(^{39}\) As above

\(^{40}\) As above
iii) The family substitute care comprises services for children without parental care, for children separated from parents and living in inadequate or irregular circumstances and other children who temporarily cannot be (re)-integrated in their families. The family substitute care could be divided into the following types of arrangements:

- Kinship care (relatives who are guardians, live with the child and receive financial support from the state for child maintenance costs);
- Foster care (non-relatives; couples or individuals recruited, selected, trained and receiving financial allowances for their work and for child maintenance);
- Short term protected shelter;
- Institutional care (institutions in the process of transformation or new small scale and/or family type of institutions).

In addition, the beneficiaries of the above services can also be provided with day care, home based care, psycho-social support, legal aid, when indicated etc.

Decisions about placements of children in the family substitute services are in the domain of statutory service and cannot be delegated to any other service provider; however, all other aspects of the functioning of these services could be delegated to non-governmental organizations and private persons.

Annex 4 – Generic MoRES framework for the child’s right to a family environment and schematic illustration of TOC

Annex 5 - UNICEF generic core roles

---

41 In spite of the enormous importance of adoption for parentless children, child adoption is not included here as a family substitute service since adopted children do not have the status of children in state care and adoption procedures are in the exclusive domain of government organs within family law.