**CHILD PROTECTION**

**MTSP & MoRES C4D Indicators**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Societal/legislative/policy (MTSP)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Number (or proportion) of civil society organizations/CBOs or opinion leaders demanding legislation on free and universal birth registration | * Key informant interviews * Survey of civil societies |
| 1. Proportion of districts/municipalities official discussions on the development (or enforcement) of legislation on free and universal birth registration | * Government documents * Meeting minutes |
| 1. Proportion of policy makers who collaborate with civil society leaders in developing and enforcing policy on birth registration to put it under civil registration system (where applicable) | * Key informant interviews * Government documents * Proposals from civil societies, and other appropriate documents including meeting minutes |
| 1. Number of official meetings between leaders of civil societies & policy makers to ensure enforcement of birth registration under civil registration system (where applicable) | * + Key informant interviews   + Meeting logs   + Meeting minutes |
| 1. Proportion of population that is aware and has knowledge of national legislation on birth registration (where applicable) | * Population survey /K.A.P studies |
| 1. Number of civil societies involved in advocating for a central level coordination and monitoring at national and district levels of birth registration linked to a vital registration system | * Key informant interviews * Documents such as petitions, proposals, action plans * Government budgetary documents at national and district levels |
| 1. Proportion of provinces/districts with demonstrable disseminated information on birth registration offices’ budgets | * Government reports, newspaper articles, content analysis of media communications via radio/television * Government budgetary reports/statistics |
| 1. Proportion of districts/municipalities that have made public budget plans and allocations on birth registration in partnership with civil societies | * Government documents/budget at local and national levels * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of population that has knowledge of % of national budgets allocated to birth registration | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of local communities that have access to information on budget allocations at national and district levels on birth registration | * Key informant interviews * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders and service providers that have knowledge on budget allocation procedures for birth registration | * Key informant interviews * Population survey |
| 1. % of budget reflecting priority communities’ demands on existence of birth registration offices in towns and village | * Government documents/budget at local and national levels |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) on free and universal birth registration | * News media content analysis |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) an appropriate monitoring system of birth registration linked to a vital registration system | * News media content analysis |
| 1. Proportion of districts which routinely map and monitor birth registration with the involvement of civil societies (specify type of civil societies). | * + Official government monitoring reports at district levels   + Monitoring reports from civil societies   + Key informant interviews/focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of districts that have a consultative group composed of members of civil societies and community leaders on improving birth registration procedures and referral mechanisms in rural areas | * Administrative data * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by channel of communication) on the prioritization of birth registry systems in rural areas | * Content analysis of health campaigns, leaflets, information on birth registration in different local languages (where applicable), and other media channels, i.e., radio, television |
| 1. Number of media communications and promotional campaigns providing information on birth registration procedures and locations within the past 3 months | * Media content analysis * Administrative data on community events/campaigns * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of civil societies that have lobbied for a local level birth registration policy and strategy for rural areas | * Key informant * Administrative data/documents |
| 1. Number of media communications and debates (specify channel) about what constitutes violence against children/ adolescents | * Content analysis of health campaigns, leaflets, information on violence against children in different local languages (where applicable), and other media channels, i.e., radio, television |
| 1. Proportion of laws, policies and guidelines that have been developed in conformity with international human rights standards for protecting children against violence in partnership with civil societies | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of districts that have developed policies and guidelines for reporting and making complaints about violation of children’s rights at school and at home in collaboration with civil societies and community leaders | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Number of media communications (disaggregated by channel) that provided information on legal safeguards of child/ adolescent *victims* of violence | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of media communications (disaggregated by channel) that provided information on legal safeguards for *witnesses* reporting cases of child/adolescent sexual and physical abuses | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of civil societies lobbying for regulations and rules of conduct that establish reporting violence against children/adolescents an obligation for all institutions and agencies that deal with children at risk of violence | * Administrative data from civil societies i.e., minutes, reports, petitions, etc. * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of the population that is aware of national protection laws and regulations on violence against children | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of the population that is aware of Children’s Court to penalize violations against them (where applicable) | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of population that has knowledge of % of national budgets allocated to social services for protection of children and adolescents against violence | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Number of official meetings between leaders of civil societies & policy makers to ensure enforcement of laws and regulations for protection of children/adolescents against violence | * Government reports, newspaper articles, content analysis of media communications via radio/television * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of provinces/districts with demonstrable disseminated information on reported cases of violence against children and adolescents | * Statistics/info obtained from civil society monitoring systems * Government reports, newspaper articles, content analysis of media communications via radio/television * Key informant * Statistics from public sources * Statistics/information collected from service providers |
| 1. Proportion of districts that have a consultative group composed of members of civil societies and community leaders on improving reporting mechanisms of violence against children and adolescents | * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of districts which routinely map and monitor violence against children with the involvement of civil societies (specify type of civil societies). | * + Official government monitoring reports at district levels   + monitoring reports from civil societies * key informant interviews/focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of population (disaggregated by age/sex) that has knowledge of Teachers’ Codes of Conduct to ensure criminal action against teachers who commit acts of violence against pupils and students (where applicable) | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) providing information on Teachers’ Codes of Conduct to ensure criminal action against teachers who commit acts of violence against pupils and students (where applicable) | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) on domestic violence against children/adolescents as being punishable under law | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. % increase in public budget allocated to social services for child/adolescent victims of violence (in the community, at home, in school) as a result of advocacy efforts from communities and civil societies | * Public budgetary data * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of local communities that have access to information on budget allocations at national and district levels on services for protection of children/adolescent against violence in the community, at home, and at school | * Population Survey |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders and service providers that have knowledge on budget allocation procedures for protecting children/adolescents against violence in the community, at home, and at school | * Service provider survey * Key informant |
| 1. % of budget for provision of social services to child/adolescent victims of violence (at home, school, in the community) reflecting priority communities’ demands | * Key informant * Focus groups * Budgetary reports |
| 1. Number of schools that have implemented “Schools without Violence programme” in partnership with key line Ministries, Council for child rights and civil societies | * Key informant * School Survey * Administrative data |
| **Organizational/institutional (MTSP)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Proportion of service points that are receiving sufficient supply of birth registration forms and birth certificates as a result of media campaigns (specify type) | * Administrative data * Service point assessments |
| 1. Proportion of population that has information on the closest birth registry office to their household | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of trained community mobilizers who can demonstrate at least 75% of core key interpersonal communication skills while talking to community members about registering the birth of their child | * Service provider survey * Participant observation |
| 1. Proportion of birth registration workers trained on interactive communication skills who received a supervision visit in the last 3 months. | * Supervision reports from local officials, health centres, civil societies * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of service providers (health workers, community outreach workers) trained on specific interactive communication with people with disabilities regarding birth registration of their children | * Service provider surveys * Key informants * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of community health workers with interactive communication training who are actively promoting birth registration of children in the community (explain how) | * Patient/client exit Surveys * Key informant * Facility based survey |
| 1. % of communities reached by communication interventions (interactive theatre sessions; community dialogues, etc.) on birth registration by trained community workers in the past 12 months | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of birth register officers with training on providing services to people with disabilities | * Employee information collected at birth registry offices |
| 1. Proportion of birth registration promotion campaigns that are accessible to people with disabilities | * Content analysis of promotion campaigns (i.e., language, where info is tailored to people with disabilities |
| 1. Proportion of population that received information on counseling services for children who have been victims of violence (at home, school, community) through various communication channels (specify communication channel) | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of communication media messages (specify channel) on violence against children/adolescents specifically catered to children and adolescents | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of media messages providing information to child/adolescent victims of violence (in the community, home, or at school) on service points in their communities catering to their needs | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of service points in the community catering to child/adolescent victims of violence | * Key informant |
| 1. % of school-based professionals including teachers that are trained on how to manage anger and mitigate conflict and violence | * School surveys * Administrative data |
| 1. % of community outreach workers that are trained in interpersonal communication skills for promoting Child Rights including protection of children/adolescents against violence among people with disabilities ‘ | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Percent of health units with at least one service provider trained on interpersonal communication skills to care for and refer cases of physical violence against children/adolescents inflicted by an adult | * Service Provider assessments/surveys * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of health units at district and local levels that have documented and adopted protocol in collaboration with civil societies for communicating service and legal options to children/adolescents who have been victims of violence and abuse at home or in the community in the past 12 months | * Health unit assessments * Key informant |
| **Community (MTSP)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Proportion of communities that have a community-based consultative group on birth registration | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Number of media communications on locations where community members can receive support from local public administration on birth registration, in the past 3 months | * Media content analysis |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders that advocate for budgetary allocations to build birth registration offices in rural areas | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of key community leaders (specify) who are actively promoting birth registration among poor households through formal/informal networks | * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of community health care providers who are actively promoting birth registration during patient visits at the health centres | * Patient/client exit Surveys * Key informant * Facility based survey |
| 1. Proportion of religious leaders that talked to community members about birth registration during religious gathering in the past 30 days | * Key informant * Population surveys |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders that believe that birth registration should be compulsory for every child | * Key informant * Focus group discussions |
| 1. Proportion of community outreach workers that have training on interactive communication skills promoting birth registration among poor households and people with disabilities | * Key informant * Training logs/administrative data |
| 1. Level of participation (low, high, medium, not at all) reported by members of women’s and youth organizations in conducting community-level assessment-analysis-action processes to address birth registration issues | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. The extent to which (i.e., low, high, somewhat , not at all) community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous and disability status) participate in decisions pertaining to designing culturally appropriate messages on birth registration at the community level | * Population Surveys/ KAP * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of household who report to have received advice at least once from community mobilizers on birth registration in the past month | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of civil societies (disaggregated by type) lobbying for improved and equitable (describe) access to birth registration for people with disabilities | * Key informant interviews |
| 1. The extent to which community women (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous and disability status) believe they can participate and voice their opinions in developing communication messages/information on birth registration | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of local community leaders who were involved in developing communication messages/information on birth registration in the past 3 months | * Key informant * Focus group discussions |
| 1. Number of key community leaders (disaggregated by types) promoting birth registration among their constituencies during the past 6 months. | * Key informant * Focus group discussions |
| 1. Proportion of public campaigns on birth registration that are accessible to people with disabilities in the community | * Content analysis of promotion campaigns (i.e., language, where info is tailored to people with disabilities |
| 1. Number of public educational campaigns on birth registration within the past 6 months | * Media/communication content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of participatory communication events on birth registration which blended an interactive dialogic process with local community members and civil society groups in order to meet the specific needs of the community | * Media/communication content analysis * Community event schedules/logs * Key informant |
| 1. Number of interactive community radio programmes and debates with community members on birth registration in the past 30 days | * Media/communication content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. % of community members that report to have raised their complaints about lack of birth registry forms and birth registration certificates at the offices closest to where they live, but have never received any feedback (describe reasons and nature of concern) | * Population surveys * Focus groups |
| 1. Level/magnitude of resources mobilized within and outside the community (i.e., a listing of all organizations contacted which gives evidence of the size of the network accessed by the community) to provide information on birth registration procedures to hard to reach populations, people with disabilities, and ethnic/indigenous groups | * Listings of organizations contacted from civil societies * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous status, as well as disability) that expect there should be free and compulsory birth registration for all children | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Number of meetings of joint citizen-local council commissions/boards on birth registration locations in the past 12 months | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Percentage of leadership positions held by ethnic/religious/indigenous groups and people with disabilities in civil society groups advocating for free and universal birth registration | * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of community members that expect all married couples should be knowledgeable about birth registration procedures for their children | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Number of community dialogues initiated by community leaders about what constitutes violence against children/ adolescents in the past 6 months | * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. % of children and adolescents (disaggregated by age and sex) that participated in public debates regarding violence at home and school against children and adolescents | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of community members that expect cases of violence and abuse against children/adolescents at home and at school should be reported irrespective of the identity and the relation of the perpetrator to the child/adolescent | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Level of participation of indigenous adolescents and those from minority ethnic groups in the public policy discussion and decision making processes on violence against children/adolescents in schools and at home | * Population survey * Focus group |
| 1. Proportion of key community leaders (specify) who are actively promoting protection of children and adolescents against violence through formal/informal networks | * Population survey * Focus group * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of community health care providers who are actively promoting protection of children against domestic violence during patient visits at the health centres | * Population survey * Focus group * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of religious leaders that talked to community members about protecting children against violence at school, at home, and in the community during religious gatherings in the past 30 days | * Population survey * Focus group * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders that believe that domestic violence against children and adolescents should be reported and punished under law | * Population survey * Focus group * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of community outreach workers that have training on interactive communication skills on protecting children against domestic violence among poor households and people with disabilities | * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Level of participation (low, high, medium, not at all) reported by members of women’s and youth organizations in conducting community-level assessment-analysis-action processes to address violence against children/adolescents at home, in school, and in the community | * Population survey * Focus groups |
| 1. The extent to which (i.e., low, high, somewhat , not at all) community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous and disability status) participate in decisions pertaining to designing culturally appropriate messages on protecting children/adolescents against violence (at home, at school, or in the community) | * Key informant * Focus group * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of household who report to have received advice at least once from community mobilizers on Child Rights and protection of violence | * Population survey |
| 1. proportion of civil societies (disaggregated by type) lobbying for improved and equitable (describe) access to legal justice for child/adolescent victims of violence at home, at school, in the community | * Key informant * Focus group * Administrative data |
| 1. The extent to which community women (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous and disability status) believe they can participate and voice their opinions in developing communication messages/information on protecting children against violence | * Population survey * Focus group |
| 1. Proportion of local community leaders who were involved in developing communication messages/information on Child Rights and protecting children against violence in the past 3 months | * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Number of key community leaders (disaggregated by types) promoting Child Rights among their constituencies during the past 6 months. | * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of public campaigns on Child Rights that are accessible to people with disabilities in the community | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of public educational campaigns on Child Rights within the past 6 months | * Media/communication content analysis * Key informant * Community event logs |
| 1. % of adolescents trained as peer promoters in the community/neighborhood on Child Rights and protection of children/adolescents against violence | * Population survey * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Number of participatory communication events on Child Rights and protecting children/adolescents against violence which blended an interactive dialogic process with local community members and civil society groups in order to meet the specific needs of the community | * Media/communication content analysis * Key informant * Community event logs |
| 1. Number of interactive community radio programmes and debates with community members on appropriate measures to protect children/adolescents against violence at home and at school, and to punish perpetrators | * Key informant * Media content analysis |
| 1. Level/magnitude of resources mobilized within and outside the community (i.e., a listing of all organizations contacted which gives evidence of the size of the network accessed by the community) to provide information on Child Rights and children/adolescent protection against violence to hard to reach populations, people with disabilities, and ethnic/indigenous groups | * Key informant * Listing of organizations contacted by civil societies |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous status, as well as disability) that expect community members to report cases of violence against children/adolescents to the police | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Number of meetings of joint citizen-local council commissions/boards on protecting children against violence in the past 12 months | * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Percentage of leadership positions held by ethnic/religious/indigenous groups and people with disabilities in civil society groups advocating for Child Rights and protection of children/adolescents against all forms of violence | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Perception of adolescents of their ability to influence public policy on issues of violence that affect their lives through participation in public policy discussions | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. ?? |  |
| **Individual/Interpersonal (MTSP)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) that have knowledge or are aware of free and universal birth registry | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who s*trongly, somewhat strongly, do not believe at all*, that there have adequate information on birth registration procedures and know how to go about registering their children | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who feel that information/messages they received in the past 6 months through the media, service providers, civil societies, interactive dialogues, etc.(specify communication channel) about birth registration have been important in increasing birth registration in their community | * Population surveys/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who feel information/messages about birth registration procedures through the various forms of the media (specify channel) are properly understood by community members | * Population surveys/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of child care-givers who recall messages during previous month (or period appropriate to communication activities) on birth registration procedures | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of pregnant women (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who intend to register their child at birth because of advice they received from an influential family or community member (state the relationship, i.e., outreach workers, midwife, religious leaders, etc.) | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who participated in informal conversations (during community dialogues, at social or religious activities) during the past 7 days where they discussed advantages of birth registration | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who can correctly provide at least 2 advantages of birth registration for children | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who believe they have the kind of information and skills to enable them to persuade other community members including family and peers to obtain birth certificate for their children | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members that believe birth registration is important because of the information they received through the media (specify channel of communication) | * Population Surveys/ KAP |
| 1. Percent women women (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/religious/indigenous and disability status) who report to have encouraged (or discouraged) pregnant friends or relatives or neighbours to register their children at birth | * Population surveys/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of women who report to have registered their children at birth because of advice they received from influential family member, friends or peers | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnic/indigenous/religion) that *accept, strongly accept, somewhat accept, do not accept at all* physical or psychological violence against children/adolescents at home or at school as a form of discipline and appropriate form of punishment | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of parents who recall 75% of the communication messages they received in the past month (or appropriate communication period) on how to manage their anger against their children/adolescents | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of community members (disaggregated age/sex, ethnicity/indigenous status) who *strongly believe*, somewhat *believe*, *do not believe at all* that one should turn a ‘blind’ eye to neighbours use of violence for punishing their children | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of parents who are aware of ‘parenting courses’ in their community (where applicable) | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of parents who have access to ‘parenting courses/programs in their community | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of in-school children/adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age) who report to have discussed teacher violence in their school with their parents/caretakers because of the advice they received from a peer or a friend | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of in-school children/adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age) who report to have discussed teacher violence in their school with their parents/caretakers because of the advice they received through communication systems/activities (i.e., public forums, the media, community activities, etc. – Specify means of communication) | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age) who feel they can talk freely to their parents/caretakers about their rights regarding domestic violence | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of parents/caretakers who believe children/adolescents have a right to report a case of domestic violence to the police | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of parents/caretakers who believe children/adolescents have a right to report a case of violence in classroom by a teacher to the police | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. % of teachers who *agree,* *somewhat agree, strongly agree, do not agree at all* with physically punishing students as a means of discipline | * School survey |
| 1. Proportion of adolescents (disaggregated by age and sex) that are aware/have knowledge of referral mechanisms and services for victims of domestic violence and abuse | * Population survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of children/adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age and ethnic/religious/indigenous background) that are informed and knowledgeable about existing laws that offer protection from violence and the procedures for reporting incidents | * Population survey/KAP |

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**MTSP & MoRES C4D Indicators**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Societal/Policy/Legislation – Enabling Environment (MoRES)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Demands from deprived/vulnerable groups on free and accessible local birth registration services in national policies/legislation | * Key Informant * Focus groups * Government documents |
| 1. Proportion of policy makers who collaborated with civil society leaders in the past 12 months in developing and enforcing national legislation on birth registration | * Key Informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of community members that believe appropriate national legislation on birth registration are in place and enforced at both local and national levels | * Focus groups * Convenience sampling surveys |
| 1. Proportion of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication) in the last 12 months promoting birth registration | * Media content analysis |
| 1. Conducive social norms in place supporting community members in registering their children at birth | * Key Informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Ratio of national to local level budget allocated to regular training of community workers on interactive communication skills to promote birth registration | * Budgetary documents from government at district and local levels |
| 1. % of community members who are aware of or/and know where to obtain birth certificates | * Focus group discussions * Convenience sampling surveys |
| 1. Proportion of provinces/districts that disseminate information from monitoring systems on the prevalence and incidence of not registering children at birth | * Data collected from appropriate public organizations (i.e., ministries) * Key informant interviews |
| 1. Proportion of districts/municipalities that have made budget plans and allocations for local birth registration offices | * Government documents related to budgets at district and municipality levels |
| 1. Proportion of local communities that have access to information on budget allocations for free and universal birth registration | * Key informant * Small and geographically restricted survey |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders and service providers that have knowledge on budget allocation procedure for birth registration at local levels | * Key informant * Focus group discussions |
| 1. % of budget reflecting priority communities’ demands on birth registration procedures and accessibility | * Government documents related to budgets at district and municipality levels * Key informant interviews |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) on free and universal birth registration | * Media content analysis |
| 1. Number of public campaigns on birth registration at national, district, and local levels | * Content analysis of health campaigns, leaflets, information on birth registration in different local languages (where applicable), and other media channels, i.e., radio, television |
| 1. Proportion of districts/municipalities that have made public budget plans and allocations on birth registration in partnership with civil societies in the past 12 months | * Key informant * Public budgetary documents * Public reports |
| 1. Ratio of local to national budget allocated to regular training of birth registration workers | * Budgetary documents from government at district and local levels |
| 1. % of mothers with disabilities who are aware of or/and know where to seek help/orientation on birth registration and certification of their children | * Focus group discussions * Convenience sampling surveys |
| 1. Proportion of towns and villages that have disseminated information from monitoring systems on birth registration rates among ethnic and indigenous populations and parents with disabilities | * Data collected from appropriate public organizations (i.e., ministries) * Key informant interviews |
| 1. Proportion of districts/municipalities that have made budget plans and allocations on birth registration public | * Government documents related to budgets at district and municipality levels |
| 1. Proportion of local communities that have access to information on budget allocations for promoting birth registration in rural areas | * Key informant * Small and geographically restricted survey |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) on free and universal birth registration in the past 12 months | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of civil societies that have lobbied for a local level birth registration policy and strategy for rural areas | * Key informant * Administrative data/documents |
| 1. Number of public campaigns on Child Rights and protection of children against violence in the past 12 months | * Content analysis of health campaigns, leaflets, information on birth registration in different local languages (where applicable), and other media channels, i.e., radio, television |
| 1. Proportion of laws, policies or guidelines that have been developed in conformity with international human rights standards for protecting children against violence in partnership with civil societies in the past 12 months (where applicable) | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of districts that have developed policies and guidelines for reporting and making complaints about violation of children’s rights at school and at home in collaboration with civil societies and community leaders in the past 12 months (where applicable) | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Number of media communications in the past 12 months (disaggregated by channel) that provided information on legal safeguards of child/ adolescent *victims* of violence | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of media communications in the past 12 months (disaggregated by channel) that provided information on legal safeguards for *witnesses* reporting cases of child/adolescent sexual and physical abuses | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of civil societies lobbying for regulations and rules of conduct that establish reporting violence against children/adolescents an obligation for all institutions and agencies that deal with children at risk of violence in the past 12 months | * Administrative data from civil societies i.e., minutes, reports, petitions, etc. * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of the population that is aware of national protection laws and regulations on violence against children | * Convenience sampling surveys |
| 1. Proportion of the population that is aware of Children’s Court to penalize violations against them (where applicable) | * Convenience sampling surveys |
| 1. Proportion of population that has knowledge of % of national budgets allocated to social services for protection of children and adolescents against violence | * Convenience sampling surveys * Key informants |
| 1. Number of official meetings between leaders of civil societies & policy makers to ensure enforcement of laws and regulations for protection of children/adolescents against violence in the past 12 months | * Government reports, newspaper articles, content analysis of media communications via radio/television * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of provinces/districts with demonstrable disseminated information on reported cases of violence against children and adolescents in the past 12 months | * Statistics/info obtained from civil society monitoring systems * Government reports, newspaper articles, content analysis of media communications via radio/television * Key informant * Statistics from public sources * Statistics/information collected from service providers |
| 1. Proportion of districts that have a consultative group composed of members of civil societies and community leaders on improving reporting mechanisms of violence against children and adolescents | * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of districts which routinely map and monitor violence against children with the involvement of civil societies (specify type of civil societies). | * + Official government monitoring reports at district levels   + Monitoring reports from civil societies * Key informant interviews/focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of population (disaggregated by age/sex) that has knowledge of Teachers’ Codes of Conduct to ensure criminal action against teachers who commit acts of violence against pupils and students (where applicable) | * Convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) providing information on Teachers’ Codes of Conduct to ensure criminal action against teachers who commit acts of violence against pupils and students (where applicable) | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of communication messages (disaggregated by medium of communication at local, district, and national levels) on domestic violence against children/adolescents as being punishable under law | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. % increase in public budget allocated to social services for child/adolescent victims of violence (in the community, at home, in school) as a result of advocacy efforts from communities and civil societies | * Public budgetary data * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of local communities that have access to information on budget allocations at national and district levels on services for protection of children/adolescent against violence in the community, at home, and at school | * Convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of community leaders and service providers that have knowledge on budget allocation procedures for protecting children/adolescents against violence in the community, at home, and at school | * Service provider survey * Key informant |
| 1. % of budget for provision of social services to child/adolescent victims of violence (at home, school, in the community) reflecting priority communities’ demands | * Key informant * Focus groups * Budgetary reports |
| 1. Number of schools that have implemented “Schools without Violence programme” in partnership with key line Ministries, Council for child rights and civil societies | * Key informant * School Survey * Administrative data |
| 1. Number of media campaigns on improving mechanisms for reporting cases of violence against children at home or at school in the past 12 months | * Key informant * Media content analysis |
| **Societal/Policy/Legislation – Quality (MoRES)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. A procurement system that ensures the availability of birth registration forms and certificates from local production at both urban and rural areas | * Key informant * Administrative data including inventories from public and private sources |
| 1. Regular training and refresher courses on international human rights standard interactive communication skills for teachers and school administrators | * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Regular training and refresher courses on international human rights standard interactive communication skills for health, community, and social workers on Child Rights and child protection against violence (at home, at school, in the community | * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Development of viable national, provincial, and local monitoring systems in collaboration with civil societies and service providers that can disseminate reliable data and information on birth registration and certification in rural and urban areas | * Public statistics/data * Key informant |
| 1. Development of viable national, provincial, and local monitoring systems in collaboration with civil societies and service providers that can disseminate reliable data and information on incidence of violence against children/adolescents at home, at school and in the community | * Public statistics/data * Key informant |
| 1. Development of a reliable and centralized data management system in collaboration with civil societies and service providers for disseminating information on birth registration | * Public statistics/data * Key informant |
| 1. Development of a reliable and centralized data management system in collaboration with civil societies and service providers for disseminating information/data on the incidence of reported cases of violence against children/adolescent at home, at school, and in the community at local, district, and national levels | * Public statistics/data * Key informant |
| **Organizational/Institutional – Supply (MoRES)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Frequency and scope of dissemination (i.e., national, district, town/village) of information on free and universal birth registration through communication systems (media, internet, media campaigns, etc,) | * Media/communication content analysis |
| 1. Proportion of service points that had sufficient supply of birth registration forms and birth certificates as a result of media campaigns (specify type) in the past 12 months | * Administrative data * Service point assessments |
| 1. Proportion of population that has information on the closest birth registry office to their household | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of trained community mobilizers who can demonstrate at least 75% of core key interpersonal communication skills while talking to community members about registering the birth of their child | * Service provider survey * Participant observation |
| 1. Proportion of birth registration workers trained on interactive communication skills who received a supervision visit in the last 3 months | * Supervision reports from local officials, health centres, civil societies * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of service providers (health workers, community outreach workers) trained on specific interactive communication with people with disabilities regarding birth registration of their children | * Service provider surveys * Key informants * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of community health workers with interactive communication training who are actively promoting birth registration among households (explain how) | * Patient/client exit Surveys * Key informant * Facility based survey |
| 1. % of communities reached by communication interventions (interactive theatre sessions; community dialogues, etc.) on birth registration by trained community workers in the past 12 months | * Population survey |
| 1. Proportion of birth register officers with training on providing services to people with disabilities | * Employee information collected at birth registry offices |
| 1. Proportion of birth registration promotion campaigns that are accessible to people with disabilities | * Content analysis of promotion campaigns (i.e., language, where info is tailored to people with disabilities |
| 1. Proportion of population that received information on counseling services for children who have been victims of violence (at home, school, community) through various communication channels (specify communication channel) | * Population survey |
| 1. Number of communication media messages (specify channel) in the past 12 months catered to child/adolescent victims of violence on social and legal services available to them | * Media content analysis * Key informant |
| 1. Number of service points in the community catering to child/adolescent victims of violence | * Key informant |
| 1. % of school-based professionals including teachers that are trained on how to manage anger and interactive communication skills in the past 12 months | * School surveys * Administrative data |
| 1. % of community outreach workers that are trained in interpersonal communication skills for promoting Child Rights and protection of children/adolescent against violence at home in the past 12 months | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. % of community outreach workers and service providers (disaggregate by type/ i.e., counsellors, nurses, doctors, teachers, school administrators) that were trained of interactive communication skills promoting Child Rights and protection of children against violence among poor households, ethnic and indigenous minorities, and people with disabilities in the past 12 months | * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Number of communication activities (community dialogues; interactive theatre/folk songs sessions; community radio programmes) on birth registration catered to the needs of people with disabilities, ethnic/minority groups, and poor households in the past 6 months | * Key informant * Listings of community events * Media content analysis |
| 1. Number of communication activities (community dialogues; interactive theatre/folk songs sessions; community radio programmes) on Child Rights and protection of children/adolescents against violence catered to people with disabilities, ethnic/minority groups, and hard to reach populations in the past 6 months | * Key informant * Listings of community events * Media content analysis (including use of local languages) |
| 1. Level of satisfaction of people with disabilities with the information/advice received within the past 3 months on birth registration | * Focus group discussions * Key informant * Convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of promotion campaigns on health registration (in the past 3 months) that were specifically catered to the needs of people with disabilities and ethnic/indigenous populations | * Key informant * Convenience sampling survey * Media content analysis (including use of local languages) |
| 1. Percent of health units with at least one service provider trained on interpersonal communication skills to care for and refer cases of physical violence against children/adolescents inflicted by an adult | * Service Provider assessments/surveys * Administrative data |
| **Community – Demand (MoRES)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. proportion of community outreach and volunteer workers who received interactive communication training courses through civil society and community initiatives on eliminating domestic and school-based violence against children/adolescents in the past 12 months |  |
| 1. Membership mix (i.e., disabled mothers, men, women, adolescents, ethnic/religious minorities) of civil societies involved in outreach and advocacy on Child Rights including birth registration and protection of children against violence | * Key informant * Focus group discussions * Administrative data from civil societies |
| 1. Number of community mobilization events in the past 3 months with a focus on birth registration | * Community event logs/activities |
| 1. Number of community mobilization events in the past 3 months with a focus on violence against children and adolescents | * Community event logs/activities |
| 1. Activities (explain type) by local civil societies in changing attitudes towards violence as a means for disciplining children at home and at school | * Administrative data from civil societies * Key informant |
| 1. Activities (explain type) by local civil societies in changing attitudes in favour of birth registration of new born infants in the past 3 months | * Administrative data from civil societies * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of local women’s and youth organizations reporting that they have conducted at least 1 community-level assessment-analysis-action process to address violence against children/adolescents at home in the past 12 months | * Short survey * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of local women’s and youth organizations reporting that they have conducted at least 1 community-level assessment-analysis-action process to address violence against children/adolescents at school by teachers in the past 12 months | * Short survey * Administrative data * Key informant |
| 1. % of community members (disaggregated by age and sex and vulnerability status i.e., disability, ethnic/minority status) that participated in local/neighbourhood assessments to identify gaps and challenges in protecting children against domestic violence and violence in schools (or developing local community-based action plans) in the past 6 months | * Short convenience sampling survey * Focus group discussions * Key informant discussions |
| 1. % of community leader that advocated for improved legal protection of the rights of children who were victims of domestic violence in the past 3 months | * Key informant * Focus group |
| 1. Number of women who report they feel comfortable in voicing their opinion on protection of children against gender based violence in places where men are also present | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of community members that believe there is ongoing leadership from members of civil societies (specify what members and what type of civil society) on protecting children against violence at home, school, and in the community | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of adolescents (disaggregated by age and sex) that feel that they can obtain quality advice and guidance *at all times* regarding reporting of cases of violence against them (at home, school, in the community) | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of community members that feel there is proper monitoring system for gathering information on the needs and concerns of the community with regard to protection of children against violence | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey * Key informant |
| 1. Scope of resources mobilized within the community in the past 12 months (i.e., a listing of all organizations contacted which gives evidence of the size of the network accessed by the community) to provide information on the cases of violence (at home, school, in the community) against children and adolescents | * Listing of organizations * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. The degree to which adolescent girls feel they can draw on both formal and informal social networks (specify, i.e., from whom) to obtain information on their rights for reporting cases of violence and abuse against themselves, or a family member, a friend, or a peer | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex and gender) who believe punishment of children at home is a private issue not to be publicly divulged | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Describe how are community members are encouraged (if at all) to participate in Public discussions on protection of children against violence and abuse at home (i.e., through what mechanisms, how are they gathered together, how and from whom do they receive information on the gathering etc.)? (qualitative) | * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. The extent to which community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous and disability status) believe that violence against children/adolescent at home should be as much a community as a household concern (qualitative) | * Focus groups * Short convenience sampling survey * Key informant |
| 1. Type of cultural/normative barriers that mothers/caregivers and other key stakeholders report for attitudes towards physical punishment of children/adolescents at school and at home as something “normal” for disciplining children (qualitative) | * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. Type of cultural/normative barriers that adolescent girls report for failing to report violence and violence against them at home, at school, and in the community (qualitative) | * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. Number of public debates (at the community level and/or neighbourhood level- specify) on importance of birth registration in the past 6 months | * Organizational logs * Event logs * Minutes |
| 1. Number of public debates (at the community level and/or neighbourhood level- specify) on protection of children/adolescents against violence at home, school, and in the community in the past 6 months | * Organizational logs * Event logs * Media content analysis |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/indigenous status, as well as disability) that expect all perpetrators of violence against children/adolescents should be brought to justice irrespective of their relation to the child/adolescent and position in the community | * Short convenience sampling |
| 1. % of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, ethnic/indigenous background) that report to have complained to local administrators in the past 12 months about absence of quality birth registration services in their community, but have or have not received any feedback | * Convenience sampling survey * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. Number of meetings of joint citizen-local council commissions/boards on protection of children against violence in the past 6 months | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Percentage of leadership positions held by ethnic/religious/indigenous groups and people with disabilities in civil society groups advocating for free, universal, and timely birth registration | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Percentage of leadership positions held by ethnic/religious/indigenous groups and people with disabilities in civil society groups advocating for respecting children’s rights and protecting them against all forms of violence | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of community members that expect all mothers should be knowledgeable about birth registration procedures for their children | * Short convenience sampling survey * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregate by sex, age, ethnic/indigenous/religious background) that believe birth registration of infants is the responsibility of the mother alone | * Short convenience sampling survey * Focus groups |
| 1. Number of community dialogues initiated by community leaders about what constitutes violence against children/ adolescents in the past 6 months | * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. Number of community associations conducting a community mapping of where children/ adolescents experience& witness different types of violence | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Perception of adolescents (disaggregated by age and sex) of their ability to influence public policy on issues of violence that affect their lives through participation in public policy discussions | * Focus group discussions * Convenience sampling surveys |
| 1. Number of child and youth associations that advocate for the protection of children against domestic violence and violence in schools | * Key informant * Administrative data |
| 1. Proportion of health units at district and local levels that have documented and adopted protocol in collaboration with civil societies for communicating service and legal options to children/adolescents who have been victims of violence and abuse at home or in the community in the past 12 months | * Convenience sampling survey of health units * Key informant |
| **Individual/Interpersonal – Demand (MoRES)** | |
| **C4D Indicators** | **Means of verification** |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, disability status, and ethnic/indigenous group) who report to have received information (specify channel of communication) on birth registry services in their community/neighbourhood in the past 3 months | * Convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, ethnic/indigenous, and disability status) that perceive birth registration should be compulsory for all children irrespective of gender, ethnic/indigenous/religion, and disability status | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of pregnant women that intend to register their children at birth *because* of the information they received (specify channel of communication) in the past 6 months | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus Groups |
| 1. Proportion of parents/caretakers with disabilities who report to have received information about birth registration services catered to their needs in the past 30 days | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of pregnant women who have been advised by a friend/neighbour or family member about registering their children immediately after birth in the past month | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex and age) that feel birth registration is a private choice that should not be made compulsory | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, disability, and ethnic/religious/indigenous status) that feel the media should have a role ( or greater role) in promoting birth registration (primary and/or secondary) among hard to reach populations | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups * Key Informant |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex and age, and ethnic/religious/indigenous status) that feel dissemination of information in the past 6 months on birth registration services through different modes of communication (i.e., the media, print, TV, radio, internet, face-to-face, etc. – Specify) has been *adequate, somewhat adequate, and not adequate at all* | * Short convenience sampling survey * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of parents/caretakers (disaggregated by sex and age) with disabilities that feel information provided in the past 6 months on access to birth registry services through different modes of communication (i.e., the media, print, TV, radio, internet, face-to-face, etc. – Specify) was *adequately, somewhat adequately, and not adequately at all* catered to their needs | * Short convenience sampling survey * Focus groups |
| 1. Reasons for which parents with disabilities and those from minority and indigenous groups feel that they do not receive adequate information on birth registration services that meet their needs (qualitative) | * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. Parents/caregivers of girls have perceptions and beliefs that constrain registration of newborns (qualitative) | * Focus groups * Key informant |
| 1. Proportion of caregivers and parents who can recall the content of messages/counseling received in the past 3 months on why infants need to be registered at birth | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. % of mother who report to have received information and advice on registration of their newborns in the past 3 months through various communication channels (specify channel) | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who feel that information/messages they received in the past 3 months through, through the media, service providers, civil societies, interactive dialogues, etc. (specify channel of communication) about birth registration have been important in increasing birth registration in their community | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who feel information/messages about birth registration procedures through the various forms of the media (specify channel) are properly understood by community members | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of child care-givers who recall messages during previous month (or period appropriate to communication activities) on birth registration services in their community | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of pregnant women (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who intend to register their child at birth because of advice they received from an influential family or community member (state the relationship, i.e., outreach workers, midwife, religious leaders, etc.) | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who participated in informal conversations (during community dialogues, at social or religious activities) during the past 7 days where they discussed advantages of birth registration | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who can correctly provide at least 2 advantages of birth registration for children | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of women/mothers (disaggregated by sex, age, minority/indigenous status, and disability status) who believe they have the kind of information and skills to enable them to persuade other women/mothers including family and peers to obtain birth certificate for their children | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members that believe birth registration is important because of the information they received through the media (specify channel of communication) in the past 3 to 6 months | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Percent women (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/religious/indigenous and disability status) who report to have encouraged (or discouraged) their pregnant friends or relatives or neighbours to register their children at birth in the past 3 months | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of women who report to have registered their children at birth because of advice they received from an influential family member, friend a peer or a community leader in the past 6 months | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnic/indigenous/religion) that *accept, strongly accept, somewhat accept, do not accept at all* physical or psychological violence against children/adolescents at home or at school as a form of discipline and appropriate form of punishment | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus group |
| 1. % of parents who recall 75% of the communication messages they received in the past month (or appropriate communication period) on how to manage their anger against their children/adolescents | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. % of community members (disaggregated age/sex, ethnicity/indigenous status) who *strongly believe*, somewhat *believe*, *do not believe at all* that one should turn a ‘blind’ eye to neighbours use of violence for punishing their children | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. % of parents who are aware of ‘parenting courses’ including interpersonal communication skills with children/adolescents in their community (where applicable) | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. % of parents who have access to ‘parenting courses/programs including interpersonal communication skills in their community | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Key informant * Focus groups |
| 1. % of in-school children/adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age) who report to have discussed teacher violence in their school with their parents/caretakers because of the advice they received from a peer or a friend | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * In-depth interviews * Focus groups |
| 1. % of in-school children/adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age) who report to have discussed teacher violence in their school with their parents/caretakers because of the advice they received through communication systems/activities (i.e., public forums, the media, community activities, etc. – Specify means of communication) | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * In-depth interviews * Focus groups |
| 1. % of adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age) who feel they can talk freely to their parents/caretakers about their rights regarding domestic violence | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * In-depth interviews * Focus groups |
| 1. % of parents/caretakers who believe children/adolescents have a right to report a case of domestic violence to the police | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * In-depth interviews * Focus groups |
| 1. % of parents/caretakers who believe children/adolescents have a right to report a case of violence in classroom by a teacher to the police | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * In-depth interviews * Focus groups |
| 1. % of teachers who *agree,* *somewhat agree, strongly agree, do not agree at all* with physically punishing students as a means of discipline | * School survey |
| 1. Proportion of adolescents (disaggregated by age and sex) that are aware/have knowledge of referral mechanisms and services for victims of domestic violence and abuse | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups |
| 1. Percent of community members (disaggregated by age, sex, ethnic/religious/indigenous and disability status) who have encouraged (or discouraged) friends or relatives or neighbours to report cases of teacher violence at school in the past 30 days | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP |
| 1. Proportion of community members (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnic/indigenous/religion) that *accept, strongly accept, somewhat accept, do not accept at all* of violence as a way to resolve interpersonal conflicts between parents and children | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of community members that expect cases of violence and abuse against children/adolescents at home and at school should be reported irrespective of the identity and the relation of the perpetrator to the child/adolescent | * Short convenience sampling survey/KAP * Focus groups |
| 1. Proportion of adolescents (disaggregated by age and sex) that are aware/have knowledge of referral mechanisms and services for victims of domestic violence and abuse | * Convenience sampling survey |
| 1. Proportion of children/adolescents (disaggregated by sex and age and ethnic/religious/indigenous background) that are informed and knowledgeable about existing laws that offer protection from violence and the procedures for reporting incidents | * Convenience sampling survey |