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Child Friendly Places Evaluation Report
Introduction

**Child Friendly Places** (CFP) is an approach for integrating children’s rights into local development initiatives and educational programs through a participatory, intergenerational and child friendly assessment and planning methodology that empowers communities to improve their local conditions and environments with children, adolescents, families, educators, service providers and decision makers ([http://childfriendlyplaces.org](http://childfriendlyplaces.org)).

This methodology was developed and implemented through a global action research project coordinated by the Children’s Environments Research Group (CERG) from 2008 to 2014. Participants included global, national and local organizations and groups that were already engaged in initiatives to improve child rights education and to better assess and monitor local conditions that are required to fulfill children’s rights. Children’s rights are outlined in the [Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)](http://www.unicef.org), which establishes minimum international standards for children’s wellbeing, participation and development from birth to 18 years of age, regardless of their gender, cultural background or abilities.

This report summarizes a global evaluation on the application, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the child friendly places methodology in 14 countries with sufficient data representing diverse cultural and economic contexts.¹ It begins with a rationale and overview of the methodology, and the process in which it was developed, tested and refined in the last five years. The next section describes the evaluation scope, design and theory of change to summarize the process, challenges and potential outcomes from integrating the methodology into existing local initiatives or programs. The evaluation report concludes with recommendations for future research and development of the child friendly places methodology. The outcomes of the evaluation are captured through online case studies to facilitate global learning and the exchange of best practices for applying and scaling the approach in different settings.

CERG has guided the conceptual development, implementation and evaluation of the CFP methodology, and has also provided technical assistance in many of the settings in which it was applied. The findings in this report are therefore derived from a developmental evaluation or action research approach, in which evaluators participated in the design of a new intervention

---

¹ While the evaluation focuses upon 14 countries with the most complete evidence, a total of 27 countries are currently implementing, or planning to implement the approach. The total number of participants continues to grow and has now reached more than 820 communities and 64,000 participants (as of March 2015).
by monitoring, encouraging and interjecting evaluative thinking into the process. Therefore this evaluation is not an independent assessment of an intervention developed by another group. Rather, it is a longitudinal, largely qualitative, and critical self-assessment of the potential opportunities and challenges of applying the child friendly places methodology in a variety of case studies around the world.

Global Context and Background

Global Context and Background

Why is this methodology needed?

Child Rights Education

One objective of the child friendly places approach is to educate children, adolescents and parents about children’s rights as they apply to their everyday living and learning conditions and experiences. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), an international treaty ratified by every country in the world except the United States and South Sudan. Despite decades of actions to implement the CRC, many children are not aware of their rights, or what children’s rights mean in everyday practice in their schools, communities and cities. The child friendly places methodology is designed to address this shortcoming through the design of an intergenerational assessment and planning process that increases public awareness of children’s rights. Therefore, the process of applying the methodology is as important, or perhaps even more important, than the data it generates. If all of the recommended activities are used, the methodology can support the following processes:
• **Develop life skills:** Children and adolescents can develop a range of social skills for group work with peers and with adults. They can learn how to conduct research, calculate simple statistics, and how to take on roles as agents of change for their school and community.

• **Improve dialogue and mutual learning across generations:** By inviting parents and their children to systemically compare and discuss the changing quality of children’s lives across the generations, all actors will benefit. Children and adolescents will better understand their place in the development of their own culture and community, and parents will enhance their understanding of human rights and community priorities for improvement in light of community changes and development.

• **Influence national standards on children’s rights:** By broadly assessing the conditions required to fulfill children’s rights in schools and communities, and linking this effort to a range of school subjects, educators can make an important leap forward in the goal of bringing children’s rights into a more central focus within school curricula. This methodology has the potential of being seen by national governments as a key way of fulfilling their obligations regarding public awareness of children’s rights, as well as the assessment of children’s rights. It can also yield a strategic plan for strengthening education systems with the input of children, adolescents, parents and education professionals.

• **Develop the school as a strategic institution or community observatory for the continued monitoring, reflection and advocacy for children’s rights.** The activities can empower schools to have a more central role in community development by providing guidance on how to collect, store and use the data that was generated through the learning process. This can include integrating the data for local advocacy with schools and communities, or larger urban development schemes at the regional or municipal level.

• **Better understand the meaning of children’s rights:** By participating in the assessment of their conditions and rights in schools and communities, children will better understand their identity as citizens. In the best of circumstances, children will also learn how to work with their community or school and local institutions to help fulfill their rights.

• **Broadly understand the rights of others:** The assessment and planning process helps children see patterns of rights infringements among their peers in their own schools and community, and thereby, enables them to have a broader understanding of patterns of exclusion and injustice as they relate to all children.

**Participation and Empowerment**

The second objective of the child friendly places approach is to improve the living and learning conditions of schools and communities with the input and participation of children, adolescents, parents, teachers, and service providers. Research demonstrates that children
have unique perspectives on the material conditions that affect them, and when given the opportunity and appropriate tools, they can effectively participate in urban and community development processes. Yet, while the CRC calls for children to be “consulted on all matters that concern them,” they are rarely given the chance to comment upon the places where they spend most of their time, or on programs and services designed for them. This includes a lack of age- and culturally-appropriate tools that empower children to give input on decisions for their schools, community and cities. The child friendly places approach addresses this shortcoming through graphic based assessment and planning tools and materials that encourage intergenerational dialogue and action for children, adolescents and families.

Children’s rights cannot be understood and fulfilled without the local participation of civil society, including young people themselves. Children and adolescents have a role and responsibility in fulfilling their rights, especially on matters of social relationships and the formation of positive peer relationships. In many countries, participation in local governance is weak, and in the case of children, non-existent. Even with much greater human resources, local government authorities would be limited in their capacity to comprehensively assess local conditions for children’s rights. But all schools and communities have assets that can be built upon to improve learning and living conditions. Children, youth and parents should be partners with local governments in data collection on their conditions, and viewed not only as recipients of services, but also as assets for improving their schools, communities and cities. The child friendly places approach encourages local decision makers to work in partnership with its citizens to improve their conditions.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

The third objective of the child friendly places approach is to gather disaggregated data at the local level to monitor and evaluate the conditions for children and adolescents over time by gender, age, and community. One reason community improvement and development processes often do not take into consideration the needs of children and adolescents is a lack of data at the local level to make informed decisions. For example, while local governments have access to some quantitative indicators on the fulfillment of certain rights (such as sanitation, water access and vaccination rates), only a limited range of indicators are available to assess the majority of conditions required to fulfill children’s rights in any place. In addition, governments and local decision makers do not have reliable and valid ways to gather data on the subjective experiences of children to improve the quality of services, places and programs that support their healthy development.

---

Community-level data is also needed in order to understand inequality within municipalities or districts. For example, data on conditions for children is often at the municipal or sub-regional scale of analysis, which masks neighborhood variations in access to services. If a municipal government wants comparative data across communities, it is possible to use the child friendly places approach for strategic sampling with the most vulnerable communities and disadvantaged groups in the municipality. The child friendly places methodology can offer local government agencies valuable comparative data to help them plan the equitable distribution of resources and services across all communities.

**Governance and Accountability**

The fourth objective of the child friendly places approach is to enhance governance structures and processes that improve the conditions required to fulfill children’s rights at the local level. While some advocacy efforts have taken place to encourage decision makers to take children’s needs into consideration within local policies and plans (such as with Child Friendly Cities), these efforts are more common at the national level. Local governments need effective tools to analyze their current governance structures and processes for children and approaches that enhance cross-sectoral planning, collaboration and partnerships with civil society to implement children’s rights. The child friendly places approach can support local government agencies in the collection of data that can be used to demonstrate their commitment to fulfill children’s rights, and to strengthen local systems that encourage child friendly policy formation.

**Who developed the methodology and how was it developed?**

**Phase 1 (2008-2010): Development and Testing**

The child friendly places methodology was originally developed as part of the Child Friendly Cities initiative ([http://childfreindlycities.org](http://childfreindlycities.org)) to support the collection of local data on the conditions required to fulfill children’s rights. The initial research focused upon developing indicators for child friendly cities and communities and the pilot testing of the methodology in nine countries with different economic conditions, including: Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Morocco, Spain, France, Italy, the Sudan, Jordan and the Philippines. The Children’s Environments Research Group coordinated the development and testing phase in partnership with the Childwatch International Research Network, the Innocenti Research Centre (now called the UNICEF Office of Research), UNICEF Country Offices and UNICEF National Committees. The process was supported with joint funding from the Bernard van Leer Foundation and the Innocenti Research Centre (UNICEF Office of Research).

The process for developing the indicators was highly participatory with teams of local researchers, UNICEF Country Office Program Officers, and local government representatives from each country who assisted in designing the approach through collaborative planning
workshops. The initial goal was to implement the methodology with community-based organizations through an action research process, with local partners reporting back on the successes and challenges of the process. This process yielded two toolkits containing a range of assessment tools and materials, including: 1) the Child Friendly Communities Self-Assessment Toolkit, with assessment tools for children aged 8-12, adolescents aged 13-18, preschool parents, primary school parents, secondary school parents, and community service providers; and 2) the Child Friendly Cities Governance Assessment Toolkit, which included a checklist tool and scenarios diagramming exercise to analyze governance structures and processes that support children and adolescents.3

The findings from the multi-country pilot research indicated the community assessment methodology was valuable for: 1) collecting community data associated with children’s rights; 2) identifying key priorities of action for children’s rights in the selected communities; 3) raising awareness on children’s rights with community and municipal stakeholders; 4) creating spaces for dialogue on sensitive children’s rights issues; and 5) triggering processes of local planning for and by children. The governance toolkit was not as successful as the community toolkit because local representatives were apprehensive in participating in a self-critique of their governance processes for children. Nonetheless, where the governance toolkit was implemented, it fostered cross-sector planning and dialogue to improve decision-making processes for children.

It was clear from the local level of analysis that children’s participation in decisions that affect them at school and in their communities was lacking or done poorly in all of the pilot countries. Based on the perspectives of children, parents and community service providers involved in the assessment, this was true regardless of community size, economic status or social context. Each community involved in the assessment process had at least one low scoring indicator for children’s participation, and most had several or many low scoring indicators in this area. Children of all ages reported not having a voice in decisions with city council, student councils or within programs and services designed for them.

Children, parents and community service providers also identified issues of equity and access. Gender differences in the realization of children’s rights were found for girls in the Dominican Republic and the Philippines in terms of safety, while both girls and boys in Morocco and Jordan identified issues associated with their rights, such as equal treatment in school and general safety. Every community involved in the research had at least one subgroup identify a lack of play spaces or opportunities for children with disabilities to use existing playgrounds, and in most communities, children, parents and community service providers all agreed that this was an issue.

Every community involved in the research noted a lack of clean and safe toilets in their schools and community. In both poor and wealthier communities, children and parents commonly

3 These tools are housed online at: http://childfriendlycities.org/research/final-toolkit-2011/
noted the lack of a clean environment. The poorer communities noted a lack of access to electricity, homes that provided adequate shelter, adequate space for living, housing affordability, and access to water for drinking and washing at home and school.

The community assessment revealed a major issue with peer relationships and the treatment of children and adolescents towards one another. Young people in every community identified issues of safety from peers, both in the community and at school, related to harassment, bullying and violence. It was clear from these findings that children are equally implicated as social actors responsible for realizing children’s rights in their communities, and work is needed to better understand this problem and find ways to help children form safe relationships with one another.

The methodology was found to be sufficiently flexible to be adapted in each local context. Community facilitators were able to implement the process in various settings (such as schools, child/adolescent clubs and community centers) and developed additional creative techniques (such as puppetry, theater, and games) to engage younger children. The Child Friendly Communities Toolkit was used by children as young as 6 years of age, with working children, and with children living in refugee camps and informal settlements. However, the period of intervention by the organizing teams was too short to judge the value of the assessment process in informing subsequent action and advocacy. In addition, valuable lessons were learned on how to improve upon the methodology in subsequent iterations, including a need for child-friendly methods to support the participatory analysis of the results, child friendly data visualizations, data management systems for scaling, and improved tools to prioritize and plan actions based on the results of the assessments.

Phase 2 (2010-2012): Adaptations and Scaling

The second phase of development focused upon adaptations to the methodology for use in transitional/temporary schools in emergencies, after school programs, and with citizen councils comprised of women, the disabled and youth. Three different pilot initiatives were implemented from 2010 to 2012, which were coordinated by the Children’s Environments Research Group. One initiative was funded by the US Fund for UNICEF to integrate the approach into a community-based afterschool program in the United States working in collaboration with the Isaacs Center – a non-profit organization in East Harlem, New York City, and with CTM Dreams, a non-profit organization focused on youth and media. Another initiative was funded by the UNICEF Education Section at New York Headquarters to integrate the methodology into transitional learning spaces in emergency contexts. Pilot programs took place in Haiti with support from the UNICEF Haiti Country Office and Finn Church Aid, and in the Philippines with support from the Institute of Philippine Culture. A third initiative was implemented in Turkey working with volunteers from citizen councils, the UNICEF Turkey Country Office, and the Youth for Habitat Organization.
These different pilot programs helped to strengthen the methodology in a number of ways. First, a new approach for tallying the results of the assessment process was developed using large charts that also enabled participants to summarize the data using child friendly graphics. In addition, a way to prioritize actions and to develop local plans with children was pilot tested. In the case of the United States, digital media, film production, blogging and video conferencing with youth who led a similar process in Brazil was integrated into the approach. In the case of Turkey, an approach for scaling the process within 10 municipalities was explored, as well as how to adapt the indicators for other marginalized groups such as women, the disabled and with older youth aged 19-24. In the case of Haiti, a new approach for incorporating teachers as co-facilitators with children in applying the methodology within a school setting was piloted. In the Philippines, an approach for integrating parent-teacher committees into the process in schools was developed and piloted.

These pilot programs demonstrated that the existing facilitator guides were not sufficient for teachers or youth without experience in research, and required adaptation to ensure the steps of the methodology were applied correctly. In addition, lessons on how to manage expectations in the process were identified, including how to plan for short-term actions that could be taken by the community itself, as well as long-term actions that required the input and participation of local decision-makers and service providers to implement. Finally, lessons on how to scale and integrate the process into local development initiatives were identified, including the importance of community volunteers rather than paid staff as facilitators in the process.

**Phase 3 (2012-2014): Evaluation and Refinement**

The third phase of development included a follow up evaluation with all groups in Phase 1 and 2, and with new groups that reported applying the methodology. The intention was to not only document what happened in communities as a result of integrating the methodology, but also to consolidate all the lessons learned into a new coherent package of tools and materials that could be used in schools and with child or youth led organizations. The Children’s Environments Research Group conducted the evaluation with support from the Bernard van Leer Foundation. New demonstration projects took place in India in partnership with the Tata Institute of Social Sciences in Mumbai, and Shaishav, a working children’s group in the state of Gujarat. In addition, CERG focused on fostering regional centers of innovation in the use and dissemination of the methodology during this phase. Given the Instituto Paulo Montenegro (IPM) in Brazil was involved in the creation of the original tools and has championed their dissemination and use at the community and municipal levels at a large scale, they were well positioned to take on this new coordination role in the Latin American region.

The goal of the Brazil demonstration project was to further disseminate the assessment tools into schools as part of the learning process. To make the tools attractive to educators, CERG and IPM agreed that new facilitator guides would be developed for use with teachers, youth and community workers with no experience in assessment and community planning. These
guides would ideally be graphic-based, youth-friendly, and made available for free online for groups to download and use. Our objective was to create facilitator guides that would empower groups to autonomously use the tools and materials with minimal technical support.

After long consideration and discussion, CERG and IPM decided to develop a comprehensive resource kit containing the guides and tools that would be made available online in multiple languages. To ensure a connection with previous child friendly city initiatives, and to recognize the importance of communities and schools, we agreed to call the new resource kit “Child Friendly Places” (http://childfriendlyplaces.org). The new resources include a greater emphasis on planning, advocacy, and outcomes, and are informed by the evaluation of previous initiatives. In addition, a new domain focused on nature and ecology was added to the set of indicators to foster young people’s engagement and participation in sustainable development processes, along with a greater elaboration on indicators for schools.

As part of the effort to develop new resources for school and community environments, IPM hosted a series of participatory workshops and planning meetings with organizations that expressed an interest in using the tools, and piloted the materials with several local groups. During these meetings, participants critiqued the draft resources and provided guidance to ensure the materials could be used in schools and community programs with teachers and youth development specialists. The groups also provided specific guidance on using the tools with children as young as five years of age, as well as with working children.

**Overview of the Child Friendly Places Methodology**

The child friendly places methodology provides a systematic strategy and child friendly approach for collecting, analyzing and comparing the subjective opinions of children, adolescents and adults about their environmental and community conditions that are necessary for fulfilling children’s rights. Communities can then take local actions on their own based on this information, or the data can be shared with local decision makers and service providers to advocate for, or improve policies and programs for children, adolescents and families.

Anyone interested in understanding the perspectives of children, adolescents and parents about the conditions of their schools, communities and cities is encouraged to integrate the approach into their existing educational programs or local development initiatives. The methodology can be applied in any country in the world, regardless of its level of human development because it is based on children’s rights, which are universal rights for all children. The methodology is unique because it enables groups to examine the importance of the physical and natural environment, as well as the social environment, in the full and healthy development of children and adolescents. The methodology is also innovative because it uses graphics and pictorial symbols that empower children and adults who cannot read to participate in the process.
The methodology can be integrated into school lessons, used in after school programs, facilitated by youth councils and child/youth-led groups, or integrated into community programs. It is based on a ‘consciousness raising’ approach to education, and supports children and adults to move from an individual to a collective understanding of their conditions. The process helps to build the awareness and capacities of participants through simple steps that are inquiry and discussion based. Because the methodology is based on the knowledge children and adults have gained through their everyday experiences, anyone can participate in the process regardless of their level of education.

Facilitators of the process may include adolescents, youth, teachers, child advocates, community service providers and other adults working for organizations that support children, adolescents and families. Groups using the kit are encouraged to adapt the process for their own community or school based on their interests, resources and time. The process can be implemented with minimal materials or resources, or can be integrated into development or educational programs at larger scales if funding is available. The main requirement is time, and the voluntary participation of community members who have a genuine curiosity or interest in helping to improve their own conditions.

The methodology includes four modules and eight activities that enable children as young as 7 years of age, adolescents and adults to assess and improve their current conditions (Figure 1). Groups can implement the activities that are most relevant for their local needs, but ideally all of the modules and activities are used to ensure a comprehensive public planning process.

---

4 Children as young as 6 years of age have participated in this process, although we recommend the age of 7 based on the global experiences in implementing the assessment and planning tools.
• **School use.** Data can be collected and analyzed by a group of school stakeholders to identify priority areas for action to enhance learning conditions for children and adolescents. The findings from this assessment can then be used for advocacy purposes with education sector decision makers or as a guide for a school’s own direct actions to improve their learning conditions. Data can subsequently be collected using the same tools for periodic monitoring of progress with regard to the learning conditions of children and adolescents. Schools can also store and present the data in a way that it can be accessed by community residents and decision makers, and become recognized within the community as a child rights community observatory.

• **Community use.** Data can be collected and analyzed by community residents to identify priority areas for action to enhance the living conditions for children and adolescents. The findings from this assessment can then be used by community residents for advocacy purposes with government representatives or as a guide for their own direct actions to improve the community. Data can subsequently be collected using the same tools by a community for periodic monitoring of progress with regard to the living conditions of children and adolescents.

• **Municipal use.** The methodology and tools are also valuable for providing municipal government decision-makers with more small-scale geographic data, and on a much greater range of dimensions than is typically available for city-level planning for children and adolescents. There are different ways that municipalities can use the tools for citywide data collection and strategic planning for children, adolescents and families. For example, if multiple schools and communities participate in the assessment process, the data can be aggregated to inform decision making for different regions within a city. Government representatives can also participate in the assessment process as service providers, and evaluate their own opinions about community and school conditions when compared with residents. Finally, a governance self-assessment tool is provided in the resource kit that enables the different sectors within a municipality to come together and analyze the degree to which policies or plans address the needs of children and adolescents.

• **National Use.** If a representative sample of municipalities applies the methodology, it can also be scaled to affect regional and national-level planning, advocacy and policy making for children and adolescents.

**Assessment Module**

The assessment module forms the core of the child friendly places methodology. All activities have been designed to support this assessment process. The assessment module enables the collection of local data on a broad range of conditions that are required to fulfill child rights. The module contains three activities that complement one another and enable participants to share their local knowledge through different approaches such as drawing, community mapping and graphic surveys (Figure 2).
**Introduce Activity**

The ‘Introduce’ activity enables children, adolescents and adults to think about what child friendly places mean to them, and provides a general orientation to the methodology, its goals, and history. The goal of the activity is to begin with participants’ own understandings of what “child friendly” means within their cultural context, and introduces the concept of children’s rights. The activity also encourages children, adolescents and adults to critically examine the indicators developed for the assessment, and to develop new indicators that are important for their local environmental conditions. For this reason, the ‘Introduce’ activity provides a good starting point for the training of community facilitators. The activity is designed to address four central questions:

1. What are child friendly communities and schools and why are they important?
2. How do you create child friendly places?
3. How can the process of creating child friendly places impact the lives of children, adolescents and their families?
4. What are some issues children, adolescents and families face in our school or community?

The activity is completed in four main steps:

**STEP 1:** In small groups, participants share their experiences in their community or school through scenario-based drama, walking tours, or a drawing-based body mapping activity;

**STEP 2:** Participants discuss the good and bad things about their community or school as shared in STEP 1;
STEP 3: Facilitators explain the objectives of the methodology and topics that will be assessed in the process while relating them to the ideas generated in STEPS 1 and 2; and

STEP 4: Participants identify new items to include in the assessment process and draw graphic images that represent these items.

Explore Activity

The ‘Explore’ activity empowers children, adolescents and adults to make maps of their community and school to identify specific places that are supportive of young people, and which places pose risks. The maps can also be used in subsequent planning activities to demonstrate how to redesign places to better support children, adolescents and their families. The activity addresses three key questions:

1. What places are supportive of young people and parents in the community and school?
2. What places pose risks to children and adolescents in the community and school?
3. How can places in the community and school be improved to support children, adolescents and their families?

The activity is completed in four main steps:

STEP 1: Participants draw the boundaries, spaces and landmarks in their communities and schools;

STEP 2: Participants select different themes and create maps to tell a story about their communities and schools;

STEP 3: Using the maps as a guide, participants share and discuss their experiences in the community or school and how these support or hinder their healthy development; and

STEP 4: Collectively participants identify strengths and weaknesses of their communities and schools and prioritize which places to improve.

Assess Activity

The ‘Assess’ activity empowers children, adolescents and adults to assess the current conditions of their schools and communities through a graphic based survey. The activity is designed to answer four key questions:

1. What do children, adolescents and adults think about their schools and communities?
2. What are the current conditions of schools and communities for children and adolescents?
3. Why are some conditions for children’s rights being fulfilled, while others are not?
4. Which conditions are priorities for improvement?
The activity is completed in four main steps:

**STEP 1:** Each participant individually and anonymously scores their own opinions on various topics through graphic survey tools by agreeing or disagreeing with statements that describe the daily lives of children and adolescents in their community or school;

**STEP 2:** The completed survey tools are shuffled to protect participants’ confidentiality; then the responses of all participants are tallied and summarized on child-friendly results charts for everyone to analyze and reflect upon;

**STEP 3:** Participants discuss the results and what they mean for children, adolescents and their families; and

**STEP 4:** Each participant identifies priorities for improvements to their school or community based on the assessment results and collective discussion.

*Assessment Domains and Indicators*

There are six broad domains or topics that can be examined in the assessment depending on local interests and goals. Because the assessment indicators or items are directly linked to the children’s rights, they also address issues of gender, inclusion and equity for children with disabilities, and young people from different cultural or ethnic groups within all of the domains.

**Play and Recreation** – This domain/topic examines access to a diversity of spaces for play and recreation, equal opportunities for play and recreation for girls and boys, and for children with disabilities, the safety of play areas, free time, and access to play and recreation materials, among others.

**Nature and Ecology** – This domain/topic examines access to nature, air quality, garbage and waste disposal, protection from harsh weather, the availability of green spaces such as parks and community gardens, community cleanliness, and disaster preparedness and planning, among others.

**Housing and Learning Environments** - This domain/topic examines the quality of the built environment within two settings. Within communities, the quality and affordability of housing is the focus, such as access to toilets with water, electricity and wash facilities, adequate space for living, and protection from weather and pests, among others. Within schools, the degree to which classrooms and the school building support teaching and learning are examined. This includes schools that can be accessed by children with disabilities, access to learning resources and spaces such as a library or laboratory, separate toilets for girls and boys, and comfortable school furniture, among others.
Participation – This domain/topic examines opportunities for children, adolescents and parents to participate in decision-making for their schools and communities, awareness of children’s rights, participation in projects or programs to improve schools and communities, and an adequate budget for children’s needs within the municipality, among others.

Safety and Protection – This domain/topic examines the safety of schools and communities, such as children’s exposure to violence, drugs and abuse, the presence of teasing and bullying, respect for diversity, cultural and religious tolerance, safe public transportation, and children’s autonomous travel in their community or city, among others.

Health and Social Services – This domain/topic examines access to health and social services, such as community or government clinics, emergency care, child development and mental health care support, access to information about reproductive health, and protection against diseases, among others.

The assessment domains/topics and indicators contained in this resource kit were developed in three ways: 1) by interpreting and defining the meaning of children’s rights in a manner that applies to children's everyday experiences and conditions; 2) through collaborations with international experts in children’s rights and the pilot-testing of indicators in countries with different economic and social realities; and 3) through an international review of over 200 research, policy, and practice documents related to children’s rights as they apply to schools, communities and cities.

For each setting, we recommend a representative sample of different groups participate in the process: 1) children and adolescents aged 7 to the age of 18, 2) parents of infants, children and adolescents from birth to age 18, and 3) educators and service providers (Figure 3). The number of assessment items is different for each group and requires the subjective response of participants based on their own personal experiences.

There are fewer evaluation items for children aged 7 to 9 years, and more items for educational professionals, community service providers and parents. The items are written in a way to compare the viewpoints of the different groups. Each organizing group is encouraged to closely examine the assessment topics and items to determine their appropriateness for the local setting. More information on the selection and inclusion of new assessment items can be found in the ‘Introduce’ and ‘Assess’ facilitator guides, and in the online supporting material, Tips for Developing New Assessment Items.
Figure 3: Total Number of Assessment Items, by Setting, Topic and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Topic</th>
<th>School Setting</th>
<th>Community Setting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children (7-9)</td>
<td>Adolescents (10-18)</td>
<td>Parents (0-6) (7-9) (10-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and Recreation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Housing Environments</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Protection</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Social Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment domains/topics and indicators/items for school and community settings are provided in graphic tables to support organizing groups in determining the most relevant items for their local context (Figure 4). Each assessment indicator has an associated image that is integrated throughout the tools to help young children or adults who cannot read participate in the process. The child rights articles associated with each assessment item is provided to encourage groups to study the relationship between the CRC and the items under investigation.

Figure 4: Example Assessment Items for Play and Recreation in a Community Setting

Play and Recreation

How can our community be improved for play and recreation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>Children (7-9)</th>
<th>Adolescents (10-18)</th>
<th>Parents (0-6) (7-9) (10-18)</th>
<th>Community Service Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play Spaces</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1. In my community I have places for play, games and sports</td>
<td>1. In my community I have places for play, games and sports</td>
<td>1. In my community children have places for play, games and sports</td>
<td>1. In the community children and youth have places for play, games and sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2. I have time to play, rest and enjoy myself</td>
<td>2. I have time to play, rest and enjoy myself</td>
<td>2. My children have time to play, rest and enjoy themselves</td>
<td>2. Children and youth have time to play, rest and enjoy themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Play</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3. The places for play in my community can also be used by children with physical disabilities</td>
<td>3. The places for play in my community can also be used by youth with physical disabilities</td>
<td>3. The places for play in the community can also be used by children and youth with physical disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Opportunities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4. I participate in, or observe festivals and events of cultures and religions different from my own</td>
<td>4. I participate in, or observe festivals and events of cultures and religions different from my own</td>
<td>4. My children participate in, or observe festivals and events of cultures and religions different from my own</td>
<td>4. Children and youth participate in, or observe festivals and events of cultures and religions different from my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The statements for each indicator are provided for each group that is encouraged to participate in the process to facilitate the comparison of opinions among children, adolescents, parents and service providers or educators. The opinions of boys and girls and of children from different communities and schools can also be analyzed, as outlined in the facilitator's guide of the ‘Assess’ activity. Depending on the literacy levels of participants, the graphic survey can be shared in a booklet or survey format (Figure 5). The statements are written in the affirmative format, so if most participants agree with a statement, it means the group views these conditions favorably. The positive format of the statement is also crucial to avoid double negatives so that children are able to comprehend the indicators. Finally, the positive wording of the statement enables facilitators to consistently tally the results with participants during the session using a visual matrix and child friendly graphics (Figure 6).

![Figure 5: Example of Graphic Survey Tools](image)

**Booklet Tool**

Ideal for young children or adults with low literacy levels because the supporting image is dominant; children ages 6 or 7 may require modeling or assistance in circling their responses.

**Survey Tool**

Can be used with children as young as 10 years of age and with adults who are literate; shading of the rows helps participants put their responses in the correct box for each statement.
Figure 6: Example Results Chart for Tallying, Analyzing and Prioritizing the Data with Participants

1 = Write the name of facilitators, the age group, the number of female and male participants, and the total participants across the top for each session
2 = Assessment image cards (placed in order)
3 = The total number of participants who said “mostly true”
4 = The total number of participants who said “sometimes true”
5 = The total number of participants who said “never true”
6 = The total number of missing responses, or responses with errors (such as when more than one response is selected)
7 = The overall result for the indicator using child friendly graphics
8 = Brief comments about the assessment item summarizing the discussion
9 = Total number of votes made by participants for their priorities
10 = Votes can be made with stickers or using markers

Upon completion of the assessment module, the data contained in the results charts for each group that participated in a session will be available for further analysis, as well as maps of the community or school if the ‘Explore’ activity was conducted. Each participant will have had the opportunity to score their own individual opinion about their conditions using the graphic based survey tools, as well as the opportunity to see the results of the assessment for everyone that participated in the session through the group tallying, analysis and discussion of the data. Finally, the priorities that each group would like to address will have been identified.

Planning Module

The planning module enables organizers to consolidate all the data collected in the different small group sessions to draw conclusions about the conditions for children and adolescents. The module contains two activities that complement one another and enable participants to prioritize and plan changes for their schools, communities or cities (Figure 7).
**Figure 7: Overview of the Planning Module**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modules</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>Participants calculate percentages and average ratings to understand, analyze, rank and share the assessment results using child friendly graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Participants develop an improvement plan for their priorities through visioning, drawing and discussion based activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analyze Activity**

The Analyze activity provides different strategies for summarizing, interpreting and displaying the results from all of the groups that participated in the assessments using simple statistics and child friendly graphics (Figures 8 and 9). The results can be shared with the community and decision makers, and be included in an improvement plan for the school, community, organization, sector, or city. The activity addresses three main questions:

1. In what ways can the results from the assessments be summarized and displayed?
2. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of our school and community for children, adolescents and their families?
3. What are the top priorities for improvement for children, adolescents and families in our school and community?

The activity is completed in three main steps:

**STEP 1:** Participants determine the way they want to tabulate the data using the goals of their initiative as a guide;

**STEP 2:** Participants calculate percentages and average ratings for the assessment results, and develop a way to display the data in a visual format; and

**STEP 3:** Participants rank the results to help guide their improvement planning process.
### Figure 8: Example of a Child Friendly Data Visualization Using Smiley, Neutral and Frown Faces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play &amp; Leisure</th>
<th>3rd Grade</th>
<th>4th-5th Grade</th>
<th>6th-7th Grade</th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
<th>10th-12th Grade</th>
<th>Community Service Providers</th>
<th>Overall Community Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children have a safe place to play right outside their home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the community children have places for play, games, or sports</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children have time to play, rest and enjoy themselves</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The places for play in the community are also designed to be used by children with physical disabilities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There are places in the community where children can be in contact with nature</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children participate in, or observe, festivals and events of cultures and religions different from their own</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Children participate in programs, groups or activities outside of school</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Children’s Environments Research Group

### Figure 9: Example of a Child Friendly Data Visualization Using Graphic Symbols

SOURCE: French National Committee for UNICEF
Plan Activity

The ‘Plan’ activity enables children and adults to examine their overall assets and priorities for change for their schools and communities. The tools empower groups to develop a plan for these priorities based on short- and long-term goals, such as: 1) what children can change on their own; 2) what children and adults from the community can change working together; and 3) what children and adults can do working in partnership with local decision makers and service providers. It involves working together to identify community assets, a vision for the future, solutions to common problems, steps or actions to achieve those solutions, resources needed to implement the proposed solutions, and individuals, groups or organizations that need to be involved to realize plan goals. The activity addresses for main questions:

1. What is our vision for our school or community, and what strengths can we build upon to achieve this vision?
2. What are our priorities for children, adolescents and families?
3. What resources, and which individuals or groups do we need to realize our ideas?
4. What challenges may we face to realize our plan, and how can we overcome them?

The activity is completed in four main steps:

**STEP 1:** In small groups, participants share their vision for children and adolescents in their school or community;

**STEP 2:** Participants discuss and determine the focus of their improvement plan (a plan for their school, organization, organization, municipality or sector of government);

**STEP 3:** In separate groups of children and adults, and then collectively, participants brainstorm solutions to the priorities they identified for improvement, including resources and other organizations that may need to be involved; and

**STEP 4:** A few participants volunteer to write a report that integrates the improvement plan, a timeline, an estimated budget, and identifies short- and long-term goals.

Advocacy and Action Module

The advocacy and action module encourages groups to advocate for their identified priorities and provides some examples of the different actions that can be taken to improve their local learning and living conditions through a case study approach. The module contains two activities that complement one another and enables participants to identify strategies and entry points to advocate for their needs (Figure 10).
**Share Activity**

The ‘Share’ activity enables facilitators to disseminate the results of their community or school assessment and improvement plans with different stakeholders and decision makers. Facilitators are encouraged to explore different approaches in presenting and discussing the results with others based on the case studies completed to date, such as through intergenerational community meetings, formal meetings with city council members, or through the arts and media. The activity addresses four main questions:

1. Which individuals, groups, organizations, community leaders and decisions makers should be made aware of the assessment results?
2. Which presentation approaches work well with different stakeholders, such as children or government representatives?
3. What challenges might participants face when presenting and discussing the results with others?

The activity is completed in two main steps:

**STEP 1:** Participants brainstorm a list of individuals, community groups, organizations, and government representatives they want to share the data and plans with to achieve their goals; and

**STEP 2:** Participants select a method for presenting and sharing their results with others that is appropriate for different stakeholders.

While not written as a step, we also recommend participants practice their presentations through simulation, to brainstorm challenges that might occur, and develop strategies to overcome these barriers.
**Act Activity**

The ‘Act’ activity encourages communities to take small-scale actions in partnership with different stakeholders and decision makers based on the case studies completed to date. It also contains a specific guide on how to improve the interior design of classrooms to encourage participatory or group learning. The main questions addressed in this classroom design guide include:

1. How can we redesign our classroom to support the needs of all students?
2. What changes can be made to our classroom to better support teachers?
3. How can we work together to create a supportive learning environment?

The classroom design activity is completed in five main steps:

**STEP 1:** Participants discuss and analyze the current uses of their classroom to begin thinking about ways to improve the learning environment;

**STEP 2:** In small groups, participants construct a basic model of their current classroom using building blocks or other local materials;

**STEP 3:** Participants create a new design for their ideal learning environment using building blocks or other local materials;

**STEP 4:** Participants discuss some of the good and bad things about their learning environment using their designs as a guide; and

**STEP 5:** Participants understand the constraints in making changes to their classroom and implement portions of their designs.

In the future, additional facilitator guides will be developed and pilot tested, including collaborative design activities for public spaces, community pathways and streets, schoolyards, and parks or playgrounds.

**Outcomes Module**

The outcomes module encourages groups to reflect on what they learned in order to document the results of their initiative and to improve its effectiveness and sustainability. The module contains one activity to evaluate both the process and outcomes of a local development initiative or educational program that integrated the child friendly places methodology (Figure 11). It also provides suggestions on how to develop and share a case study on the child friendly places website so other groups can learn from each experience in the application of the methodology.
Figure 11: Overview of the Outcomes Module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modules</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Using road maps and other visual discussion tools, participants review what they accomplished, what they learned, and discuss how to sustain and improve the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review Activity**

The ‘Review’ activity enables participants and facilitators to document what they accomplished, what they learned, and to analyze the overall successes and challenges of their initiative. Using simple graphics and symbols, participants create a road map or diagram of their initiative to illustrate the stakeholders involved in the process, the activities that were used, challenges along the way, short-term achievements and long-term goals. Finally, organizers are encouraged to identify their school or community center as a child rights community observatory so that is recognized by decision makers and local residents as a repository of data on conditions for children, youth and families. The activity addresses four main questions:

1. Which groups were we able to involve in the process and who was excluded?  
2. To what extent were we able to use the activities with different groups?  
3. What did we learn from doing the activities, what challenges did we face, and how did we overcome them?  
4. What happened as a result of doing these activities to benefit children and adolescents?

The activity is completed in four main steps:

**STEP 1:** Facilitators begin with a game or use drama to encourage participants to share what they learned from being involved with the initiative;  

**STEP 2:** Participants graphically document and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the process to create better environments for children, adolescent and families;  

**STEP 3:** Participants graphically document and discuss the results of their initiative for individuals, schools, communities or municipalities; and  

**STEP 4:** Participants discuss their ideas for the next steps in their initiative, such as whether the process can continue or be replicated in other communities.
Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations of the Methodology

The term ‘child friendly’ is found in research, policy and program documents around the world and is a common way to acknowledge if a particular setting is respecting of children’s rights. For example, UNICEF has frameworks for ‘child friendly spaces,’ ‘child friendly schools,’ and ‘child friendly cities’ (see Figure 12). All of these frameworks are designed to encourage the implementation and realization of the Convention on the Rights of the Child at the local level, by operationalizing the meaning of children’s rights for specific contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child friendly spaces</td>
<td>A child friendly space is a designated community space (often temporary in nature) that supports the resilience and well-being of children and young people through community organized, structured activities conducted in a safe, child friendly, and stimulating environment. Child Friendly Spaces are widely used in emergencies as a first response to children’s needs and an entry point for working with affected communities. The specific objectives are to: (1) mobilize communities around the protection and wellbeing of all children, including highly vulnerable children; (2) provide opportunities for children to play, acquire contextually relevant skills, and receive social support; and (3) offer inter-sectoral support for all children in the realization of their rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child friendly schools</td>
<td>Child friendly schools is a model for moving schools and education systems progressively towards quality standards, addressing all elements that influence the wellbeing and rights of the child as a learner and the main beneficiary of teaching, while improving other school functions in the process. The child friendly school model is UNICEF’s means to advocate for and promote quality education for every girl and boy. The model can be viewed as a package solution and a holistic instrument for pulling together a comprehensive range of interventions in quality education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child friendly cities</td>
<td>In 1996 UNICEF and UN Habitat launched the Child Friendly Cities Initiative to encourage the local implementation of the CRC within municipalities. A child friendly city is one in which children’s rights are reflected in policies, laws, programs and budgets. In a child friendly city, children are active agents; their voices and opinions are taken into consideration and influence decision-making processes. There are 9 building blocks used to guide governments in creating a child friendly city, such as an adequate budget for children’s services, a system for monitoring children’s rights at the local level, and a child advocate to address child rights violations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The child friendly places methodology incorporates all of these frameworks by supporting local organizing groups to comprehensively assess the range of settings in which children live, learn and develop. The methodology is based on an integrated, cross-sectoral, and ecological view of child development, in which it is recognized that (Figure 13):
Figure 13: An Ecological View of Child Development

1. The current conditions of children, adolescents and families are influenced by...
2. Access to local services, programs and places for children and youth to live, grow, learn, play and develop...
3. Which are determined by municipal and national level policies, budgets, planning and decision-making processes...
4. That are shaped by international policies and organizations, as well as culture, economy, politics and geography.

For example, a ‘child friendly park’ is a place that is welcoming to children and adolescents of all ages, and can be safely used by both boys and girls. A ‘child friendly school’ is one that promotes high quality instruction using age appropriate methodologies that encourage children’s active learning. A ‘child friendly community’ provides adequate services for children, adolescents and families, such as health clinics and family support programs. Housing should be affordable for families, safe for children to live in, and located on stable land. The community should be safe for children to walk and play, with adequate spaces for recreation for all ages, genders and abilities. Children, adolescents and parents should also have the opportunity to voice their opinions about matters that concern them on community councils.

At the municipal scale, a ‘child friendly city’ provides adequate waste disposal to protect the environment and children’s health, has urban planning policies that take into consideration the needs of children and their families, and provides opportunities for children, adolescents and parents to voice their opinions on municipal councils. Local and national governments should ensure there is a child friendly justice system, including a child advocate or ombudsperson for child rights violations to be reported. Local and national governments should also have an adequate budget and a plan of action for children, adolescents and families.

When children’s rights are not being fulfilled in the settings in which young people spend most of their time (such as schools and communities), this often means something is not working in favor of children at the municipal or national level. For example, if the quality of education is not adequate for children and adolescents in a community, this may be a result of many causes, such as: 1) a lack of adequately trained teachers; 2) classrooms that do not have enough light.
for children to learn; 3) a lack of student or parent participation in decision making; 4) an inadequate city budget for education; or 5) unfair national laws that prevent children with disabilities from attending school.

It is often necessary to address multiple causes of an issue with different groups at the community, city, national and international scale. In order to obtain services for children’s needs, it is useful to collect information that explains what is really happening in schools and communities, and in the other settings of their everyday lives. For this reason, the child friendly places approach is centered upon a comprehensive assessment, planning and advocacy methodology that empowers diverse groups to monitor and improve their conditions. In addition, the methodology is designed to educate children and adolescents about their rights as they apply to their everyday conditions and experiences. In the best of scenarios, the process also empowers children and adolescents to take actions on their rights on their own, or by working collaboratively with adults and decision makers.

We have designed the activities of this resource kit for use by schools and community based programs because we feel that there is a pressing need for tools that support a bottom up assessment and planning process to improve children’s rights. However, with some adaptations, the resources can also be used to support organizations and local governments working to improve conditions for children from the ‘top down’ with large national samples of children, adolescents and their parents or caregivers. This latter approach is necessary if a municipality has geographic inequalities in conditions for young people across communities.

**Evaluation Scope and Design**

The overall goal of this evaluation was to document and analyze the relevance, ownership and efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the child friendly places methodology. The following specific questions were studied in this evaluation:

1. **Relevance** - To what extent has/is the child friendly places methodology been/being used around the world? In which contexts? By which groups? For what purposes?

2. **Ownership and Efficiency** - How do groups integrate the child friendly places methodology into existing local development initiatives and local programs? What are the common challenges in integrating this methodology, and how do groups overcome these challenges?

3. **Effectiveness** - How effective is the methodology in supporting changes to children’s conditions? What are the potential short-, mid- and long-term outcomes from applying and integrating the methodology?
4. **Sustainability** - Will the methodology continue to be used without funding and technical support? What factors enable or prohibit the sustainability of the child friendly places methodology?

**Evaluation Methodology**

**Case Studies**

A multi-method case study approach was employed in this evaluation, including a review of evidence and interviews with key informants. For each case study, ‘place’ was the central organizing concept rather than a particular theme or topic, such as children’s health. Place refers to the geographic scale where changes or direct actions were planned or applied – such as the school, community, municipality or nation. Other criteria used to define a case study included:

1. The methodology was integrated into a local development initiative or educational program that was comprised of a unique set of stakeholders and decision makers specific to a particular place;
2. The methodology yielded unique outcomes that could be analyzed for that place;
3. Specific actions were planned or occurred in the same place;
4. There was sufficient data to develop a coherent and complete case study (such as information on the local development initiative or educational program in which the methodology was applied, the number and type of participants, the number and type of facilitators, adaptations to the assessment indicators, and a description of the process for applying the methodology); and
5. There was a focal point or contact person willing to participate in an interview about the outcomes from applying the methodology, and to validate the case study prepared by CERG.

Potential cases were identified using existing contact information from initiatives that integrated the methodology from 2008 to 2012. In some situations, key informants no longer worked for a particular organization and additional steps were taken to identify new respondents who were knowledgeable about the initiative. Further, some key informants identified additional respondents and potential cases that CERG was not aware of, in large part because no tracking system was developed to understand who downloaded and used the initial version of assessment tools.5

---

5 CERG made repeated requests to the Innocenti Research Centre (UNICEF Office of Research) to implement a tracking system for the downloading of the child friendly cities and communities assessment tools; however no system was ever put in place for reasons that are unknown.
Based on the outlined criteria for case studies, a total of 146 potential cases studies were identified in 27 countries (Figure 14). Among these potential case studies, 54 were completed or in progress, and an additional 92 were in the planning stages. A total of 44 cases in 14 countries met all the criteria or had sufficient data at the time of analysis to be included in this evaluation.

**Figure 14: Overview of Identified Case Studies (as of March 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Ongoing or Completed Cases Identified</th>
<th>Number of Additional Planned Cases Identified</th>
<th>Total Number of Potential Cases</th>
<th>Number of Cases Meeting All Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Benin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Finland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Annually*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Iceland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kazakhstan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Philippines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sudan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Togo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Turkey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The French National Committee for UNICEF has committed to conducting the assessment on an annual basis

**Review of Evidence**

A total of 332 project artifacts were reviewed and analyzed for this evaluation, consisting of project reports of the local development initiatives that integrated the child friendly methodology, media releases, websites, photographs and project materials (Figure 15). Given
the global nature of this project, some of these documents were shared in the local language and were translated into English for review and analysis.

![Figure 15: Description of Project Artifacts Reviewed](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project Artifact</th>
<th>Number of Project Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative Project Reports or Evaluations</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Materials (assessment instruments, facilitator guides, presentations, etc.)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites, Blogs, Facebook Pages, Videos or Media Releases</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>332</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Informant Interviews**

A total of **130 key informants** were interviewed for this evaluation, including 12 researchers, 14 NGO staff members, 2 consultants, 17 UNICEF staff members, and 85 community participants (Figure 16). With the exception of project participants, interviews were conducted using a semi-structured protocol that focused on the process and outcomes of initiatives that integrated the methodology (Annex A). Project participants were interviewed in small groups or through interactive survey methods to ensure that children could participate, as well as to understand what they learned through the process.

![Figure 16: Number of Key Informant Interviews](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>NGO staff</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>UNICEF staff</th>
<th>Community Participants</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Haiti*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. India</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kazakhstan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. South Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sudan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. United States*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N of Interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interviews with project participants were conducted by CERG previously in these countries as an evaluation of these pilot initiatives. Given it was not possible to conduct a follow up evaluation with all project participants, this
Data Analysis

Triangulation and Validation

The project artifacts and key informant interviews were analyzed through a three-step qualitative and quantitative process. The first step included a within case analysis to tally the number and type of participants and facilitators, the process used to apply the methodology, and any other themes that emerged from the data. The second step consisted of a meta-analysis across all the cases through triangulation of emerging themes and the consistency of narratives provided. It also included tallying the quantitative data on participants and facilitators to analyze the overall number of participants involved in applying the methodology. A consistent format was developed for writing the case studies based on the meta-analysis of the data (Figure 17). The third step involved validation of the case studies with key informants. This included uploading and sharing the case studies with key informants on the child friendly places website, where all the completed cases are currently housed. Key informants were instructed to review the materials and to correct any errors or omissions.

Figure 17: Case Study Narrative Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A one-paragraph succinct summary of the goals and results of an initiative that integrated the child friendly places methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>One to three quotations from project stakeholders about the value of the methodology or of their participation in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Overview</td>
<td>A chart to visually and succinctly summarize the objective, duration and partners involved in the initiative, as well as contact information for the case study focal point(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td>A description of the place or setting in which the process was conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process and Results</td>
<td>A description of the assessment process and results, which can include charts and other graphics to summarize the findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>A summary table and description of the individual, organizational, school, community, city, or local systems/policy outcomes from integrating the methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons for Practice</td>
<td>A description of some of the challenges of implementing the process, or ideas for improving the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Methodology</td>
<td>A summary of the documents reviewed by CERG to develop a case study, along with the number of key informant interviews that were conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footnotes</td>
<td>Reference to official documents or other resources cited in the case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes Harvesting and Developing a Theory of Change

To analyze the overall process and effectiveness of the child friendly places methodology, two data analysis techniques were employed: outcomes harvesting and the creation of a theory of
change. Outcomes harvesting refers to a process in which largely qualitative data is analyzed with a view to understanding changes in behaviors of the people and organizations affected by an intervention. Outcomes harvesting is useful in evaluations when there are no pre-determined set of indicators or when the potential outcomes are unknown at the time the intervention was designed. The evaluator begins by harvesting both positive and negative outcomes from reports, interviews and other sources and then works backwards to determine the extent to which the intervention contributed to these outcomes. The harvested outcomes then go through a validation and refinement process where knowledgeable sources substantiate them.⁶

A useful tool for summarizing and analyzing an intervention for its potential outcomes is through the creation of a theory of change. Theory of change is a visual diagram that outlines the context in which an intervention is developed, the inputs necessary to implement an intervention, activities that constitute the heart of the intervention, and potential short- and long-term outcomes. Theory of change also includes an analysis of assumptions, or factors that are influential in determining if outcomes can be achieved. Theory of change also attempts to identify the direct or indirect relationships between activities and outcomes, through visual diagramming or color-coding of the pathways to potential outcomes. The Child Friendly Places theory of change is provided in Annex B, and is used as an organizing framework for presenting the evaluation results. Therefore, the analysis framework is integrated into the presentation of the evaluation results in the next section of the report.

Evaluation Results

National, Sub-national and/or Local Processes

Distributors or Champions of the Methodology

A range of local, national and global groups and organizations have been involved in the application of the child friendly places methodology. Historically UNICEF and academic researchers been the primary distributors involved in coordinating or supporting the local development initiatives that have integrated the child friendly community assessment and planning tools. This includes all UNICEF divisions, including: UNICEF Country Offices, UNICEF National Committees, UNICEF International Headquarters Education Section, and UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (now called UNICEF Office of Research). Researchers/academics, non-governmental organizations, and local government agencies among different sectors such as health, social welfare and planning have also been involved in using the tools. For example, researchers from the National Youth Policy Institute in Seoul, South Korea incorporated some of the assessment indicators into their national study on child and youth happiness in communities. Local organizations and groups have only recently taken on a leadership role as a distributor of the methodology through the support of the new resource kit of tools and materials. In the past these groups had a greater role as implementers of the methodology in partnership with distributors such as UNICEF or national NGOs and organizations.

Interviews with key informants revealed a number of reasons why this methodology was selected over other existing participatory tools used to monitor conditions that fulfill children’s rights. For example, distributors saw an added value of integrating the methodology into existing development efforts, especially those initiatives that lacked the perspectives of children and adolescents. In addition, local initiatives or groups seeking a strategic direction in their development efforts found value in the tools because the assessment and planning process supports children, adolescents and families to evaluate and prioritize their needs. The
fact that the tools are simple to use, cost-effective, and adaptable for each community context made them attractive to distributors. For example, the cost of integrating the methodology could be achieved with as little as $5,000 USD to support a coordinator, photocopying and translation costs. In most cases the lead organizations leveraged existing project funding to integrate the methodology, rather than applying for a specific grant to complete the process. As was suggested in the facilitator guides, local initiatives also relied upon the voluntary participation of community facilitators to implement the process, which was found to be empowering as well as cost effective.

Key informant interviews revealed their interest in the methodology because the assessment process covers a comprehensive range of indicators to monitor conditions for children’s rights. This enabled local development initiatives to gather systematic data on the social and environmental conditions of communities for children and adolescents. Many key informants indicated that community members were unaware of the depth and diversity of children’s rights that are guaranteed in the CRC. Finally, distributors valued the participatory, action-oriented approach the methodology encourages, and appreciated the intergenerational dialogue it fosters among children, adolescents, adults and decision makers. Several key informants stressed that the process was more important than the data it generated, noting that it was the first time in many communities that adults and children came together to discuss their rights in a safe environment where all views could be shared and deliberated.

Key informants expressed a high degree of ownership in the use and application of the assessment and planning materials. They expressed feeling empowered to continue to apply the tools within new projects or programs initiated by their organizations. This sense of ownership was a direct result of participating in the design of the child friendly places methodology, as well as the results it yielded for different local development initiatives. With the exception of a couple of cases in which local politics made it difficult to apply the methodology with decision makers, all key informants stated they would continue to adapt and apply the approach within their existing or planned work. For example, this evaluation identified 92 planned case studies in all regions of the world, including Brazil, Morocco, Spain, France, Turkey, and the Philippines (among others).

Currently the assessment tools are available on three different websites that target different users. The original versions of the tools that were completed in Phase 1 of the development process are available on the Child Friendly Cities and the Childwatch International Research Network websites. These websites primarily target global and national organizations and groups. The current version of the tools are available on the Child Friendly Places website, with the goal of empowering local organizations and groups to be distributors of the methodology. Because there are different versions of the tools on the various websites, this has caused some confusion among groups interested in implementing the approach. CERG will request the new version of the tools be linked to both websites for this reason, once the materials have been revised based on the lessons from this evaluation. There are likely many other potential distributors who have applied the methodology that CERG is unaware of, because of a lack of
website tracking of downloads from the Child Friendly Cities and Childwatch International websites.

An effort to market the methodology to potential distributors has not yet taken place, although the CERG Project Director was invited by UNICEF and researchers to give presentations recently on the methodology in Spain, South Korea, Northern Ireland, and Slovakia. Instead potential distributors of the methodology reported learning about the tools via word of mouth, or through existing distributors. It is not likely that potential distributors will learn of the methodology on their own, thus it is recommended that a deliberate communications strategy be developed by CERG and Bernard van Leer Foundation for the new resource kit of materials to share with groups likely to be interested in championing the approach. The new website enables the tracking of individuals and organizations that download the tools and materials, as well as Google analytics to track website visits. Based on a recent review of this information, UNICEF and NGOs continue to be interested in the methodology. For example, World Vision in Jordan, Save the Children in Somalia, Plan International, Cipta Fondasi Komunitas in Indonesia, Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action in India, Fundação Tide Setubal in Brazil and the International Medical Corp in Iraq have recently downloaded the materials.

Case Study Demographics

The **44 case studies** included in this evaluation represent **14 countries** and more than **800 communities** with varying levels of human development in all regions of the world (see Figure 18 and Annex C for a complete list of ongoing or planned case studies in 27 countries).

Figure 18: Map of Identified Case Studies
An estimated 941 facilitators led the assessment and planning process across these 44 case studies, including: a majority of older children and adolescents (N=479); teachers or other adult volunteers from the community who were affiliated with schools, citizen councils, or community based organizations that provide services and programs to children and adolescents (N=338); government representatives (N=38); researchers (N=13); and UNICEF or other UN agency staff members (N=7) (Figure 19). Sessions took place in a wide range of settings, including in school classrooms, community centers, recreation centers, afterschool programs, government offices, public spaces, in private homes, and through digital versions of the survey.

### Figure 19: Type and Estimated Number of Assessment and Planning Facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facilitator</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Facilitators*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Children or Adolescents</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers or Other Adult Volunteers from the Community</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Representatives</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers or Consultants</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF, UNDP, UN Habitat Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>941</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In some cases, the number of facilitators could not be estimated or validated.

Taking these 44 case studies into consideration, a total of 60,782 individuals participated in the assessment and planning process. This included a majority of children and adolescents aged 6-18 (77 percent; 46,908 participants), parents (11 percent; 6,399 participants), and other adults (12 percent; 7,475 participants) including teachers, older youth, community service providers, women, adults with disabilities, and local government representatives (Figure 20).

### Figure 20: Validated Participants of the Community and Governance Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total N of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children (ages 6-12)</td>
<td>2,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents (ages 13-18)</td>
<td>9,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Not specified (ages 18 and under)</td>
<td>34,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Children &amp; Adolescents</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,908</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (Children ages 0-7)</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (Children ages 8-12)</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (Adolescents ages 13-18)</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Parent’s Children Not Specified</td>
<td>4,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parents</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,399</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Providers</td>
<td>2,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Representatives</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (ages 19-25)</td>
<td>1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Disabilities</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Adults</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,475</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,782</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since the time of data analysis for this evaluation report, the total number of participants identified = 64,037.
Across all of the case studies, the assessment and planning process has privileged the participation of children and adolescents, as well as other marginalized groups traditionally excluded from community planning and urban development processes. Examples of stakeholders include children ages 6 to 9 living and working on the streets, parents of infants living in urban slums and resettlement areas, citizen councils of adults with disabilities, adolescent girls and boys residing in refugee camps, and preschool children attending transitional learning spaces in emergency contexts.

On average, organizing groups included approximately 100 participants per community in the process. It is important to highlight that the largest proportion of participants comes from four countries that applied the methodology at scale, including: 34,545 participants from seven cases in France; 11,192 from two cases in Brazil; 6,520 from 10 cases in Turkey; and 5,392 from two cases in India (see Annex C for a complete list of participants). Based on the type and number of facilitators indentified in this evaluation, it can be concluded that the process was indeed community-led, especially by young people who often worked in collaboration with adult volunteers from the community to implement the approach. The assessment process also favored the participation of children and adolescents more often than parents or other adults working to improve the situation for children in the various communities.

**Integrating the Methodology into Existing Initiatives or Programs**

![Diagram showing integration of methodology into existing initiatives]

A number of factors were found to be important in the effective application of the methodology by the different distributors, including: 1) the social mobilization of community participants willing to share their viewpoints, and of allies willing to facilitate action on the assessment results; 2) the capacity development of coordinators and facilitators of the process; and 3) the planning and adaptation of the methodology for the local context by a committee of individuals capable of coordinating and managing the process. The short-term outcomes from this process typically included a plan of action for applying the methodology within existing initiatives, prepared coordinators and facilitators who have the skills to implement the methodology, and participants and allies who agreed to voluntarily commit time and energy to implement the process in their schools or communities.
Social Mobilization

Overall, the evaluation revealed that when the child friendly places approach was integrated into an existing school, or community-based development initiative or program, it was more likely to be sustainable and it increased the likelihood of affecting change. This was associated with the fact that organizing groups already had allies on board and a good working relationship with communities to mobilize for the assessment. Distributors that applied the methodology independently without an existing initiative to build upon were not as successful because of the time required to mobilize participants and allies. At the same time, the latter approach was needed in some schools or communities where no forum currently existed to gather citizen input about their conditions.

Local development initiatives that were already organized with a strategic plan of action were not as amenable to the methodology. Local development initiatives that had no previous experience in mobilizing participants for the assessment took more time in implementing the approach. Therefore, local development initiatives that had already mobilized communities to some extent, but which lacked a strategic focus or the perspectives of children and adolescents were found to be the most effective distributors of the methodology.

In some communities, it was difficult to enlist the participation of decision makers in the process. For example, in the case studies from Spain, the local leadership changed during the application of the methodology making it challenging to take actions on the results. In other cases the decision makers were not government representatives, but rather individuals who were considered community leaders by residents. Sometimes government officials did not consider these leaders legitimate actors, such as in the case of Brazil where drug dealers often determine decisions for the community. Therefore, when considering how to mobilize decision makers for this process, organizing groups sometimes had to operate within informal planning processes rather than those endorsed by governments. The informal nature of community planning created different challenges in applying the methodology, such as how to safely engage residents in the process. For this reason, it is important for organizing groups to have a thorough understanding of the community and political context and how it functions before embarking on the assessment and planning process.

Capacity Development

Local organizing groups adopted different ways to orient community leaders and decision makers, and to build the capacity of community facilitators to lead the assessment process, which included children as young as 10 years of age in India. Based on the case study experiences, capacity development should ideally include: 1) an orientation to the assessment methodology through simulation and role playing; 2) a discussion of local cultures of childhood, or the different meanings that children, adults and the local community ascribe to the period of childhood and adolescence; 3) an overview of children’s rights and how they are integrated into
the assessment topics and items; and 4) an overview of local community or municipal decision making processes that could be targeted for advocacy and action on the assessment results.

In some case studies, community facilitators also had the opportunity to critique the assessment indicators that were selected by a coordinating committee for inclusion in the process as part of their training. For example, in India child and adolescent facilitators were empowered to create their own definitions of what “child friendly” means before learning of the assessment topics and items identified by child rights experts. In this case, children and youth identified an additional 36 indicators for inclusion in the assessment process. In Haiti, children and teachers identified new assessment items focused on the social relationships in their school, which they considered to be a strong asset that warranted inclusion in the process. For this reason, the new version of the materials include guidance on how to develop new assessment indicators with children, adolescents and adults who serve as community facilitators in the ‘Introduce’ activity (see also additional guidance in the supporting tool, Tips for Developing New Assessment Items).

Planning and Adaptation

There are many ways to use the intergenerational assessment, planning and advocacy tools included in the child friendly places methodology. For this reason, appropriate planning and adaptation of the materials for the local context was found to be a crucial dimension of its successful implementation. Key informant interviews revealed some important factors to take into consideration in the planning and local adaptation of the process.

Identifying the Objectives for Integrating the Methodology

Some key informants expressed challenges in figuring out how to integrate the methodology into their existing work. For example, organizing groups may see value in conducting the assessment process, but are unsure who should be involved in the different phases from planning to adaptation to implementation. Some organizers of the process had a vision for training others in using the methodology, while other organizers of the process served as implementers themselves. In both of these scenarios, different capacity development processes may be important, such as the cascade or train-the-trainer approach, or simulation and role-playing. Some groups also struggled to identify the focus of the assessment. For example, should a school analyze its own conditions using the indicators developed for the school setting, or should the school assess its community conditions, or both? The answers to these questions depended upon the larger goals of the local development initiatives or educational programs in which the methodology was integrated. In some cases, schools were not willing to critically examine their own conditions, so organizing groups encouraged them to assess their community conditions.
Identifying and Mobilizing a Representative Community Sample

If the assessment is to capture the full range of perspectives on the conditions for children, then the process needs to include a select group of participants that democratically represent all of the different social groups found in a school or community. Unlike household surveys, where surveys are given to a random number of households, the child friendly places approach relies upon the voluntary participation of children and adults. Many organizing groups struggled with how to approach the issue of democratic representation. For this reason, the new version of the materials includes some suggestions on how to achieve this (see the background material, Identifying Participants for more information).

There are some steps that organizing groups can take to maximize the representativeness of participants. For example, it is important to have an equal representation of boys and girls and different age groups participate in the process. There are other equally important issues of representation, most notably variations in the wealth and material resources of families. Also, some groups may define themselves and their needs for children differently in terms of their culture or religion. If families with similar incomes or distinct cultures are clustered in particular geographic areas of the community, organizing groups should make sure that children and parents from these geographic areas are represented in the assessment and planning process.

The assessment process may also be conducted in a school rather than in a community-based organization. If a high percentage of children in the community attend the school it may be possible to obtain the high levels of representativeness found in household sample surveys. But this will only be possible if the schools draw children from their surrounding community. If they are not, the data collection process would no longer be community-based and so there could not be any community level analysis, discussion or planning by the children and parents. If not all of the children from the community attend school it will be necessary to find a way to correct this bias in the data collected through the assessment survey. At a minimum, when the data is presented in school or community meetings and with decision makers it should be shown alongside tables or maps identifying which groups of children and adults participated so that the data can be judged appropriately.

The most excluded groups of children may be difficult to bring into settings such as community group meetings or schools. Children with disabilities, girls or those not attending school or living on the streets, may not always feel comfortable or confident to share their perspectives. In these cases it is possible to supplement the group approach to data collection with the strategic sampling of excluded children through one-on-one interviews with individual households. In some cases, a public health official or social worker may have established trusting relationships with the most marginalized children and families. If a session is run with children who are out of school, there are a few items concerning their unique needs, but additional specific indicators should be added by working closely with organizations that understand their concerns. The representation of the perspectives of children who do not live with families should be obtained by partnering with the organizations where these children live. If some children consistently live
and sleep on the streets of the community, their perspectives also need to be obtained by working through those adults or social workers who have the closest contact with them.

**Defining Community**

The child friendly places methodology was designed so it could be used in all types of communities, including those that are poor and lacking in resources. However, identifying and defining the community is often challenging for several reasons. Not all communities are clearly defined, and community members may disagree on its boundaries. For example, children often feel connected to a small geographic area around their homes, while older adolescents and parents have greater mobility and often feel connected to multiple areas within a municipality. Most municipalities have community-level administrative boundaries to identify geographic areas for service provision. However, these administrative boundaries do not necessarily reflect the everyday spaces in which children live, grow and play or the social networks that are supportive of their healthy development. One advantage of using administrative boundaries to define the community is that the information participants will share about their conditions will align with other information or data the city typically collects to make decisions about services. This would allow a municipality to see incongruence or alignment between the community’s perspectives and their management decisions around service delivery. On the other hand, to rely upon municipal boundaries to define a community can be a problem for residents if they do not identify with this area, and this might lead them to not participate.

**Adaptation and Translation of the Materials into the Local Language**

It is important that organizing groups adapt the materials for the local context to ensure the youngest children can participate and that the process is culturally and environmentally relevant. Having an initial understanding of the existing conditions and concerns of children, adolescents and families will help organizers make some preliminary decisions about the topics and items that might be included in the community assessments. In each case study, organizing groups were able to adapt the indicators for the local context, and in Haiti and the Sudan, the images were also adapted to be more culturally appropriate. However, some organizing groups struggled with writing new assessment statements in the affirmative format, in large part because of translation related issues. Therefore, the new version of the materials provides additional guidance on how to develop new assessment items in the affirmative format.

Some of the terminology used in the materials is difficult to translate, including the concept of “child friendliness.” In Brazil and India, key informant interviews revealed a need to have competent translators participate in the adaptation of the materials. This typically was not a professional translator, but a bilingual researcher familiar with the methodology. The new facilitator guides are formatted graphically like a comic strip so they can be used with older children and adolescents. This requires a translator who is skilled in basic word processing functions, to reduce fonts when needed to keep the graphic design in place. It also requires translators who are skilled at manipulating images in basic software programs such as Power
Point and Microsoft Paint. This type of image formatting is typically not included in professional translation services, or costs additional money to include. Finally, because the number of resources contained in the new methodology includes more than 80 documents or files, translation can be both costly and time consuming. For this reason, the new materials are only available in English and Brazilian Portuguese at the moment. However, case studies provide some documents translated into Spanish, French, Haitian Kreyol, Arabic, Turkish, and Hindi.

**Approaches in Applying the Methodology**

**Flexible Leadership and Organizing Process**

Key informant interviews and project reports revealed a flexible leadership and organizing process in applying the methodology. Different groups led specific activities during the process depending upon personal interests, skills, the time involved, and community relationships. Therefore, we cannot conclude that specific cases were entirely child or adolescent led, or entirely intergenerational in their leadership structure. Rather, the process was more malleable and fluid in its governance and implementation. In general, the assessment, advocacy and action modules tended to be either child/adolescent-led or intergenerational and collaboratively led, while the planning and outcomes modules were generally adult-led.

The intergenerational approach to leadership often favored more adolescents than adults as facilitators. For example, in India, one girl and one boy co-facilitated assessment sessions with one adult NGO representative. In Haiti, two students and one teacher co-facilitated the assessment process within their schools. In the USA and Brazil, young people led the assessment sessions with their peers with minimal adult intervention. Sometimes adults were in charge of explaining the assessment process, while young people then implemented the process with minimal adult intervention. Young people were observed facilitating the tallying of the results, summarizing the assessment results using child friendly graphics, and explaining
how to prioritize actions. Adults tended to help young people facilitate the discussion of the results, as this requires greater facilitation skills. Based on the best practices identified through this evaluation, a number of ideal characteristics for community facilitators were identified, including:

- **Gender Balance** – Ideally there will be an equal number of men and women, and boys and girls who serve as facilitators;
- **Intergenerational** - Both adults and young people should serve as co-facilitators of the process, with adults supporting young people as needed;
- **Local Knowledge** - People with knowledge of the school or community make ideal facilitators because they are able to answer questions and guide the discussion;
- **Good Listeners** – Facilitators should be able to create an environment where others feel comfortable sharing their ideas, and to listen and guide the discussion rather than dominating the conversations with their own opinion;
- **Commitment** – Facilitators should be willing to commit the time it takes to do the activities, which will vary depending on the number of activities used;
- **Open-Minded** – Facilitators should be willing to try new things, and value the contributions children, adolescents and parents can make to improve their own school, community and city;
- **Unbiased** – Facilitators should be people who are unbiased, or those who do not have a stake in the outcomes of the assessment (such as someone who can benefit from a positive rating of the school or community); and
- **Representative** – Facilitators should be reflective of the different religions, economic backgrounds and other cultural groups found in the school or community.

With few exceptions, the planning and outcomes modules tended to be directed by adults. Organizing groups often did not go beyond documenting the results of the assessment sessions or sharing the improvement plans in project reports, rather than sharing the outcomes of gathering the data and advocating for children’s needs. And while young people may have been asked their opinions on what they learned or gained through this process, adults were primarily in charge of documenting the outcomes of the process. One reason for this was the inability of some adults to step back and give up control of the process, even though they genuinely may have wanted young people to take on leadership roles. Another reason for adult control of the planning and evaluation activities was the perception by adults that if young people take on a leadership role, the process takes more time and is not efficient.

Some of the leadership approaches were influenced by the setting in which the assessment and planning sessions took place. In general, there were three ways organizing groups involved community members in the process, through: 1) schools; 2) community centers, programs and organizations; and 3) households (Figures 21-23).
Figure 21: Advantages and Challenges of School Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Potential Facilitators</th>
<th>Potential Participants</th>
<th>Potential Allies</th>
<th>Advantages (+)</th>
<th>Challenges (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate the activities during school as a learning opportunity for teachers and students</td>
<td>Adolescents Teachers School Service Providers</td>
<td>Children (7-9) Adolescents/Youth (10-18) Parents Teachers School Service Providers</td>
<td>School Principal School Directors District-Level School Administrators Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Potential to reach many different groups and large numbers of children and adolescents Emphasizes the importance of teaching and learning about children’s rights If the school is neighborhood based, the evaluation can also address child friendly communities</td>
<td>Does not include the perspectives of children and adolescents not in school It may be difficult to locate schools that are willing to participate in the process Power dynamics in the school may create challenges for children’s meaningful and genuine participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate the activities after school as part of child/youth club activities, or during meetings held by parent or teacher groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Advantages and Challenges of Community-Based Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Potential Facilitators</th>
<th>Potential Participants</th>
<th>Potential Allies</th>
<th>Advantages (+)</th>
<th>Challenges (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate the activities into community programs and groups This might include women’s groups, child-led groups or clubs, or specialized programs for children with disabilities or youth living on the streets</td>
<td>Adolescents Community Service Providers</td>
<td>Children (7-9) Youth (10-18) Parents Community Service Providers Children and youth not in school Children and youth not living at home Working children and youth</td>
<td>Community Leaders Elders Local Politicians Government Representatives NGOs Directors of Community Organizations Community Activists and Networks</td>
<td>Enables the participation of marginalized children and groups not affiliated with schools Community groups often have the trust and respect of its members, ensuring the process is culturally appropriate Community organizations may have strong political power with local leaders to implement proposed changes</td>
<td>It may be difficult to enlist the participation of a large number of community members Participants of community programs may come from many different areas within the city, making it difficult to focus on one community as part of the process Cultural values in the community may create challenges for the meaningful and genuine participation of children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In each setting certain facilitators were possible, different groups were reached, and specific allies were needed. Each setting had advantages and challenges for enlisting the participation and leadership of various individuals and groups. In the case of communities, some groups had more power because of their relationship with local leaders or government representatives. Because school administrators have such a powerful influence on the decisions of the learning environment, students and teachers were sometimes reluctant to speak truthfully about their school. For example, in Haiti and India, school directors were observed encouraging children to rate their conditions in favorable ways despite the strategies employed by organizing groups and facilitators to minimize these power dynamics. In the Sudan, children did not feel free when teachers, older youth and adults were attending the data collection sessions. In response to this, the organizing team agreed upon certain criteria for the place of sessions with children and gave them the responsibility of selecting the place. Also team leaders discussed the issue with the community leaders and they committed to preventing others from attending children’s sessions.

The challenge in managing adult influence over the process was often a result of time constraints. For example, even though the planning activity recommends separate sessions are held with children and adults first before bringing the generations together, some groups were not able to do this because of time. The tradeoff then is a tendency for adult control over the planning process. In some cases, young people also challenged adults during the activities, often because of their lack of trust with adult decision makers. For example, adolescents sometimes questioned if any real actions would occur by giving their input on their communities. In other cases, some children pulled facilitators aside and informed them of difficulties they were having with adults in their communities or schools. Therefore, it is important to have a plan in place for addressing the ethical concerns raised by adults and children, such as transparency in data collection and analysis, and the voluntary participation of
community residents (see the background materials, Ensuring the Participation of Everyone for additional information).

CERG anticipated these power dynamics in designing the new materials, and has developed strategies and suggestions to minimize these power differences in each activity. However, it is important to identify and consider the best way to conduct the assessment within a school and community setting in a way that enables all groups to participate in a respectful and meaningful way. Bringing the generations together to discuss the conditions for children and adolescents in a school or community takes time because opportunities for intergenerational dialogue often do not exist. Sometimes the process is difficult because adults and children have different stereotypes about one another that can prevent genuine dialogue from happening. In other cases, it may not be considered appropriate for children to voice their opinions to adults for cultural reasons. Therefore, it often takes time and well designed activities for adults and children to get to know and trust one another, and to learn how to work together in participatory groups (see the background material, Working with Different Age Groups for additional information on promoting intergenerational dialogue).

Approaches to Scaling the Methodology

Four countries were able to apply the methodology on a large scale thus far, including thousands of participants: Brazil, France, Turkey and India. These four cases had similar factors that attributed to their success in going to scale with the methodology: 1) a high density of social networks and relationships with community residents and decision makers that were quickly and easily leveraged to participate in the process; 2) a group of committed volunteer facilitators from the communities where the process was implemented; 3) an individual with the skills to manage the multiple data sets derived from the small group assessment sessions; and 4) the resources to conduct the process at scale (ranging from $5,000 to $100,000 USD).

In Brazil, the methodology was integrated into a UNICEF initiative, referred to as the Platform for Urban Centers, with more than 11,190 participants in over 200 communities in three cycles. The methodology was positively received by organizing groups because it enabled the possibility of collecting both quantitative and qualitative data in a participatory format that required less technical skills among community facilitators than implementing more traditional methodological approaches, such as focus groups. UNICEF requested the voluntary participation of communities in the process, which was one element of its success at going to scale. They trained both adults and adolescents aged 13 to 18 to serve as facilitators from the communities that volunteered. While adults tended to lead the sessions with parents and service providers, and adolescents tended to lead the sessions with children and their peers, sometimes they also led sessions with parents. Adults and adolescents from the community were in charge of mobilizing participants for the assessment process, which gave them a high degree of ownership in applying the methodology. This also contributed to the high engagement of community members in the process because of the trust they had for
facilitators. The data from all the assessment sessions was then compiled by the Instituto Paulo Montenegro, a local research group, and shared back with participants through the community facilitators to direct action planning in each setting.

In France, the methodology was applied with over 35,000 participants by UNICEF’s Child Friendly Cities network of municipalities already committed to improving the conditions of their communities for children and adolescents. After putting a call out to municipalities within this network, 73 volunteered to implement the assessment and planning process. UNICEF developed an abbreviated facilitator’s guide and arranged for the printing of the assessment materials, which were reproduced into a booklet format. They also provided an online portal for young people or parents to take the assessment. Government representatives within each municipality were in charge of organizing the sessions with participants, which generally took place in schools and community centers within each municipality. Facilitators were adults working within these settings who volunteered their time to implement the process. A team of researchers then managed all of the data from the 73 municipalities and conducted a statistical analysis of the results. The results of the assessments were reported in the media and shared back with each municipality and the schools and community centers that participated in the process. UNICEF’s youth ambassadors then spearheaded action planning in the most marginalized communities that participated in the process.

In Turkey, UNICEF and the Youth for Habitat Association organized the process to improve the participation of citizen councils in local decision-making processes within their municipalities. Citizen councils were comprised of community volunteers of youth, women, and adults with disabilities. A train-the-trainer approach was conducted with 6 representatives of citizen councils (2 from women’s councils, 2 from youth councils, and 2 from councils of adults with disabilities) from 10 cities, for a total of 60 trained facilitators. These facilitators then trained other members of their citizen councils to implement the methodology with more than 6,500 participants. UNICEF supported the training process, and conducted assessment sessions with children to ensure their participation in most of the cities. A representative of the Youth for Habitat Association coordinated the data management and report writing in collaboration with UNICEF. Community facilitators then shared the results back with their citizen councils to plan actions.

In India, two groups were involved in applying the methodology at scale: Shaishav, a child-led working children’s group, and the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS), a local university based in Mumbai. CERG was involved in training community facilitators in both of these case studies, in partnership with Shaishav and TISS. Community facilitators were then autonomous in their application of the methodology with support and technical assistance from Shaishav and TISS. Shaishav was able to collect the opinions of more than 3,500 participants in 27 communities with minimal funding, whereas TISS involved approximately 1,800 participants within 10 community and school settings with more substantial resources required. Shaishav was successful in engaging 27 communities because of the density of their social networks in Bhavnagar City, and because their organization was well known and respected by community
leaders. Shaishav facilitators also made an effort to include young people not involved in school or community programs by using creative methods to conduct the assessment, such as with computers on a mobile van to collect the opinions of children playing in public places.

*Figure 24: Shaishav Facilitators Conducting the Assessment on Mobile Vans*

The approach employed by TISS to go to scale required more human resources, in large part because the communities are organized on a micro-level within the slums, such as along a community pathway or along a particular hill. The micro-level planning that was required in Mumbai slowed the process down, along with difficulties in gaining access to the schools, and the monsoon rains. Nonetheless, community facilitators working in triads of one girl, one boy and one adult were able to gather the opinions of more than 1,800 parents of infants, children, adolescents and service providers. The results of the assessment were then shared back with each school and micro-community that participated in the process. The data was managed by TISS and is currently being consolidated at a meta-level to support advocacy efforts for children and families at the ward level.

**Common Challenges in Applying the Methodology**

**Time Required to Complete a Comprehensive Assessment and Planning Process**

Given the length of time it takes to conduct a comprehensive assessment of all the indicators, organizing groups struggled with how to best design the process in many settings. For example, in India within the slum communities where the process took place, families struggling to meet their basic needs were difficult to engage in a session that took longer than two hours. In addition, many key informants noted that younger children and adults with low literacy levels took more time to complete the assessment and planning process. However, it is worth mentioning that none of the distributors reduced the domains under investigation as a strategy to deal with this problem. Instead, they included all of the domains contained in the assessment and developed other techniques to reduce the length of time in applying the methodology, such as holding more than one session with participants.
In many cases, it took over two years to see real changes occur as a result of the assessment process. For this reason, the new materials emphasize both short- and long-term planning approaches to guide organizing groups so participants benefit from immediate actions based on their participation and input. We now suggest the priorities derived from the assessment be considered based on: 1) what actions children can take on their own to improve their conditions (short-term goals); 2) those actions that require children and adults from the community work together to achieve (mid-term goals); and 3) actions that require the participation of decision-makers to implement (long-term goals). This approach worked well in the USA, India, and Brazil, where children and adolescents developed advocacy campaigns to raise awareness about the issues identified through the assessment. The guidebooks also encourage small-scale actions to improve conditions, such as the painting of classrooms to make them friendlier and more welcoming to children, as was proposed in India. In Haiti, the school director changed the amount of free time children could play during school from 15 to 30 minutes, which required no financial investment. Integrating the methodology into the school curriculum or educational program was also another strategy for dealing with time constraints, such as in the USA, Haiti, the Philippines, Brazil, and India case studies.

**Working with the Youngest Children**

Based on the global experiences in implementing the methodology, we have recommended that children age 7 and above participate in the process. However, children as young as 6 years of age participated in the assessment process in the Dominican Republic, India, and the Philippines. Many key informants expressed a challenge in involving the youngest children in the activities, but tried different approaches for including them in the process. For example, in the Philippines the community facilitators gave more time and developed additional activities to empower the youngest children to participate in the process, especially non-schooling children. In Haiti and Brazil, community facilitators agreed that the assessment should be made into a game for younger children to help improve their engagement. One girl suggested children could stand up to tally the results of the assessment, as moving their bodies would help keep them focused. “*This would help children avoid falling asleep or getting bored during the voting and counting process.*” One boy recommended, “*telling jokes and using more laughter*” in the assessment process. One teacher noted that working with smaller children requires more patience and time. In the Sudan, the use of drama and drawing assisted in illustrating the questions and breaking the ice with the youngest children.

There are a number of ways the new version of the resources incorporate these best practices to encourage the participation of the youngest children in the process. First, a three-point scale was determined to be the easiest way for the youngest children to score their opinions in the assessment. A four-point scale proved to be too difficult for them to understand, and therefore, we recommend a three-point scale be used with all participants to facilitate comparison of the results across all the assessment groups. Second, we now provide guidance on how to conduct the assessment as a game with young children. Additional drawing activities, drama and games have also been incorporated throughout the planning and advocacy activities to ensure young
children are also involved in planning and implementing actions. However, each organizing group should carefully examine the most appropriate ways to include the youngest children in the process and is encouraged to develop new approaches that facilitate their participation.

**Managing Expectations for Change**

Concerns about how to best manage expectations for real change, as implied by the assessment items, is something that was raised by participants during the process. For example, in Haiti, on the first day of their school assessment, both teachers and students questioned whether any change was feasible. One teacher remarked that teachers and students would score all of the items poorly, as he felt the school lacked all the necessary elements of a high-quality learning environment. In fact, children, adolescents, parents and teachers scored only about one-half of the evaluation items unfavorably. In addition, students and teachers realized they could address some of the items that were scored poorly on their own, such as developing a program to reduce teasing and bullying in school. In India, adolescents and parents living in the slums questioned whether any actions would take place, because researchers have involved them in the past in collecting data with no results.

Many communities and schools face serious and difficult challenges that require government resources or support from other organizations to change. However, schools or communities can improve many of their conditions on their own. It is important to emphasize that the assessment results can support both types of actions, as both are necessary to create child friendly places. In addition, the improvement plans can address short- and long-term goals, so some issues can be acted upon immediately, while others may take more time, resources and collaboration with community leaders or government representatives to achieve. In order to ensure immediate actions are taken, we recommend seed funding be provided to each participating school or community. With very minimal money, a community or school can create small-scale changes that show participants their opinions have been listened to and are being acted upon.

**Accountability in the Use of the Data**

While schools and communities can benefit from collecting and reflecting upon their own situation through the process, the lack of capacity and accountability of governments to act on this information poses a challenge for the systematic application of the results in many contexts. For example, if the results are shared with the Ministry of Education to advocate for school needs, government representatives may or may not agree to implement changes based on this information. Sometimes communities have no relationship with the government.

Empowering communities and schools to conduct and act upon the assessment results themselves has the potential to build bottom-up monitoring and accountability into local government systems. For example, accountability is important at the scale of the school – by holding the school directors, teachers and students accountable for their actions - but also at
the scale of the Ministry of Education, by holding governments accountable for the fulfillment of children’s rights. We recommend groups integrating the methodology consider important allies to include in the process, those champions within local governments who are willing to support and act upon the views and opinions of children, adolescents and their families.

Outcomes

Based on key informant interviews and a review of project artifacts, a range of outcomes were identified from integrating the child friendly places approach into local development initiatives and educational programs (Figure 25). This includes outcomes for individuals and families, organizations and groups, places such as schools, communities and cities, and local systems or policies for children. These outcomes are based on the assumption that groups were able to complete most or all of the activities included in the process, that groups were willing and able to take actions themselves when appropriate, and that local decision makers were willing to support actions that required their involvement.

In addition, two different types of outcomes were identified: 1) those outcomes that were possible from the direct application of the methodology (shown in purple in Figure 25); and 2) those outcomes that were possible because of the social networks, activities and processes
associated with an existing initiative in which the methodology was integrated (shown in light green in Figure 25).

These outcomes represent the comprehensive range of results that are possible from applying or integrating the child friendly places methodology. Some organizing groups only achieved a particular set of outcomes, such as those at the individual or organizational level, while other groups were able to achieve many dimensions of the outcomes identified in this diagram. The breadth and range of outcomes depended in large part on the type of distributor involved in organizing the process. For example, when UNICEF was involved in organizing the assessment and planning process, it was more common to observe outcomes at the local systems or policy level. When NGOs were highly engaged in the process, it was more common to observe outcomes at the organizational or community scale. However, all of the organizing groups identified individual level outcomes from applying the methodology, as well as the collection of data on the conditions for children and adolescents and action plans to address community priorities.

The outcomes are listed in conceptual order from the bottom to the top of the diagram to demonstrate what typically resulted first from the process, and what processes must occur before other outcomes can be observed. For example, it would not be possible to integrate the priorities of children and adolescents into existing local plans before the data was collected and analyzed. Those outcomes listed towards the top of the diagram require more time to develop in the process. With few exceptions organizing groups were not able to document their outcomes for a variety of reasons, including a lack of funding or time to implement an evaluation. In addition, some key informants were not aware of how to go about documenting outcomes. For this reason, the theory of change and the outcomes identified in this diagram were used to create the ‘Review’ activity in the new version of the resources to encourage organizing groups to document their results, and to empower young people and adults to reflect upon their outcomes through a collaborative evaluation exercise. Each case study is hosted online on the Child Friendly Places website and highlights the particular outcomes associated with the various initiatives that applied the methodology for learning purposes.

**Individual or Family Outcomes**

Individual or family outcomes refer to changes in awareness, knowledge or behaviors among children, adolescents or adults who participated in the assessment and planning process. Individual outcomes were identified in all of the case studies, with key informants reporting that it was often the first time children and adults were asked to share their opinions about their communities or schools. As one researcher in Spain noted, “We realized that the children were unaware of the meaning of the word ‘participation’ because they had never been exposed to this concept before in their own experiences.” Because the assessment was positioned as an examination of children’s rights, young people and adults also expressed learning more about the topic and how children’s rights applied to their everyday lives.
According to an NGO director in Turkey, “The assessment tools were really useful for all individuals involved in the process, as the rights-based approach is highly empowering, raises awareness, is easy to implement, and is useful in helping the community understand its own society and to demand better policies.” In Jordan, key informants noted the discussions, arguments and debates generated among the participants during the assessment sessions proved to be an ‘eye opener’ for the participants on many issues and matters that should be considered and treated as ‘child’ rights and needs. According to a key informant in France, “citizens and local decision makers became aware that dialogue on everyday matters is productive, that children’s rights is not just the concern of those charged with the responsibility to advocate for them, but needs to be considered by all adults.”

Many key informants noted that taking the assessment and discussing the results in small groups provided a safe space to talk about sensitive issues. During action planning when all the results from each group were shared back with participants, it also provided a safe space to discuss children’s conditions across generations. As one UNICEF representative in France commented, “The methodology is very interesting as it fosters a new dialogue between adults and children, adults and youth, parents and professionals, local decision makers and the population. It also addresses questions that neither adults nor children are used to discussing.” Moreover, when children and adults had the opportunity to compare how each group scored the different assessment items, they often saw the corroboration of their perspectives, which helped them understand they were not alone. One UNICEF representative in the Sudan echoed this perspective noting, “Overall the methodological tools gave the children a feeling of importance, a taste of the sweetness of participation, and the collective sensation of thinking of others.”

Moving from an individual to a collective understanding of the conditions in schools and communities was a transformative experience for both children and adults. Therefore, the collective analysis of the results is crucial in fostering awareness of collective experiences. This in turn engendered intergenerational dialogue and empathy among participants in a way that often empowered them to take actions on behalf of children. For example, in Haiti, girls, boys and teachers agreed that facilitating the assessment process made them feel proud and valued by the school because they were able to help and serve others. “It helps children see they are valued by adults,” commented one teacher. In Brazil, both adolescent and adult facilitators learned how to problem solve, increased their self-esteem, improved their sense of belonging to a community, and increased their sense of empowerment that they could have a role in creating changes for their community. In the case studies from Morocco and the Sudan, key informants also observed an improvement in intergenerational communication within families. For example, in the Sudan the assessment process and results highlighted the importance of education for a father who had previously considered early marriage as the best option for his daughter. At the community forum where the assessment results were discussed, he became more aware of these issues and then agreed to send his daughter to school.
In the case studies from the Philippines, Brazil, and the USA, adolescent and adult facilitators gained additional skills associated with the local development or educational programs in which the methodology was integrated, which were leveraged to achieve additional individual level outcomes. These ranged from public speaking and communication skills development, to media and blogging skills that empowered facilitators to increase their participation in local development processes. For example, adolescents implemented advocacy campaigns to increase the larger public’s awareness of children’s rights, and in doing so gained an understanding of how decisions are made on behalf of children in their communities and cities. In these cases, some young people and adults also earned employment to work on behalf of children. For example, in the Philippines, one of the community facilitators joined local politics and became a youth representative as a result of his experience in the project. In the USA six youth gained employment with a community-based organization as activity leaders in a summer program for children. In Brazil, some adult facilitators decided to explore new professions in social work as a result of their participation in the Urban Platform process.

Organizational or Group Outcomes

Organizations and child/youth-led groups benefited from the methodology in a number of ways, including sharing some of the individual level outcomes in common. First, the data and improvement plans generated through the process were found to be useful for some organizations and groups for strategic planning purposes. For example, in India, the Shaishav children’s group used the data to write a grant based on the assessment results to develop a community-based child protection system. In the USA, a community-based organization valued the results of the assessment for improving their programming with children’s input, and used the findings for strategic planning within their agencies. This in turn helped to improve the quality of programs and to enhance services for children and youth in the community.

Another way that organizations benefited from the methodology was the increased capacity and knowledge of their staff to engage children, adolescents and families in new participatory ways. For example, in the Sudan, UNICEF field staff became more aware of the situation of children through this methodology, which enabled them to talk about problems in new ways with children, and to address priorities in partnership with local communities. In Turkey, the Youth for Habitat Association reported they now focus on children’s participation within their organization, which previously focused exclusively on adolescents and older youth. For example, as a result of the success of the methodology, the organization has worked more intensively to advocate for Children’s Assemblies within City Councils, to further develop legislation and to propose policies related to children’s needs. In Brazil, the NGOs involved in the process reported they have adapted the methodology for use in their other programs, such as those focusing on the participation and empowerment of girls.
School, Community or City Outcomes

Improved Monitoring and Planning for Children and Adolescents

All of the schools, communities or cities that participated in the process benefitted from the collection of disaggregated data to monitor conditions for children and adolescents. In all of the case studies, key informants reported it was the first time that the subjective opinions of children and adults had been gathered in a systematic and comparative way, including both their perceived assets and priorities for change. In addition, each organizing group was able to generate a plan of action to improve upon the priorities identified through the assessment. For example, in Haiti, children, teachers and parents developed a school improvement plan for their top five priorities from the assessment that focused upon increasing access to electricity, improving opportunities for play and recreation during school, school funding and access to educational resources (Figure 26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Priorities</th>
<th>Proposed Solution</th>
<th>(+) Benefits</th>
<th>(-) Challenges</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Who needs to be involved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school has access to electricity</td>
<td>Purchase a generator</td>
<td>(+) It will make our work easier to do and facilitate (+) The Generator would be useful to help the school (+) It will help the school during our cultural activities</td>
<td>(-) We will need the necessary things to make the Generator work (-) In case there are damages, what do we do to repair and maintain it?</td>
<td>$600-$800 USD</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are toys and recreation materials for students to play with</td>
<td>NGO donation of recreation equipment</td>
<td>(+) Immediate action on the evaluation results</td>
<td>(-) Not adequate for the unique needs of girls and boys, younger and older children</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is enough time for children to play during school</td>
<td>Increase amount of free time for play from 15 to 30 minutes</td>
<td>(+) Children will be happier and more focused on their studies if they have more opportunities to play during school</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>School Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has enough funding to function and be properly maintained</td>
<td>Raise money for the school with generator Resources</td>
<td>(+) Economic benefits for the school (+) We have to find a way to make the school function better</td>
<td>(-) Economic problems</td>
<td>$550-$700 USD</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have enough books, paper, pencils, and other school supplies to learn</td>
<td>UNICEF and NGO donation of scholastic kits</td>
<td>(+) Immediate action on the evaluation results (+) Assessment Booklets for everyone</td>
<td>(-) Not enough kits for all students</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>UNICEF NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Philippines, children, parents and teachers met as one large group to identify a doable and simple plan of action to improve their school. This plan focused upon installing a drainage system to remove stagnant water that often accumulates during seasonal flooding. Many participants thought that this plan would benefit the entire school population as well as the
villages near the school. The plan developed by the participants complemented and validated the school’s own Annual Improvement Plan, which highlighted the need to improve school facilities to make them more conducive for learning (such as a lack of perimeter fence, muddy pathways, non-functional toilets and rundown buildings).

Improvement plans for communities and cities were also developed in a majority of the case studies. For example, in Brazil all of the communities that participated in the Urban Platform generated community improvement plans focused on a wide range of issues, such as increasing access to HIV prevention programs, increasing access to healthy foods, improving the cleanliness of the environment along community pathways, and improving access to educational programs. In Spain, municipal improvement plans were developed to address the needs of the most vulnerable children in specific communities with poor access to services. In France, Turkey and Brazil, community identified priorities were integrated into existing municipal and sector plans. For example, in São Paulo the priorities of children and adolescents were integrated into the city plans for the Ministry of Education and the Secretary of Planning. In France, the Deputy Mayor of Nancy integrated children’s needs into municipal plans to improve the conditions of schools in low resourced communities. In Turkey, more than 70 priority projects were outlined during improvement planning processes with municipal and citizen councils, the private sector and government representatives.

**Improved or Enhanced Programs and Services**

Many of the participating schools, communities and cities benefited from improved or enhanced programs and services for children and adolescents. One common benefit included new approaches for including children, adolescents and parents in decision-making processes in services designed for them, or in local governance structures and processes. As one key informant in Brazil summarized it, “the tools help communities make Article 12 a reality.” For example, in Haiti the facilitators of the school assessment formed a new intergenerational committee of students, teachers and parents to discuss school issues and plan actions together on a regular basis. In the Sudan, the Community Development Committee (CDC) issued laws legalizing children's participation in local committees. This law states that CDC meetings are not legal without the attendance and participation of child representatives. In Brazil, six schools and two communities developed student-community associations to regularly deliberate on issues of concern to children and adolescents where no such process previously existed. In Jordan, the National Council for Family Affairs and UNICEF facilitated the creation of a “Change Agents Network” (UCAN) for anyone between the ages of 10 to 24 to become more engaged in decision-making processes within the country.

These new local structures and processes for child and adolescent participation often yielded additional benefits for communities. For example, in Brazil, the “First Forum on Policies for Health Promotion and Education for Children and Adolescents with Special Needs” was arranged with the support of community facilitators, which saw the participation of many
service providers that catered to this population. The forum identified the need for the creation of a Children and Youth Center for Psychosocial Care in one community to absorb local demand and relieve the industry of pediatrics and psychiatry at the Family Clinic. Finally, the forum established itself as a “watchdog” for the rights of children with disabilities in several communities and has monitored and routed demands on education, health, culture and leisure to various decision makers. One of the first actions of this ‘Child Rights Community Observatory’ was developing recommendations for the right to inclusive education and the need for better training of teachers and school staff in relation to children with disabilities.

In Morocco, responding directly to the needs expressed by community members in the assessment process, a municipal assembly of children and youth was created, working in conjunction with community service providers, municipal officials and parents. The municipal assembly includes children and youth aged 10 to 24, who were elected by their peers. The assembly established the following goals to work on over the next five years, to:

- “Reduce the dropout rate and its eradication in certain scholastic units;
- Increase institutional openness and parent participation in schools where their children are enrolled;
- Develop new cultures of citizenship among students through increased knowledge of their rights and duties;
- Establish cultural principals of child protection to prevent all forms of violence and exclusion; and
- Diversify the forms of child and adolescent participation through social, cultural, sports, and artistic activities.”

The assessment process contributed to a more inclusive municipal youth council in Dajabón, in the Dominican Republic. More children and girls become involved in the youth councils, and the leaders of the council changed to include 11 and 12 year old children, whereas previously leaders were 15 years old. Similarly in Turkey, collaboration between the various citizen assemblies increased as a result of the community-based assessment process, thereby improving the inclusivity of the assemblies. The Assemblies of Youth, Women and Disabled People in the City Councils, which were previously quite fragmented and male-dominated, became more diverse, and these under-represented groups became more visible at higher levels of the City Councils. The Assemblies began working together and developing policies in collaboration with one another. Through this collaboration, the assessment results were placed on the agenda of the City Councils in 10 municipalities with the aim of developing rights-based solutions and policies that ensure the participation of urban dwellers in problem areas that call for planning and action. In this context, the Assemblies of Youth, Women and the Disabled in City Councils conducted advocacy activities to influence policy development and strategic planning processes in local governments.

Advocacy campaigns based on community priorities helped to increased public awareness of conditions for children, which often led to other actions. For example, in the Sudan, residents
from one village mobilized to lobby for improvements to school buildings, to build a house for medical care in the community, and to carry water to school until it could be hooked up with the general water network. In France, the data was compiled on a national level and was publicized by UNICEF in the media, contributing to an increased public awareness on the conditions for children in the country, and initiating dialogues on children’s rights within community programs and services. In the USA, adolescent facilitators acted on the evaluation results by increasing awareness of children’s rights through a youth-produced film about the topic. Facilitators shared this film via a speaking tour with 200 young people and adults in schools and community-based organizations in East Harlem and other neighborhoods in New York City. As one key informant noted, “the youth in this program are teaching their peers all about children’s rights everywhere they go. They are learning how to be facilitators and how to be advocates for children’s rights, something that nobody knows about. So they basically are pioneers in the United States.” The speaking tour helped youth serving organizations become aware of children’s rights and to consider ways of integrating the topic into their programming.

In Brazil, community facilitators developed a variety of social mobilization campaigns to improve health prevention programs and services for children and adolescents. For example, facilitators held monthly debates on the Women’s Community Radio for Peace program and developed a public health campaign called, "Prejudice, fear and shame do not prevent HIV/AIDS." The campaign material was designed and produced by young people, and their ideas, texts, drawings and schematics were passed to a graphic artist, who created 2,000 posters and 10,000 informational flyers. The campaign was carried out across the city of Rio de Janeiro, through the 151 schools that catered to residents living in 50 communities that participated in the Platform of Urban Centers. Through the distribution of posters and flyers, students discussed the topic in classrooms and joined the campaign. Adolescents also developed a radio show to enable youth to discuss and debate health prevention issues and to articulate their proposed solutions. These programs have become a platform in the community for open discussions on topics such as sexual exploitation and safe sex. For example, three public schools began sexual orientation activities and hosting debates on health promotion as well as ensuring easy access to condoms.

Case studies from the Sudan and Haiti also reported improvements in educational services for children and adolescents. In the Sudan, the assessment process increased the awareness among local leaders on the conditions of schools in their community. This included their increased awareness about a lack of adequate teachers, books, and furniture in the classrooms, which they agreed to facilitate actions to improve. Similarly, the assessment process increased the awareness among women leaders in the community to take actions on behalf of children. One action was fundraising and advocacy for a new social and educational center for women and children in the community. In Haiti, recognizing the importance of play in children’s development, the school director increased the amount of time children had to play during school from 15 to 30 minutes.
Several case studies reported new or enhanced child protection programs for children and adolescents. For example, in the Philippines the local government agreed to conduct capacity training of the Pasay City Council for the protection of children at the city level and the Barangay Council at the barangay (or neighborhood) level, and to provide programs for the benefit of out of school youths. In the Sudan, after learning about the issues facing children’s protection in his community, a local leader established a ‘Peace Committee,’ which contributed to the building of a new school that encouraged children of different ethnic tribes to attend. In Brazil, 12 communities installed family health clinics focused on a range of protection issues after the results of the Platform of Urban Centers were known. In addition, the Ministry of Social Development approved a new social services center for 45,000 residents in one community to reduce the number of victims of domestic violence.

Improved or Enhanced Environments

In several case studies, changes to the physical or built environment also occurred based on the priorities identified through the assessment process and other actions by organizing groups. For example, Haiti, the Philippines, France, the Sudan and Brazil reported improvements to the learning environments for children and adolescents. In the Philippines, the school installed a drainage system to provide an answer to the muddy and flooded pathways during rainy periods, and the installation of a back fence to prevent the entry of looters. The improvements were conducted as part of the Brigada Eskwela school maintenance and upgrading project prior to opening of classes in June 2012.

In Haiti, the school agreed to purchase a generator with small seed money as a way to begin addressing both the lack of electricity and their long-term goal of obtaining computers with access to the Internet. A committee of students, teachers and parents determined the generator would help the school provide educational activities for children, such as the projection of multi-media in the classroom. By renting the generator to other schools for community events, or hosting community cultural events and charging admission for attendance, the committee could also raise funds to support the functioning and maintenance of the school. In addition, the committee was thoughtful about how the generator could benefit the community, as events and classes could also be held in the school during the evening hours.

In France, several schools in Nancy and Montbéliard received additional soap in bathrooms and new opportunities for the drinks were added to the school meals. Additional security lights and pedestrian crossings around schools were also developed to ensure young people’s safe routes to and from school. Similarly in the Sudan, community members admitted that prior to the assessment process, they were unaware of the problem of violence children encountered on their way to school. After discussion they agreed to provide permanent transportation and fuel for the students with contributions from community members and state-level decision makers. The community agreed to construct a secondary school closer to children’s homes so they
could avoid the risks they were exposed to on their way to school. In Brazil, a pedestrian bridge was constructed so children, adolescents and adults could walk to school safely (Figure 27). In addition, the State Department of Education of Rio de Janeiro agreed to build a secondary school in the City of God. The school opened in 2013 and serves 720 students. The communities of Complexo do Alemão, Batan, Padre Miguel, Village Alliance, Monkeys, Borel, Andaraí and Willow also had improvements made to their school structures through the construction and installation of new classrooms.

Figure 27: Construction of a Pedestrian Crossing in Rio de Janeiro

The Santa Cruz neighborhood is on the west side of Rio de Janeiro and is split by an important avenue, Avenida Brasil. Part of the services that are available to the communities in that area such as the health clinic and the municipal school are on the opposite side of this avenue. Thus, children and adults of the Sagrado Coração, Morada Verde, and Jardim Palmares communities needed to cross the avenue on a daily basis, with hazards to all, as there were no elevated passages to cross. During the community assessment, children and adults realized how exposed they were to danger with the lack of a safe pathway to cross the avenue on foot and that accidents were common in the area, almost on a daily basis. During the Community Forum the president of the association of Morada Verde explained that the community had required an elevated passage since 2004 and that the documentation was stuck for some bureaucratic reason. The facilitators from Berço dos Sonhos took several actions in order to have the passage built, including a connection with both the local executive and judiciary powers asking for a solution. At the end of 2010 the documentation finally was unblocked and the work was done. The elevated passage Sagrado Coração was finally made available for the population in December 2011.

Improvements to the cleanliness and ecology of community environments were also reported in Brazil and India. In Rio de Janeiro, community facilitators removed two tons of trash and debris from the streets. After removal of garbage from the spaces in the community, the place called "Campinho" became revitalized and began undergoing reforestation. In another example from Rio de Janeiro, youth proved the existence of a street that was ignored by the government through digital mapping. This street was urbanized and began receiving basic services such as having their garbage collected. Finally, facilitators implemented a community garden in the community of Luis Carlos Prestes. The garden supplied vegetables for students during the school day, and it was envisaged that the garden would catch on and be expanded to serve the entire community.
Local Systems or Policy Outcomes

Several organizing groups were able to achieve local systems or policy outcomes for children as a result of the community assessment process. A number of key informants discussed the importance of the community-level data in contributing evidence for policy-making and planning for children and adolescents. The assessments were found useful in evaluating government services and decision-making processes for children. For example, in Spain the assessments were useful in obtaining children’s input on the municipality’s process for participatory budgeting. While some children engaged in participatory budgeting and gave input on how to spend municipal funds, the assessment helped them to reflect upon what was working, and to identify areas for improvement. The findings revealed that while children felt they were listened to by the city council, their ideas for the budget were not acted upon. In Brazil, government data did not exist at the smaller geographic scale of the community, but rather, was only available at the regional scale. The community-level data generated through this methodology therefore enabled participating organizations and local governments to better understand dimensions of inequality within some of largest urban centers in Brazil.

In France, Spain, Brazil, the Philippines, Jordan and Morocco, local assessment and monitoring systems for children were established, improved and scaled for use in a variety of municipalities to strengthen child rights monitoring and reporting. For example, in the Philippines, the local government agreed to closely monitor the local plans of all barangays (or neighborhoods), to update the barangay database for children on a regular basis, to issue a “State of the Barangay’s Children” report (in addition to the State of the City’s Children report), and to strictly monitor and implement the inventory of facilities that cater to the needs of children. They also agreed to conduct studies on the transportation and housing sectors to emphasize the true conditions of children in the barangays. In addition, the UNICEF Country Office in the Philippines integrated the child friendly communities assessment and city governance tools into its accreditation process for child friendly cities, now referred to as the Seal of Child Friendly Local Governance.

Similarly, in Spain and Morocco, the community assessment tools have been adapted and integrated as an option for local participatory monitoring within their child friendly cities accreditation process, which will be scaled with over a dozen municipalities in the next several years. In France, based on the successes of the national scaling of the methodology with municipalities in its Child Friendly Cities Network, the French National Committee for UNICEF committed to conducting the assessment annually to monitor conditions for children over time. They plan to use the data to advocate for children’s needs on specific policies, especially those that address children living in poverty and experiencing social exclusion. The results will be integrated into UNICEF France’s report to the UN Committee on Child Rights each year. In Brazil, key informants also reported child rights violations identified through the community assessments. Allegations were made regarding teacher shortages, poor school building conditions and unsafe environments around schools.
At the time of writing this report, Jordan was in the process of establishing a new innovative monitoring system for children and adolescents based upon the child friendly places methodology. In June 2014, the Change Agents Network (UCAN) of youth held focus groups with over 150 young people, civil society groups and government representatives to validate the community indicators that were part of this case study. For each indicator, young people outlined how they participated in realizing their rights through videos and their personal experiences. UNICEF Jordan and UCAN are now working on integrating these indicators and the assessment process through a website and mobile application that will empower young people to share their responses and viewpoints directly with decision-makers. The goal is to ensure decision-makers respond and actions can be accounted for with information flowing both ways. According to the Mayor of Amman, “The Greater Amman Municipality is keen on working on the friendliness of the city, implementing activities targeting the children of Amman, and activating its public facilities such as parks, playgrounds, and libraries to become child friendly.”

A technical company is already working on building the application and interactive map. UNICEF Jordan is also working with the Greater Amman Municipality to verify the indicators with government ministries and all major stakeholders to obtain buy-in throughout the country, which is critical for the success of this new monitoring system.

The use of the governance assessment tools in the Philippines also encouraged municipalities to enhance their governance structures to better address children’s issues, such as through improved cross-sector coordination and planning. For example, the assessment provided city officials and workers with a new way of looking at the governance structures of Pasay City in order to ascertain how these mechanisms were addressing the rights of all children. As one government representative commented, “We became aware of the involvement of the different agencies in providing child protection. We also realized after going through the emergency section in the governance tool that our citywide emergency plans have no specific plans on children.” As a result, key informants reported a growing recognition among government representatives of the significant roles and functions that city agencies or units not directly working on child rights have on the overall welfare of children, such as the City Engineer’s Office, the Housing Regulation Office and the Traffic and Parking Management Office. In France, key informants also reported the creation of a “Special Representative for Children” in all Child Friendly Cities to advocate for their needs.
Conclusion

Summary of Findings

Relevance

The evaluation found the child friendly places approach was highly relevant for groups already engaged in local development initiatives or educational programs seeking to improve conditions for children and adolescents. The number of countries where the methodology has been/is being applied increased from 9 to 27 since 2008, with 54 confirmed case studies in every region of the world, representing more than 820 communities and over 64,000 participants. The methodology was particularly suited to organizing groups engaged in child rights education, those seeking the perspectives and participation of children, adolescents and parents, and for prioritizing actions with service providers based on community identified needs.

The methodology was found to be relevant for all countries, regardless of their level of human development. Based on the 44 case studies with data, it was clear that both wealthy and poor countries benefited from the application of the methodology, as the assessment addresses children’s rights, which are universal rights relevant for all young people around the world. For example, a lack of opportunities for children’s participation, and inequality in access to services for the poorest children within all countries was documented in the assessment results. While historically UNICEF and academics have been the lead distributors of the methodology, the new version of the resources are also designed to include other relevant stakeholders without research experience. For this reason, the distributors of the methodology have expanded to include international and local NGOs, community based organizations and educational programs, child- and youth-led groups, schools, urban designers/planners and citizens’ councils. Examples of recent adopters and organizations downloading the materials include Plan International, World Vision in Jordan, Save the Children in Somalia, the Child Rights Collective in India, the Danish Refugee Council in Lebanon, the Cipta Fondasi Komunitas in Indonesia, and the International Medical Corps working in Iraq.

A primary factor contributing to the relevance of the methodology is the empowerment organizing groups have to adapt the tools and materials for their local context. Rather than suggesting organizing groups implement specific indicators and activities, the facilitator guides encourage a flexible and malleable approach in selecting the tools and indicators most suitable

---

7 The total number of communities and participants is likely significantly higher, as 10 of these case studies are ongoing and the data is not currently available. Each case study can be explored through an interactive online map. An additional 92 case studies are being planned or are under development. The evaluation is based on 44 case studies with comprehensive data on the process and outcomes.
for a local development initiative or educational program. In addition, the new version of the resources encourage children, adolescent and adult facilitators to be included in the adaptation of the indicators to ensure a child-centered approach to local planning in their use or application.

**Ownership and Efficiency**

Given the tools and materials contained in the methodology were developed through participatory networks of researchers, UNICEF staff, NGO representatives and government officials, organizing groups exhibited a sustained level of interest and ownership over the process. Many groups continued to adapt and use the methodology without CERG coordinating the process, and in some cases, were able to scale the approach at the national level. The efficiency of implementing the process depended in large part on group leading the process and the context in which the methodology was applied. For example, in India when researchers led the process in extremely difficult environments, it took them more time to mobilize communities to implement the different activities than when the process was led by a local NGO with a dense network of local actors who were easily activated to participate. The evaluation found the process for implementing the methodology was indeed community-led, primarily by older children and youth, as well as adults working with children in community programs. This demonstrates the importance of community ownership of the methodology, and the supportive role that organizations like UNICEF and NGOs can play in helping communities leverage their data to improve conditions for children, adolescents and families.

**Effectiveness**

While there were some challenges in implementing the child friendly places methodology, such as working with the youngest children and translating the materials, these issues did not prevent organizing groups from effectively implementing the process. Across all of the case studies, the assessment and planning process has privileged the participation of children and adolescents, as well as other marginalized groups traditionally excluded from community planning and urban development processes. Examples of stakeholders include children ages 6 to 9 living and working on the streets, parents of infants living in urban slums and resettlement areas, citizen councils of adults with disabilities, adolescent girls and boys residing in refugee camps, and preschool children attending transitional learning spaces in emergency contexts. In addition, the methodology has been effectively and efficiently scaled; in Brazil, France, Turkey and India adolescents led the assessment and planning process in partnership with adults, including thousands of participants in numerous communities and cities.8

---

8 Other distributors in the Philippines, Morocco, Jordan, Turkey and Spain are in the process of scaling the methodology in over a dozen municipalities within each country.
Although the evidence on the effectiveness of the child friendly places methodology is largely anecdotal, the data suggests short- and long-term benefits are possible at the individual or family level; organizational or group level; school, community or city level; and at the local systems or policy level. The scale of outcomes varied depending on the groups leading the process. Those organizing groups that had existing partnerships with local governments were more likely to influence outcomes at the policy or local systems level. When NGOs were involved in applying the methodology, a greater number of outcomes at the organizational, school and community level were observed. However, all of the case studies reported individual level outcomes, such as an increased opportunity for children, adolescents and parents to voice their opinions on their school and community conditions. One of the greatest benefits of the process was improved intergenerational communication and empathy, which empowered children and adults to work collaboratively to take actions on behalf of young people. The new version of the resource kit will also empower organizing groups to better document the outcomes from the process, as many groups were not able to accomplish an evaluation of their initiative.

Sustainability

The high level of local ownership over the methodology will ensure its continued adaptation, scaling and sustainability for a variety of local development initiatives and educational programs. In addition, an endorsement of the methodology by distributors to other potential groups has facilitated a viral marketing of the materials with potential champions working in child rights education or right-based development schemes. However, without long-term funding for CERG to follow up on new groups that have implemented the approach, it will likely be challenging to integrate additional case studies into the website, and to learn from these new experiences to revise the methodology, which requires substantial human resources. Additional measures can also be taken to improve the sustainability and efficiency of the methodology, which are outlined in the final section of this report.

New Research Directions for Improving the Methodology

Scaling of the Methodology in Formal School Settings

Given the interest among different distributors to integrate this methodology into schools, the next phase of development should focus upon scaling the approach within this setting. This may require forming partnerships with the Ministry of Education, local researchers and NGOs working with teachers in schools who can collaborate with CERG to test an approach on a large scale. Based on the lessons from this evaluation, scaling the approach within the formal school setting may require: 1) adapting the assessment process for use with up to 50 children at one time in a classroom environment; 2) the training of teachers in participatory, rights-based
approaches to instruction; 3) the addition of new content and educational resources to provide more in-depth information on each assessment topic; and 4) a glossary of terms and concepts, among other strategies.

**Assessment Tool Formatting Wizard**

An interactive tool that helps coordinators and facilitators improve their efficiency in selecting and formatting the graphic assessment tools is greatly needed. Currently the assessment tools contain more than 100 survey items that organizing groups select from to plan their assessment process. Local groups facilitating the process have to make a range of decisions when formatting the assessment tools for their own use, because the tools should be adapted for the local context and the goals of their initiative. An assessment tool wizard will encourage maximum flexibility and adaptation of the indicators to ensure the process is culturally appropriate for use with different age groups. The goal is to enable users to select the assessment tool format required for their local context (such as the booklet or survey tool), to upload new assessment images that are more culturally relevant, to reword, translate or create new assessment items, and to save and print their outputs as a .pdf files.

**Digital Community Assessment Tool to Support Children with Disabilities**

One persistent challenge in conducting the community assessments has been the engagement of children with disabilities, who are often unable to attend community meetings. Children with disabilities often require different modalities and processes to express their opinions with others in an inclusive way. For this reason, we recommend adapting the assessment tools for use with children who have physical, cognitive, speech and hearing impairments through the creation of a Digital Community Assessment Tool (DCAT) (Figure 28).

Through the use of tablets or laptop computers, the DCAT can:

- Engage hard to reach individuals and groups who do not attend school or community programs, such as children with physical disabilities or working children;
- Provide different sensory modalities for children to understand the assessment statements and to input their opinions, such as through voice recording and visual reading prompts (karaoke);
- Improve the efficiency of data collection, input and analysis into child friendly visualizations for children to understand and compare their opinions with others;
- Increase the number of participants who are able to assess their conditions to make informed decisions;
- Create real time data sharing and feedback loops between community members, schools and decision makers; and
• Provide new opportunities for learning to support children and youth as centers of innovation in their own development, and in the development of their schools and communities.

Figure 28: Mock-Up of the Digital Community Assessment Tool

Potential Modalities:

1. Children can click on the ‘sound’ box icon to hear the assessment statement read in their local language. As a word is read, its color changes to demonstrate this to the reader, therefore supporting children’s literacy skills development.
2. The graphic image demonstrates what the assessment item means. It could also be a brief video about the assessment item.
3. Children respond to the statement by pressing one of three choices that represent a favorable, somewhat favorable, and not favorable response.
4. Children can click on the ‘microphone’ box icon to record a brief comment about the assessment item, such as why something is viewed favorably or children’s ideas to improve the situation.
5. Children can advance forward in the assessment process, or go back and check their previous responses to change them or add to them if desired.
Digital Mapping and Data Analysis Interface

The child friendly places website includes a digital mapping platform that enables users to create unique maps for their community that can be linked with the assessment and planning process. This mapping interface also could be used with Smart phones to empower children, adolescents and parents to document issues in their community within specific places, or along routes or community pathways. Future research should be conducted with participants to explore ways of integrating this online mapping interface in a way that shares real-time information with decision-makers. This process is already being explored in Jordan, with a Smartphone mapping platform. Along with the digital mapping interface, a more robust way of inputting the data from the assessment process and summarizing the results through child friendly graphics should be explored. This might include linking the data collected through the digital community assessment tool with a backend data analysis platform that enables users to print bar charts, pie charts and other child friendly data visualizations.