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Executive summary

This report was written by consultants Dr. Volodymyr Kuzminskyi, Irina Malanchiuk and Peter Evans within the framework of the UNICEF project “Family and Child Support Services in Uzbekistan”. The report covers the key findings during an evaluation visit to Uzbekistan from September 9th – 26th 2009. The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate the impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the piloted Family & Child Support Service in Uzbekistan.

The Child Protection system in Uzbekistan remains unchanged, closely resembling the one that was founded during the Soviet Union. This is a fragmented system and many governmental structures are responsible for child protection. In addition there are complexities in the decision-making mechanisms at local levels.

UNICEF Uzbekistan has been involved since 2004 in child care system reforms. UNICEF together with the Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children conducted two studies in 2006. The research identified gaps in the current child care system and led to the development of practical concepts to test the potential for the introduction of various services for children with disabilities and children without parental care at the local level. One of these concepts led to the pilot project - Family and Child Support Services (FCSS) beginning in 2007.

The aim of the Project was to develop and expand the model of effective childcare system and family and child support services by creation of Family and Children Support Services. The overall goal of the pilot aimed at preventing children from being admitted to institutions, reintegrating children already living in institutions with their biological parents or extended family, or arranging substitute family care for children unable to live with their biological family.

At the same time that FCSS services were established, the social work profession was given government approval with the recognition of social work as an official occupation and the establishment of undergraduate, graduate and in-service courses in social work taught in centres of higher education.

The evaluation was carried out using qualitative and quantitative research methods. In addition to conducting a desk-top review of background documents, the evaluators held wide-ranging interviews and focus-group discussions with stakeholders at national and local levels in Uzbekistan. At the same time, the evaluators endeavoured to collect quantitative data about decisions made by authorised bodies in pilot and non-pilot regions to place children in institutions or substitute families. During the course of the evaluation field work it became apparent that such data was exceedingly difficult to obtain as placement decisions were made by many authorised bodies at many levels of local government and none of which was collated at regional or national level. The evaluators collected as much quantitative data as they were able but it is acknowledged to be incomplete for the non-pilot regions. As a consequence there are limitations to the conclusions that can be drawn from the data.

The data appears to show that FCSS have reduced the proportion of children placed in institutions in pilot districts of Tashkent compared with the non-pilot Tashkent district though that reduction does not show in the other pilot regions. This is probably because each region is different in terms of demographics, employment and health indicators, factors that are known to impact on rates of placement in institutions. However, according to figures provided by the FCSS teams themselves the vast majority (96%) of out-of-biological family placements made by them were in substitute families such as adoptive families, guardianship or patronage (foster care).

One pilot region (Samarkand) appears to show an increasing capacity to reintegrate children from institutions back to their families though the same capacity was not observed in other pilot regions.

The evaluators observed that most FCSS teams were using internationally recognised case management processes when working with children and families though because staffs were only working part-time for FCSS while continuing to work in their ‘regular’ jobs, the number of child and family cases they worked with was limited to ten cases per worker. Other potential cases were referred on to SPON inspectors.
Individual interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders in pilot regions indicated general satisfaction with FCSS services. Fewer persons in non-pilot regions knew very much about FCSS and were unable to express an informed opinion. Some staff of children’s homes rejected the proposition that children were better off in poor families saying that children’s homes provided a better environment.

The biggest difference in approach to vulnerable children and families observed by the evaluators in pilot and non-pilot regions was that FCSS staff adopted a non-judgemental attitude to families and tried to assess the individual needs of children and families. In non-pilot regions the approach appeared to be more administrative, dependent on the production of required documents and certificates following which a child was placed in an institution.

FCSS services were successful in preventing the admission to institutions of almost all children they worked with, either by supporting the child in its biological family or by arranging care in a substitute family. However, the overall impact of FCSS interventions on reducing the number of children placed in institutions was limited because many more children from the pilot regions; children lacking parental care, children from poor families, children with severe and less severe disabilities, young children under three years, children in conflict with the law, were placed in institutions by the many authorised bodies at several levels of local government. This situation reinforces the conclusion that a scaling up of FCSS services would succeed in preventing many more avoidable admissions to institutions, especially once FCSS service became more widely known by potential sources of referrals and by families themselves.

The evaluators conclude that FCSS teams were responding to referrals efficiently though they noted that the average time spent on a prevention case was longer than that spent on a reintegration case. The evaluators thought that situation would reverse itself as the teams became more confident and experienced. The evaluators did not attempt to directly compare the cost-efficiency of care in an institution with the cost of supporting a child at home though they made some calculations of the cost of FCSS care packages. Reference is also made to studies of comparative costs of institutional and family support in other CIS countries.

The evaluators conclude that FCSS organised at oblast level is not the most effective model for a national scaling up of services. FCSS pilots that were organised at District level are closer to the communities they serve, meaning that the workers themselves had better knowledge of local resources, and that local government officials are more likely to refer families in difficulties to the FCSS. Similarly, self-referrals by families themselves are more likely when FCSS are seen as local resources. The evaluators agree with several stakeholders who expressed support for locating FCSS at rayon and city levels and for strengthening the capacity of key people at makhalla level to respond to vulnerable children and families.

The evaluators conclude that the project had implicitly adopted a human rights-based approach to programming with its focus on supporting children to live in families. The evaluators were less certain that a results-based approach had been adopted to manage the project.

The evaluators make a number of recommendations; principally that consideration is given to developing a broad-based, high-level national strategy to protect vulnerable children at risk of admission to institutions. The assessment and family support services of FCSS would be a key feature of the strategy, which would also aim to streamline decision-making procedures to ensure that all children at risk of admission to institutions are first assessed to see if they could be supported in their own or a substitute family. The strategy would also aim to reduce the bed capacity of institutions and redirect the savings in government expenditure towards community-based support services such as day care, after-school care, education and support for children with special needs and financial support for substitute families, etc.

Recognizing that a strategic review and strategy development will probably take at least 18 months, the evaluators make a number of shorter term recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of the FCSS teams.

Uzbekistan faces the exciting challenge of reducing its reliance on expensive care in institutions and increasing its support for less expensive and more effective family based care.
Introduction

This report describes an evaluation of the “Family and Child Support Services” project carried out in Uzbekistan by UNICEF and the Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children between 2007 and 2009 in five regions (six districts); Samarkand city, Syrdarya and two districts of Tashkent city; Sobir Rakhimov and Chilanzor. The project was essentially a trial of social services provision for vulnerable children and families in order to test and demonstrate how practical social work can prevent placement a child in an institution. It was an alternative to existing child care system in Uzbekistan that relies on different types of residential institutions for children who, for whatever reason, were not being cared for by their parents. It was, UNICEF argued, more effective to demonstrate an alternative so that Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan, local authority and community could see for themselves how it worked.

The aim of the evaluation was to see how effective and efficient the project has been and what impact it has done. In other words, to judge whether or not the project had met its objectives. Beyond this, in line with the point above, a further aim was to look beyond the pilot and identify issues that might hinder the application of the ideas elsewhere in the country. Additional tasks of the evaluation was to assess the application of human rights-based approach (HRBA) and results based management (RBM) approach throughout the project. This evaluation will provide necessary information and recommendations for the development of the next UNICEF country program (2010-2015) and to equip UNICEF office in Uzbekistan with ideas for further support of the reform of the childcare system for the next six years.

The structure of the report is as follows. A brief history will describe the background to the projects. The central part of the report comes next. This section considers whether and to what extent the objectives of the project have been met. Brief conclusions follow with a section on potential barriers to the further extension of the model elsewhere in Uzbekistan. Finally an extensive set of appendices includes full supporting information for the report. This includes the tables and figures on which the quantitative part of the analysis is based, a list of the people interviewed during the evaluation, a project chronology and a listing of the ancillary information.
Background

The Child Protection system in Uzbekistan remains unchanged, closely resembling the one that was founded during the Soviet Union. This is a fragmented system and many governmental structures are responsible for child protection. At the central level, the structures responsible for child protection are:

- Ministry of Public Education
- Ministry of Labour and Social Protection
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education
- Ministry of Internal Affairs
- General Prosecutor’s Office

A Commission for the Affairs of Minors under the Cabinet of Ministers is vested with extensive powers to coordinate the activity of ministries, state committees and departments in the area of crime prevention among minors and their legal defence as well as the drafting of proposals to the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan in this area.¹

Placement of a child in an institution was by far the most common response by the Soviet state for orphaned, abandoned and neglected children, as well as for children with disabilities. Nowadays there are many residential institutions in Uzbekistan under different ministries.

The difficulty in providing adequate service to these children is partly due to the absence of one body or system to oversee all issues of childcare. As of today, childcare is still divided among different ministries and number of state agencies. In addition there are complexities in the decision-making mechanisms at local levels. There are Commissions on Minors that make decisions regarding many children’s issues. Guardian and Trusteeship Inspections are responsible for recommendations on children’s placements. In practice, the focus of Commissions on Minors is only on children in conflict with the law and general oversight of implementation and functioning of childcare agencies. Being officially abolished, the performance of Guardian & Trustee bodies has been limited to one person who is overwhelmed with documentation and other tasks not related to children.

Children with disabilities are placed in the residential institutions according to the decision of the local Psycho-Medico-Pedagogical Commission (PMPC). Children from poor families are entrusted to residential care services based on the request of the families to the regional Departments of Educations.

After the placement of the child in a residential institution no effort is made by the public structures to improve the situation in the family. As a result, children are left in residential institutions for a long time, a period during which their ties with families are weakened or broken due to the exposure to various forms of deprivation and abuse.

UNICEF Uzbekistan has been involved in the reforms of child care systems in since 2004. One main way of UNICEF engagement has been through high level advocacy. Now the Government of Uzbekistan faces challenges and opportunities to modify the existing child protection system. The most significant policy result is the adoption of the Law on the Guarantees of the Rights of the Child that recognizes the child’s right to a family environment and that a child’s placement to an institution should be a last resort. This law has become an important starting point for changes in secondary legislation.

UNICEF together with the Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children conducted two studies in 2006; “Assessment of Social Policy on Children with Disabilities” and “Assessment of System of Social Protection of Children at national and local level”. The research identified gaps in the current system and led to the development of practical concepts to test the potential for the introduction of various services for children with disabilities and children without parental care at the local level.

¹ Regulations on the Commissions on the Affairs of Minors – Annex 1 to Resolution # 360 of the Cabinet of Ministers dated September 21, 2000.
One of these concepts led to the piloting of Family and Child Support Services (FCSS) at local level to address the above mentioned gaps and support policy development for childcare system reform. In this regard the project “Development of a Model of Effective Childcare System for Uzbekistan and expansion of pilot Family and Children Support Services to other regions” was implemented beginning in 2007.

The aim of the Project was to develop and expand the model of effective childcare system and family and child support services by creation of Family and Children Support Services.

The overall goal of the pilot project aimed at preventing children from being admitted to institutions, reintegrating children already living in institutions with their biological parents or extended family, or arranging substitute family care for children unable to live with their biological family, such as fostering and family type groups. FCSS have been staffed by suitably trained social work professionals who deliver prevention, reintegration and alternative family services. The project also aimed to achieve restructuring childcare system at the local level to ensure a reduction in the number of children in state institutions.

Currently there are five regions (six districts) with pilot Family and Child Support Services (FCSS) staffed with 30 certified social workers. Three pilots were established in 2007 in two districts of Tashkent (Chilanzor and Sobir Rakhimov) and Samarkand. Three more pilots, in Gulistan, Andijan and Bukhara were established in 2008 and early 2009. The structure of each team comprises of a head and between two and four social workers. The rights and official duties of the experts in the pilots have been agreed through memoranda signed with local Khokims, UNICEF and Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children.

The Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children is supporting the Family and Child Support Services by visiting the teams to offer social work advice to social workers about new or difficult cases. The Centre is also able to monitor the effectiveness of the teams to prevent avoidable admissions as they grow in confidence and experience to use social work skills and approaches from their initial training. The Centre has provided each team with a template for a monthly monitoring form. Each team is expected to complete the form with details of the cases that it is working on, and to email the form back to the Centre for review. The Centre also considers the on-going training needs of the teams. Recommendations are made at the end of this report to strengthen local supervision of FCSS teams.

The Head of Service of each pilot is usually the local Inspector from the Guardianship & Trustee body, which is a key role and who at the same time is responsible for family and child assessment and recommendation on type of care for a child in the current system. A specialist from the Police is the Head of the FCSS team in Samarkand. The social workers/experts in the pilots have been selected for their operational experience in child protection and child care and they come from a variety of backgrounds including Guardianship & Trustee body, Education, Police etc.

The development of local family support services work has also been undertaken with local makhallas, Commissions of Minors, Committees of Women Issues and Guardianship & Trustee bodies. This has promoted very good examples of multi-agency working. International experience has shown that social workers are most effective when they work with other government and non-government agencies that also have child and family protection functions. Effective cooperation and coordination begins with communication between agencies so that each understands the strengths and limitations of the other. Once trust and understanding have been established, it is much easier for people to work together to protect an individual child and family. By working together government and non-government resources achieve greater impact than if they work alone, or maybe even in conflict with each other.

At the same time that the pilot FCSS were established the field of social work has been developed and officially recognized as a profession. Currently three universities offer a social work program at undergraduate level and one university offers a Masters program on social work. Given the long time for the first social work graduates to become social workers, and that reforms cannot be delayed, an in-service training component of social work has been developed as well. Hence, a four-month retraining diploma course on social work has been designed and approved by the Ministry of Higher & Specialized Secondary Education in 2007 to re-train practitioners who already perform social work type services to be able to adjust to the new system of childcare and provide them with knowledge on social work. The four-month re-
training program provided by the Tashkent State Institute of Culture is the outcome of a partnership project between UNICEF, Tashkent State Institute of Culture, Teesside University UK, RCSAC and the Government of Uzbekistan. The aim of the project was the development of the profession of social work in the Republic of Uzbekistan and to strengthen the capacities of practitioners within the child welfare system through retraining in the field of social work. It began in 2007 with the training a national team of trainers who then went on to train local staff employed in social welfare settings. Training material developed in the project forms the basis of the current four-month in-service training course.

There are already 130 child protection practitioners (including the staff of FCSS) from these five regions retrained through the four-month diploma program on social work. Additionally 700 university students are studying at undergraduate level and ten at graduate level of the social work program.
Assignment

1.1. Purpose and objectives of the Evaluation

Purpose of the evaluation:
- To have documented evidence about impact, effectiveness and efficiency of newly established Family and Child Support Services in improving the childcare system for future policy development.

The objectives of the evaluation are:
- Assess the impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the pilot project “Family and Child Support Services”
- Assess the application of human rights-based approach and results based management approach throughout the project

1.2. Methodology

The methods used in the evaluation included:
- Desk review of background documents (Annexe 2)
- Field visits for interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders in four pilot regions; Taskent: Sobir-Rakhimov, Tashent: Chilanzor, Samarkand and Gulistan: Sirdarya
- Field visits for interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders in four non-pilot regions; Dzhyzzak, Kashkadarya, Tashkent: Khamza, Tashkent: Yunus Abad
- Interviews with external resource people to benchmark some of the findings of the evaluation

Table 1: Composition of Evaluation Target Groups and Methods of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Number who took part in the Evaluation</th>
<th>Methods of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers of FCSS in pilot areas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Field-based survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study of written records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official representatives of Khokimiyats of pilot and non-pilot regions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Interview, questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official representatives of Makhalla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Semi-structured focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors &amp; staff of Children’s Homes “Mekhribonlik” and Children’s Town,</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Semi-structured focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representatives from school for children with mental disabilities, boarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school for children with hearing difficulties, boarding school for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with scoliosis, children’s home for young children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCSAC staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Interview, questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key people in Ministries - MOPE, MOH, MLSP, GPO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Individual meetings, Interview, questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of reintegrated children and clients of FCSS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Semi-structured focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children reintegrated from Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of Universities (Tashkent and Samarkand)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Semi-structured focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interview, questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Team on Social Work</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total participants in the study</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3. Scope of Work and Limitations

The fieldwork was conducted in the main areas where pilot projects are located as well as in non-pilot areas as it is shown at the Figure 1. The amount of time available for fieldwork was enough to visit the most important pilot sites. The selection of pilot sites to visit was made in consultation with the UNICEF country office. The evaluation team also visited non-pilot regions for comparative purposes (Figure 1).

The quantity and reliability of statistical data collated in the fields was very variable in pilot and non-pilot areas. We accept the fact that due to very short time of operation of FCSSs the collected figures could not be relied upon with full confidence in drawing conclusions. However the evaluation team made all possible efforts to collect the data with maximum accuracy and the analysis of impact below was made taking into consideration this limitation.

The secondary data that was collected and analysed for the purpose of this report included information from UNICEF (project proposals and work plans, budgets, reviews, consultancy reports, training materials); and statistics from governmental bodies.

Very important limitation for the purpose of this report was lack or sometimes absence of data on children at risk and vulnerable families. Available data was usually fragmented and collected by different bodies.

The evaluators were also concerned with lack of baseline data. This obviously influenced the evaluation and it does point up the need for more effective monitoring of the progress of the project in the future.

One of the challenges was interpretation of data regarding impact, effectiveness and efficiency of FRCSs and comparison pilot and non-pilot areas. We admit the fact that all visited pilot and non pilot regions are very different in terms of basic socio-economic indicators, for example income level (Figure 1), population, child population, number of institutions in the territory, services available, etc. In order to avoid misinterpretation of data we have drawn conclusions by comparing similar from statistical point of view territories like districts of Tashkent city.

Although the most of interviews, focus groups and discussions were conducted in Russian, which is the second language of evaluators we have had a number of meetings in the regions in Uzbek language where we had to rely on our interpreters. Thus we recognised this limitations as well as features of local culture and traditions.
Figure 1: Geographic distribution of incidence of low income in Uzbekistan

Regions:
1. Andijan
2. Bukhara
3. Fergana
4. Dzhak
5. Karakalpakstan
6. Kashkadarya
7. Khorezm
8. Namangan
9. Navoiy
10. Samarkand
11. Surkhandarya
12. Syrdarya
13. Tashkent
14. Tashkent city

Legend:
- 0 - 6.7
- 6.8 - 20.8
- 20.9 - 23.9
- 24.0 - 26.9
- 27.0 - 33.4
- 34.5 - 36.2
- 36.3 - 41.4

2005
2. Results and analysis

2.1. Impact

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation (see Annex 1) set out following specific questions for the evaluation in order to assess the impact of the project:

1. **What is the percentage of children without parental care placed in institutions per year, in pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?**
2. **What is the percentage of children without parental care returned to biological families per year, in both pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?**
3. **What is the percentage of children without parental care placed in alternative forms of care per year, in both pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?**
4. **What is the percentage of children whose families have been properly assessed by the system in pilot and non-pilot districts?**
5. **In which way are the stakeholders satisfied with pilot services?**
6. **What is the difference in work approach of childcare service providers in pilot versus non-pilot districts (existence and usage of tools, mechanisms, etc.)?**
7. **Is there a difference between the level of knowledge of childcare professionals in pilot versus non-pilot districts on de-institutionalization, placements of children, alternative care for children without parental care? If yes, what is this difference?**

**What is the percentage of children without parental care placed in institutions per year, in pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?**

The team had intended to answer this question by collecting data in a survey of placement decisions made by FCSS staff, SPON inspectors and secretaries of CoMs whom they interviewed. However, during the course of the fieldwork it became apparent that placement decisions were being made at several levels of local government administration and by several departments, not all of whom the team were scheduled to meet. The team was able to collect data from FCSS teams and SPON inspectors, but not all children with social problems or children with disabilities passed through the FCSS or SPON processes. The team learned that some children from poor families and children with disabilities are placed in institutions by local Departments of Education. Children with severe disabilities are placed in institutions by departments of the Ministry of Labour & Social Protection. Very young children are placed in institutions by authorised bodies of the Ministry of Health.

The team took the decision to collect such information as was available from the planned survey but also from activity reports provided by SPON to the Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children and other sources. Therefore the team recommends caution in interpreting the following tables and graphs that are based on the collected data as it acknowledged to be incomplete because of the highly fragmented systems for making placement decisions.

**Table 2: Percentage of children without parental care placed in institutions over period 2006-2008 years in pilot and non pilot sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Children without Parental care</th>
<th>Children placed in institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of children without parental care placed in institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2006</td>
<td>Year 2007</td>
<td>Year 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand (pilot)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrdarya: Yangier city (pilot)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Rakhimov (pilot)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzhyzzak (non)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of the figures in Table 2 is not easy. All visited pilot and non pilot regions are very different in terms of basic socio-economic indicators, for example poverty level (Figure 1), population, child population, number of institutions in the territory, services available, etc. From the point of view of comparing 'like with like' the best approach is to compare two districts of Tashkent city. Limited conclusions about the impact of FCSS are drawn from such comparison.

Figures 2&3 show the rate of children placed in institutions in Tashkent city pilot sites has significantly decreased over the period of FCSS operations.

Figure 2: Percentage of children placed in institutions – Sobir Rakhimov & Yunus Abad districts 2006-2008

Figure 3: Percentage of children placed in institutions – Sobir Rakhimov & Khamza districts 2006-2008
Looking at the numbers of children placed in residential institutions in Sobir Rakhimov district (Figure 2) the project appears to show very positive tendency. During 2006-2008 the rate of placement in Sobir Rakhimov district decreased from 16.3% to 1.8%. If these figures are compared with non pilot districts Yunus Abad and Khamza it is possible to draw a conclusion about the impact of FCSS in Sobir Rakhimov. However, Table 3 below shows that the dramatic reduction in the proportion of children placed in institutions was not replicated in Samarkand or Syrdarya regions.

Table 3: Placements in institutions in pilot & non-pilot regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Children without parental care</th>
<th>Placed in institutions</th>
<th>% placed in institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rakhimov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilanzor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzhizzak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunusabad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>630</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though numbers of children entering institutions appear to be reducing in Sobir Rakhimov district, it is not possible to draw a firm conclusion about the impact of the FCSS on the proportion of children placed in institutions in pilot and non-pilot regions on the basis of the incomplete figures that the team have been able to collect.

**What is the percentage of children without parental care returned to biological families per year, in both pilot and non-pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?**

The percentage of children without parental care returned to biological families over period 2006-2008 years in pilot and non-pilot sites is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Percentage of children without parental care returned to biological families over period 2006-2008 years in pilot and non pilot sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Children without Parental care</th>
<th>Children returned to biological families</th>
<th>Percentage of children without parental care returned to biological families, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand (pilot)</td>
<td>160 197 208</td>
<td>0 3 38</td>
<td>0.0 1.5 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrdarya*: Yangier city (pilot)</td>
<td>14 14 18</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Rakhimov (pilot)</td>
<td>129 113 110</td>
<td>4 6 1</td>
<td>3.1 5.3 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilanzor (pilot)*</td>
<td>- 18 24</td>
<td>- 0 0</td>
<td>- 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamza (non-pilot)</td>
<td>65 59 61</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td>0.0 1.7 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunusabad (non-pilot)</td>
<td>84 120 133</td>
<td>0 2 0</td>
<td>0.0 1.7 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzhizzak (non-pilot)</td>
<td>43 19 46</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 above shows that the proportion of children from Samarkand who were returned to biological families increased after the establishment of the FCSS. However, that trend is not repeated in Sobir Rakhimov. The establishment of FCSS in Syrdarya in February 2009 is too soon to draw conclusions about rates of reintegration in that region. It can be seen how few children appear to be returned to biological family in non-pilot regions.

The team was very encouraged to see documentary evidence in a number of children’s files of ‘Statement of institution about agreement for reintegration’. It was clear to the evaluators that social workers and staff of institutions were working together on these reintegration cases to ensure a successful outcome for the child. The Statements showed that institution staff can overcome their understandable caution about returning children home and work as with the social worker, the child and its family to support a plan for reintegration.

From the interviews with staff of FCSS in pilot sites the team learned that not all children in pilot sites pass through the FCSS. For example, because the retrained SPON inspectors in Samarkand were working part-time as FCSS social workers, their FCSS caseloads were limited to a maximum of ten cases at any one time. If the social worker’s caseload was full and another referral came into the team, the social worker would redirect it on to be processed under customary SPON procedures. In other words, only a proportion of referrals of vulnerable children received a full assessment and intervention plan service from retrained SPON inspectors. There was also no evidence of eligibility criteria for accessing to the FCSS. The limits on caseloads and the absence of eligibility criteria for attention by FCSS might explain the variation in figures of reintegration as most of the cases worked by the teams were randomly selected.

---

2 Numbers collected only for children of Yangier city of Syrdarya oblast. FCSS team began operations in 2009. Figures for previous years were provided by SPON inspectors.

3 Figures provided by Chilanzor FCSS. Figures for previous years not available.
What is the percentage of children without parental care placed in alternative forms of care per year, in both pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?

Table 5 below shows the proportions of children placed in substitute families; adoption, guardianship and patronage (foster care), in pilot and non-pilot regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of children placed in substitute families</th>
<th>Proportion of children placed in substitute families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand (pilot)</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrdarya: Yangier city (pilot)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Rakhimov (pilot)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilanzor (pilot)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashkadarya: Kashi city (non-pilot)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunus Abad (non-pilot)</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzhyazzak (non-pilot)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team learned that the majority of placement decisions were made by Guardianship & Trustee bodies or Commissions on Minors at several levels of local government. But where an FCSS worker had made an assessment of the needs of a child and family, the worker was able to advise or make representations to the appropriate decision-making body. From the survey data provided by the FCSS themselves about their operations it appears that 96% of all out-of-family placement recommendations made by them involved placement in substitute families. According to the data FCSS teams recommended only four children to be placed in institutions, not in substitute families.

Figure 5 compares proportions of children without parental care placed in alternative forms of care and institutions each year from 2006 to 2008 in Sobir Rakhimov and Yunus Abad districts of Tashkent city.

---

4 Statistics collected only for children of Yangier city of Syrdarya oblast
Figure 5: Number of children without parental care placed in alternative forms of care and institutions (pilot – Sobir Rakhimov and non-pilot – Yunus Abad)

The number of children without parental care placed in institutions in pilot Sobir Rakhimov district decreased from 21 in 2006 (no FSCC), 12 in 2007 and only two in 2008. There was also general reduction of children without parental care from 129 in 2006 to 110 in 2008. The opposite picture is demonstrated by non-pilot Yunus Abad district of Tashkent city. The total number of children without parental care increased: 84 in 2006; 120 in 2007 and 133 in 2008. Taking 2006 year as the base line before FCSS was established and when Yunus Abad district had a lower rate of children without parental care, it appears that FCSS may have been instrumental in conducting preventative work and helping to decrease number of placements in institutions.

The similar situation was observed comparing Sobir Rakhimov (pilot) and Khamza (non-pilot) districts in Figure 6 below. In Khamza district the level of placements children in institutions remains significantly high with no clear tendency comparable with Sobir Rakhimov.

Figure 6: Proportion of children placed in institutions and alternative care in Sobir Rakhimov and Khamza districts of Tashkent
**Figure 7** below shows an increasing proportion of children placed in substitute families in Samarkand after the establishment of FCSS in 2007.

**Figure 7: Proportions of children without parental care placed in alternative forms of care and institutions in Samarkand city**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Children in alternative care</th>
<th>Children in institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the percentage of children whose families have been properly assessed by the system in pilot and non-pilot districts?

By examination of the case files of FCSS in pilot regions the team identified that the majority of cases that passed through FCSS were subject to a basic needs assessment. FCSS workers used a version of the Initial Assessment form adapted by Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children from the UK Common Assessment Framework methodology. FCSS staff showed the team evidence of Referral forms, Needs Assessment forms and case notes. Some children and families did not require a full needs assessment but were given simple information or referred on to another agency for assistance. Generally 70% of referrals proceeded to an assessment of need though some FCSS teams assessed 100% of referrals.

The typical file of an FCSS Reintegration case consists of the following documents:

- Initial Assessment;
- Statement of grandmother about reintegration and agreement for guardianship;
- Statement of institution about agreement for reintegration;
- Certificate of Makhalla about place of living;
- Act of Inspection of living conditions;
- Pension certificate;
- Copy of grandmother passport;
- Reference letter;
- Health certificate;
- Court decision about deprivation of parental rights of parents;
- Solicitation of SPON about abolition of previous decision of Khokim regarding placement of a child in children’s home and placement in guardianship;
- Minutes of the meetings of social worker with grandmother;
- Recommendation of social worker about placement in guardianship;
- Conclusion of social worker about living conditions;
- Copy of birth certificate of a child;
- Individual plan of service provision;
- Copy of certificate of ownership for house/flat;
- Previous decisions of Khokim about placement in children’s home;
The typical FCSS file of Prevention case consists of the following documents:

- Record chart with the information about referral;
- Initial Assessment;
- Individual plan of service provision;
- Statement of a child in the event of this case about conflict with the law;
- Certificate of registration authority about number of family members;
- Copy of birth certificate of a child;
- Copy of passport of a mother;
- Reference about a mother;
- Others documents if relevant.

The team observed that a social work needs assessment process was not in place in the non-pilot regions. Decisions were made based on the Act of Inspection of Living Conditions (AILC). For example, the team was told that the procedure in Dzhyzzak region is that referrals to Commissions on Minors are received from the inspector on child surveillance in the Department of Internal Affairs or from the inspector of SPON. The inspector of SPON should do an assessment within one month and then prepare all materials for a review by the Commission that gathers once or twice a month. Once the case is reviewed by the Commission a recommendation is passed to the Khokim who decides on the placement of the child within three days.

The team was told that Dzhyzzak SPON does not collect statistics for placement of children in boarding schools for children with specific educational needs, children with severe disabilities, children with difficult behaviour, children in conflict with the law, children from poor families or children of parents who supervise the sheep. These admissions are authorized by bodies of the Department of Labour & Social Protection, the Department of Education or the Medical-Pedagogical-Psychological Commissions, which itself is part of the local Department of Education.

Based on the review of several cases, it can be said that the assessment start within three days and the decision is made within one month. However, from the discussion with caregivers, it seems that the cases are opened only after all documents are collected by the caregivers, which means that the initial contact with SPON may happen months earlier but gets officially registered only after all documents for processing the case are ready.

The team did not make a detailed examination of the assessment process and procedures used by Guardianship & Trustee bodies, Medical-Pedagogical-Psychological Commissions or Departments of Education to see if they were comparable to the child protection needs assessments made by the FCSS workers. But the evaluators noted with concern the large number of authorised bodies at various levels of government that placed children in residential institutions of one kind or another and were concerned that they were unable to examine in detail the assessment and decision-making procedures used by these bodies.

The evaluators make several recommendations at the end of this report for streamlining the placement decision making process and ensure all children at risk of admission have their needs assessed.

In which way are the stakeholders satisfied with pilot services?

In general stakeholders were positive about their interactions with FCSS services. At a meeting in Chilanzor district, care-givers said that all services were helpful and they appreciate support provided to them by FCSS. The caregivers said that it is difficult at times to provide care for children because of insufficient social allowances. According to the carers children get winter clothes but very often they are ashamed of this because all children from low income families have the same type of clothing. Caregivers
wish to be able to do more for children but most of them are retired and do their best to provide care at the level it is now. Despite all of these issues, they are grateful to FCSS for helping them in keeping children in the family and not in institutions.

Parents in Syrdarya told the team they had a very positive opinion of the FCSS. Asked to give examples to the help they received from FCSS, one parent referred to the help of FCSS to obtain necessary documents. Another parent referred to the humanity of the FCSS worker. Parents in Chilanzor provided the following examples of the help they had received from FCSS:

- defining legal status of the child and restoration of birth certificates
- collection of documents
- search of a disappeared parent
- help in preparing documents
- veto on selling of the child’s apartment in cases of a temporary or long-term out-of-home placement of the child
- ongoing consultations
- help in depriving parental rights in cases of abuse and neglect

A Regional Inspector of SPON in Syrdarya acknowledged that he can observe the difference in quality of work and reports done by the inspector of SPON of Yangi Yyer town after her participation in training, compared to the reports submitted by other inspectors who did not participate in the training. He also emphasized that after the training the social workers changed their attitude to families and now families coming to FCSS are approached in a friendly way, something that did not usually happen in the past.

"It is very important to return children back to their families. However the return depends on the type of family and it is very important to examine if the child will be safe there."

"It would be much better for children living in their own families. Whatever we do here, family is the best place for them."

"Children are waiting for their parents regardless of what kind of parent they have."

- Participants, focus group of staff of institutions, Syrdarya

Institution staff in Chilanzor had positive opinions of FCSS, specifically about its work on prevention of institutionalization and finding alternative solutions for children without parental care. When asked by the evaluator about perceived threats to their jobs as a result of fewer children being placed in institutions, educators said they did not have any fear of losing their jobs and would be very eager to take care of children in the capacity of an educator or a patronage parent if they were paid for that work.

Before the existence of the project, there were no formal social services for vulnerable families, although there was a system for the provision of small amounts of financial assistance through Makhalla and systems of guardianship, adoption and residential care. Consequently, the provision of any system high-quality social services would improve vulnerable families’ access to such services. Thus all of the stakeholders expressed very positive feedback about FCSS.

The most positive indicator was that most people who were interviewed, from senior local government officials through to social workers, were very clear that it was best for children live at home rather than in the Internat. However focus groups with directors and other Internat staff have shown different opinions. Only 30% from 21 interviewed people from Children's home “Mekhribonlik” agreed that family, even a poor family, is better for a child.
“...In Children's Homes children are getting more than in poor families. Here children have access to better education, better development and good clothing but in such family only dirt and poverty ...”

- Staff member of Children’s Home “Mekhribonlik”, Samarkand

Clients gave very high estimation of the project’s work according to evaluation form. Twenty-four families participated in the semi-structured focus group discussions. All of them confirmed that their families were in worse situation before they started receiving social support. Among positive changes the families referred to included improvement of child’s health and family climate. Carers considered communication with social worker and psychological support to be the most necessary element of social support. It shows the importance of psycho-social support as an important factor for improving the family’s situation along with material support.

“...Communication with social worker helped me overcome a barrier of detachment and loneliness. Due to support of social worker my health and material condition has improved. I was pregnant and I received better food so important during that period. I am also very grateful for moral and psychological support. Due to the meetings and conversations with social worker I started communicating with my relatives...”

- Family N., Samarkand

The Deputy Khokim of Chilanzor mentioned that there is a huge benefit from FCSS. According to her, FCSS had capacity and skills for better assessment and analysis of the situation of vulnerable families, which is very helpful in further decision making process, though she did not specify how it helped the decision-making process.

A Deputy Khokim view of the FCSS

“I think that FCSS is really helpful. Such services were created by the request of the life. FCSS is really instrumental in providing support to vulnerable families. I am very satisfied with the work of social workers and would like such services to be disseminated across the country...”

- Deputy Khokim, Samarkand

The interviews with staff of FCSS have shown that the social workers have taken a practical and pragmatic view of their responsibilities. In order to return children home they have negotiated with local businesses, Khokimiyat officials and Makhallas to help families to receive any financial benefits. Alongside this they have provided psychological support to parents and guardians as well as helping children adapt to return home and their new schools.

Wherever possible, the opportunity was taken to talk to the children and young people themselves to enable them to express their views about their situation and the help they had received from FCSS. A member of the team was able to meet two children recently reintegrated to their biological families in Samarkand city. A six year old girl said that she was so happy to come back home. She said that she experienced physical abuse from older children in the institution where she was placed.

What is the difference in work approach of childcare service providers in pilot versus non-pilot districts (existence and usage of tools, mechanisms, etc.)?

The biggest difference in work approaches in pilot and non-pilot regions is that FCSS workers use an internationally recognised Case Management approach to assess the needs of vulnerable children and
families and plan an intervention to support the child at home or reintegrate the child back home wherever safe and possible. As a result of their training they use a well defined assessment procedure to make a holistic assessment of the needs of the child and family. Based on that assessment, FCSS workers develop a care plan to draw on local resources to support the child in the family. When the risk of being placed in an institution has reduced to a reasonable level the case of the child and family is closed.

On the other hand, the approaches used in non-pilot regions appear to be more administrative. Applications to place a child in an institution are processed once the necessary documents and certificates have been collected and presented to the decision-making body. The team did not see evidence that the needs of children were assessed by responsible workers in non-pilot regions.

The semi-structured interviews with the social workers and key officials from Khokimiyats in pilot areas have shown a good level of knowledge about child protection and the protection of children's rights. Most of the stakeholders, apart of some internat staff, recognised the fundamental right of children to grow up in their family according to UNCRC.

However in both pilot and non pilot areas the team witnessed that significant resources were invested in the system of Children's Homes “Mekhrbonlik” in order to improve the living conditions. Some of them looks like “palaces in the jungles” and are very attractive for poor families (Picture 1&2). Thus many families consider that it is better place for their children to be brought up and educated.

**Picture 1&2: Children’s Home in Karshy, Kashqadarya oblast**

It was also certainly clear from interviews with senior officials in the pilot sites that there was an understanding that a new approach that focused on supporting families and keeping children in families was being applied. The new approach focussed on assessing the needs of children and families and developing an intervention plan that supported the child at home wherever safe to do so, as opposed to an administrative process that focussed on the collection and assembly of required documents and certificates.

The team also heard from stakeholders in pilot areas that there has been a significant change in the approach to family problems. Their opinion and attitude has been changed from non-acceptance to understanding of family problems. Social workers in particular mentioned that their attitudes to work changed in following ways:

- They started approaching children more individually.
They got to an understanding that the family is the best place for a child and more preventive work should be done with the families.
- Attitudes to families have been changed and they treat them in a friendly way. It is something that did not usually happen in the past.
- They understood that residential institution is the last option for a child placement.
- Their attitude to their own children has been changed also.

**Is there a difference between the level of knowledge of childcare professionals in pilot versus non-pilot districts on de-institutionalization, placements of children, alternative care for children without parental care? If yes, what is this difference?**

Observation of local processes and procedures showed that the reality of the social work approach was different in pilot and non-pilot areas. The initial training of FCSS staff funded by UNICEF and coordinated by the RCSAC was vital to change the existing practice of work in the child protection system. From the visits and meeting different stakeholders it was clear that trainings became a central aspect of the projects. All of the social workers and a number of other staff who were consulted, expressed strong views about the training that they received. Most of the training they had was carried out by Technical Advisers from the UK and it was evident from people’s comments that it was done particularly well and brought new knowledge and skills to the fields. The team reviewed samples of the ongoing FCSS cases and identified that social workers from pilot sites were able to use a range of techniques and methods of working with families and children such as conducting needs assessment, counselling, case management etc. The team did not see evidence that SPON inspectors and CoM in non-pilot areas used case management assessment tools, intervention plans or recognised social work techniques in their work with children and families. Neither do non-pilot SPON inspectors receive supervision from RCSAC.

### 2.2. Effectiveness and efficiency

**Effectiveness:**

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation set out the following key questions for the evaluation in order to assess the effectiveness of the project:

- Were there areas (technical or geographical) in which the pilot intervention (FCSS and social work) was more effective? If so, what factors could account for the difference?
- Were there areas (technical or geographical) in which the pilot intervention (FCSS and social work) was less effective? If so, what factors could account for the difference?
- Are the piloted referral mechanisms working correctly/being applied correctly?
- Are the children/families served get better and more sustainable solutions as per the principles of de-institutionalisation and right of children to family life?

**Were there areas (technical or geographical) in which the pilot intervention (FCSS and social work) was more effective? If so, what factors could account for the difference?**

In order to find the answer on this question the team examined FCSS case records to compare three pilot regions; Samarkand, Sobir Rakhimov and Chilanzor districts of Tashkent city. The three FCSS were created approximately the same time in 2007 and have a similar number of staff. It is assumed that the more cases on prevention and reintegration and patronage that passed through FCSS the more effective they became as workers acquired knowledge and experience. The team did not take into consideration cases of FCSS connected with placement of children in out of home care such as adoption, guardianship and institutions for the following reason. From the review of the case records the difference in work approaches towards placement was not clear. For example a case connected with placement in guardianship was conducted by the same SPON inspector and all documentation was absolutely the same. However in some cases it was recorded by FCSS, in other cases it was processed by the
Guardianship & Trustee body. The evaluators did observe however that generally the quality of family assessment made by an FCSS worker was of a high standard. The evaluators also noted that FCSS workers provided continuing support to guardians after an order was made, unlike the process in non-pilot regions.

Figure 8: Number of FCSS cases in pilot areas

Looking at prevention, reintegration and patronage in Samarkand city (Figure 8), a total number of 98 cases were handled over 2007-2008 years. Thirty-three cases were handled in Sobir Rakhimov and 38 cases in Chilanzor. It can be seen that in the second year of operation all three teams handled more prevention, reintegration and patronage cases than in their first year of operation. This is probably due to FCSS workers developing greater confidence and skills, plus their existence may have become more widely known among potential referrers of children at risk.

Were there areas (technical or geographical) in which the pilot intervention (FCSS and social work) was less effective? If so, what factors could account for the difference?

FCSSs are less effective at region (oblast) level due to lack of the connection with vulnerable families. The evaluators make recommendations for locating FCSS at the end of this report. In Gulistan (Syrdarya) FCSS had only recently been established and told the evaluators that because of their limited capacity to respond to referrals they had widely informed potential referring agencies and beneficiaries about their service.

The incomplete case record keeping by FCSS workers in Syrdarya was noted by the team. It raises the possibility that other aspects of their functioning might also be less than satisfactory. The team were told by the FCSS workers that they had not received regular monthly supervision from the Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children. This illustrates the importance of regular professional and management supervision of FCSS workers by knowledgeable and skilled first-line managers. Recommendations about strengthening supervision of the FCSS teams are made at the end of this report.

Are the piloted referral mechanisms working correctly/being applied correctly?

There was no clear evidence of formal and established referral mechanisms in all pilot sites. Most of the referrals were either self referral or from the personal network of social workers. However children who passed through FCSS were properly assessed and an institution was used only as the last option. From the beginning of the pilots it was acknowledged by UNICEF and the RCSAC that the limited number of
retrained social workers could not intervene in all potential admissions to institutions. Therefore the pilots deliberately targeted SPON inspectors and the children with whom they worked. As a result of this necessary constraint many children placed in institutions did not pass through FCSS, for example, children with disabilities, children with behaviour problems, and children from poor families.

The other observation by the team was the lack of information about FCSS among potential referrers and the general public. Most stakeholders including client families did not recognise the name of “Family and Children Support Services”. They knew the social workers in person and still referred to old systems and names.

From interviews of social workers it was apparent that there was a lack of access/ eligibility criteria to the FCSS. Thus families are included into FCSS if the workload allows. Additional cases were not provided with an FCSS service over the normal ten families per social worker limit and instead referred on to SPON. A recommendation is made at the end of this report to develop eligibility criteria.

**Are the children/families served get better and more sustainable solutions as per the principles of de-institutionalisation and right of children to family life?**

In all reviewed prevention cases in three pilot areas (Figure 9) there was no evidence or indication that the child was placed at risk as a result of the support of the FCSS worker to remain in the family.

The team reviewed all 31 reintegration cases in Samarkand FCSS and no evidence or indication was found that the situation of the child had broken down and the child had needed to be re-admitted to the institution.

*Figure 9: Number of prevention cases over 2007-2008*

There is still small number of cases since FCSS started to make the convincing conclusion about sustainable solutions. Every child is a unique individual and it is not appropriate here to make any generalization. Thus every case should be treated individually in terms of sustainable solution.

**Efficiency**

*In terms of efficiency (seen as the capacity to achieve childcare system’s objectives in the most efficient way), the evaluation should answer to this tentative and demonstrative set of questions:*

- On average, how long is the process from referral to destination of the child in pilot and non pilot areas?
- What is the level of cost-efficiency for the implementation/functioning of the pilot and non pilot system?
On average, how long is the process from referral to destination of the child in pilot and non pilot areas?

The time of placement of orphans and children without parental care from referral to final destination (guardianship, children’s homes etc.) in both pilot and non pilot areas was not longer than one month. This time period is defined by the Family Code of Republic of Uzbekistan.

The answer on this question relied mainly on data collected in pilot regions. The fullest information was gathered from Samarkand city. Thus the most of the corollaries about working time were drawn based on the data received from Samarkand FCSS.

Figure 10 shows the proportion of distribution of work time of the staff of FCSSs in the pilot district - Samarkand. The answers collected through examining records of FCSS and interviewing the personnel of FCSSs formed the following picture: average time spent on prevention cases was 97 days.

Figure 11 shows the proportion of distribution of work time of the staff of FCSSs in the pilot district - Samarkand. The answers collected through examining records of FCSS and interviewing the personnel of FCSSs formed the following picture: average time spent on reintegration case was 58 days.

**Figure 10: Prevention cases, Samarkand, 2007-2008**

**Figure 11: Reintegration cases, Samarkand, 2007-2008**
From experience in other countries the average time for prevention cases is usually less than for reintegration cases. A reintegration case often requires a number of lengthy administrative processes to be completed. Plus, the reintegration plan may include ‘trial periods’ for the child back home to enable the social worker to monitor the home situation before deciding that it is safe for the child to stay at home permanently. The opposite picture in Samarkand is shown, (Figure 12). It is difficult to know exactly how to interpret these figures. By examining cases and interviews with social workers and internat staff the team was given to understand that it is because social workers worked with the easiest reintegration cases. It is possible that prevention cases took more time because social workers were new and did not have the experience of using new instruments and techniques of working with vulnerable groups. The team suggest the picture will be reversed as soon as social workers become more experienced and FCSSs operate for longer.

**Figure 12: Average time per case, Samarkand FCSS, 2007-2008**

What is the level of cost-efficiency for the implementation/functioning of the pilot and non pilot system?

In order to compare the cost to the State of institutionalisation and support in a family, this question can only be fully answered by a detailed study of the costs of care in institutions in Uzbekistan and computation of the cost of a sample of FCSS interventions that support a child in a family. Such a study is outside the terms of reference for this evaluation. Therefore reference is made to a study\(^5\) that examined the costs of care in countries on Central Europe and CIS countries, see Figure 13 below, and to studies of care costs in other CIS countries.

\(^5\) **Family matters: a study of institutional childcare in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.** Richard Carter, EveryChild, 2005
It can be seen in Figure 13 that although the costs of providing family-based care are considerably less than those of institutional care, the resultant savings will not be received immediately. This is because it is necessary to set up alternatives before an institutional system has been closed down or reduced in size, to enable a smooth transition.

This effective ‘double-running’ means that the costs over the transitional period will be greater than under the old system. Initial costs during the transition to the new system are higher than under the old system but as institutions are gradually closed, the costs are reduced as the new system takes over. These extra transitional costs must be regarded as an investment to the introduction of a new and better system.

Studies of the costs of care in institutions in other CIS countries invariably show the high cost of institutional care. Some studies even compare the costs of supporting the child in a family. For example, the annual cost of caring for a child in an internat in Moldova in 2005 was 10,689 lei ($969 at current exchange rates). The study separated the education costs ($315) and the care costs ($655). The study also calculated the cost of reintegration and family support as between $426 and $493, depending on whether the child used the services of a Family Support Centre.

A recent study of the 2009 costs of care in Kazakhstan revealed the annual cost of caring for a child in an orphan house or correctional institution to be $5,000. Annual cost to the State for a child in foster care (patronage) - $1,700. Annual cost to the State of paying an allowance to a guardian - $400. The study calculated the total cost to the State of a caring for a child who entered an orphan house aged six years (the average age of admission in Kazakhstan) and remained there until graduation was a truly alarming $55,000.

A study of the 2009 costs to the State of caring for children in institution in Azerbaijan showed that the annual cost to the State of caring for a child in an institution in Baku is $4,703. The annual cost of caring for a baby in an Azerbaijan baby house was $13,193, because of the large numbers of staff required to care for babies.

Each of the above studies repeats the findings of earlier cost studies in Georgia, South Africa, the USA, the UK and other countries; that care in institutions is extremely costly. It is important not to compare the costs of institutional care across countries. Staff, fuel, food costs, etc., will vary from country to country. The important thing is that institutional care in all countries studied is invariably more expensive than supporting a child at home or in a substitute family. The evaluators would be very surprised if a similar study of the

---

6 the same
7 the same. P. 33
8 Larter, D & E Vereritsa, Services for children in difficulty – Residential care/Community-based services, TACIS project “Capacity Building in Social Policy Reform in Moldova”, 2005
costs of institutional care in Uzbekistan did not also reach the same conclusion that caring for children in institutions is very expensive, especially when compared to the cost of supporting a child in its family or substitute family. It should also be noted that the care costs above do not include the additional loss to the country's economy of the graduate output of institutions who become economically unproductive adult citizens or adults who represent a cost to the State for increased health care or incarceration in prison.

Of course supporting a child at home or in a substitute family is not a nil cost. There are three components to costing community-based alternatives; the setting-up costs of the FCSS team, its on-going operational costs and the cost of the support package to the child and family. Based on the information from the field we can calculate setting up costs (SC) and the cost of a sample of FCSS case work interventions (CS). In order to do so we use the added cost approach to find out cost for setting up FCSS. The added cost will be calculated by summing up recruitment cost (RC), cost of social work gross salary (GS), training cost (TC), equipment and stationary cost (ESC), transport expenditure (TE) and other costs connected with management and supervision (coefficient Δ ≤ 10% of total cost for setting up FCSS). The formula does not take into account office costs and other running costs because normally all FCSSs use already existing premises of Khokimiyats and communication. This cost has been already budgeted in Khokimiyat budget.

Therefore formula for calculation of total cost will be following:

\[ SC = RC + \sum_{i=1}^{n} GS_i + TC + ESC + TE + \Delta; \quad (1) \]

Interviews with key Khokimiyat officials and the National Team on Social work gave an understanding that average time needed for retraining of social workers was about six months and they received at least three basic trainings on social work with families. Thus the average time required for to set up an FCSS is six months and the formula will be modified as follows:

\[ SC = RC + 6 \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} GS_i + 3 \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} TCP_i + ESC + TE + \Delta; \quad (2) \]

\( TCP_i \) is training cost per \( i \) person, where \( i = 1 .. n \) number of social workers per FCSS team. \( TCP_i \) consists of UNICEF budget allocated per one training per \( n \) number of participants (including all related costs like trainers fee, lodging and refreshments) divided by \( n \) trainees. Equipment and stationary will be constant as it was one off provision. The cost of transport \( TE \) is also considered as the constant for the period of setting up period of FCSS.

So cost of setting up new FCSS with three social workers will be \( i=1 \ldots 3 \) :

\[ GS_1=285000, \; GS_{2,3}=20000 \; (UZS) \]

\[ SC(FCSS)=150000+6\times(285000+20000+2000)+3\times3\times67500+285000+270000+756759=8621250 \; (UZS) \]

\[ \text{equivalent to US$5,747} \]

In reality in Samarkand this figure was even less because they did not organize open recruitment and did not employ extra social workers. The social workers of FCSS were transferred from the Department of Education, Commission on Minors and local policlinic. They only work for FCSS part time and continue to receive salary from their main working place. UNICEF has only paid 100,000 UZS per month per person for their extra responsibilities. The travel cost was not also allocated. Therefore the setting up cost for Samarkand FCSS was:

\[ SC(Sam)=0+6\times100000+12\times100000+3\times3\times67500+285000+0+525750=5783250 \; (UZS) \]

This is US$3,855 only, which was spent for setting up FCSS in Samarkand city. From the interviews with other pilot sites we have drawn the conclusion that this figure is applicable also for the FCSS in other areas.

\[ 11 \text{ Salary figures were provided by Finance Department of Khokimiyat, other costs by UNICEF} \]
The cost of a sample of FCSS case work interventions (CS) is calculated in the following way:

\[ CS = UC \times k + \alpha(3) \]

Where the monthly unit cost \( UC \) of providing a social worker service is obtained by dividing the annual gross salary of social workers \( GSi \) by the ten families on the social worker’s caseload. Thus the full cost of the social service provided to the family \( (CS) \) is obtained by multiplying the monthly unit cost of the social worker \( (UC) \) by the number of months \( (n) \) the family is on the project and then adding the total value of the financial and material aid given to the family \( (\alpha) \) (Formula 3). For example, if a family was on the project for six months and received 20,000 UZS in financial and material aid during that time, the cost of providing the service to that family is calculated as:

\[ UC = \frac{200000}{10 \times 12} = 1666.7 \text{ UZS} \] (which is \( \sim 11.11 \text{ US$} \))

\[ CS = 1666.7 \times 6 + 20000 = 30000 \text{ UZS} \] (which is \( \sim 20 \text{ US$} \))

In reality, there is insufficient data about the amount of financial and material aid accessed by FCSS workers as it was not allocated in UNICEF or Khokimiyats budgets. Most of the financial aid was provided by relief organisations or local businesses and are ignored by the purpose of our calculation.

For Samarkand prevention case where average working time was 97 days which is 4.5 months (Figure 12) the cost of sample was actually:

\[ CS = 1666.7 \times 4.5 = 7500 \text{ UZS} \] (which was 5 US$).

**Conclusion on effectiveness and efficiency**

One way to identify the effectiveness of the FCSS pilots is to compare two different scenarios. First scenario is the system where there is no FCSS as in non-pilot area. The second scenario is with FCSS. By asking the question, “How many children would be placed in out of home care if there were no FCSS in place?” The answer to this question for Samarkand city is shown in Figure 14.

**Figure 14: Scenarios of institutionalisation with and without FCSS in Samarkand**

![Graph showing scenarios of institutionalisation](image)
**Figure 14** suggests that a lack of family support will raise the percentage of institutionalisation. In Samarkand city the absence of FCSS in 2007 would increase the institutionalisation by 48% and in 2008 by 88%.

The analysis presented above demonstrates that the pilot FCSS initiative is efficient and effective, and has a positive impact on the provision of childcare services.

### 2.3. Sustainability and relevance of the project

#### Sustainability

In terms of sustainability, this evaluation should ultimately give light to the following question: in case the above analysis demonstrates that the pilot initiative is more effective, efficient and has a more positive impact on the provision of childcare services, is there potential for scaling up of FCSS countrywide and its official incorporation to the childcare system? In more detail, this should be addressed considering this tentative and demonstrative set of questions:

What is the level of ownership adopted by the Government at local and national level on this pilot initiative and on the incorporation of social workers in the official childcare system?

Is there any evidence of political will from different Government stakeholders at national and local level to constructively analyze the results of the pilot initiative and ultimately be open to adopt a new system based on its results?

What is the level of ownership adopted by the Government at local and national level on this pilot initiative and on the incorporation of social workers in the official childcare system?

The structure of the child protection system in Uzbekistan is presented schematically in Annexe 3 to this report. It can be seen that many central and local structures are dealing with child protection.

#### Ownership at national level

Published policies and plans were examined for evidence that national and local government structures intend or are considering concrete child protection reforms at local and national levels. There are policies that show the Government of Uzbekistan faces challenges and opportunities to modify the existing child protection system. The most significant policy development is the adoption of the Law on the Guarantees of the Rights of the Child, which recognizes the child’s right to a family environment and a child’s placement to an institution only as a last resort. This law becomes an important starting point for changes in secondary legislation.

An important strategic document is the Plan of Actions on Securing Child Welfare in Uzbekistan for 2007-2011, approved by the Cabinet of Ministers on 15th January 2007. This document foresees the following primary tasks:

- Creation of centres of educational, psychological, material and social support of vulnerable families at makhalla level in order to prevent placement children in institutions (2007); (p.27)
- Conduct monitoring of vulnerable families and organize social support based on interdepartmental cooperation (2007-2008); (p28, 60)
- Develop programmes for social services development for children in difficult conditions; (p59)
- Study and implement best international practices regarding development of foster care and other forms of substitute families. (p54, 55)

It is understood that the National Plan is being reviewed by Government and updated this year. The review will possibly provide some indication of the Government’s attitude and intentions towards the FCSS.

#### Ownership at local level

Final Report 18\textsuperscript{th} November 2009
There was evidence of local ownership for the establishment and implementation of FCSS. For example, key documents were approved by local public authorities (mayors of the regions/municipalities):

- Memorandum of understanding between RCSAC, UNICEF and Local Public Authorities regarding establishment of FCSS;
- Regulation of FCSS;
- Terms of reference for social workers and the head of the unit FCSS.

The team had meetings with Deputy Khokims in the pilot regions. In several pilot regions the team was able to meet Khokims, as well as the Head of the units of local Departments of Public Education. It was apparent in meetings with Khokims and deputy Khokims in pilot regions that there is goodwill towards the FCSS. According to Mrs. Muattar Sadykova – deputy khokim of Chilanzar district, there is a huge benefit from FCSS. According to her the FCSS has capacity and skills for better assessment and analysis of the situation of vulnerable families and the family’s eagerness to change, which is very helpful in further decision making process. In her opinion FCSS should be further developed and be established in all regions, cities and districts. Members of the Commission of Minors of Chilanzor district told the evaluator that the FCSS supported and complemented their work. In their opinion the service should be made more widely available.

During the field visit in the meeting with Ms. Khikoyat Rakhmatova, Deputy Khokim of Samarkand city, she mentioned, “It was requirement of the life for setting up such services. We believe that family is the best place where a child can fully realize his/her potential.”

Ms. Dilshoda Khaydarova – Deputy Khokim of Syrdarya region and Gulom Abdusalomov – Regional secretary of the Commission on Minors, Syrdarya, told the evaluator that FCSS was supported in the region and that they would be committed to expanding it if that was the policy of central government.

Ms. Dilshoda Khaydarova said the successes of the FCSS pilots are:

- less children get admitted to the Children’s Town, Gulistan. (This is an institution established by the local public authority, not an NGO).
- when there are parents, social workers try to prevent institutionalization and also explore opportunities of placement with kinship families
- it is possible to assess situation of the family more thoroughly

Concerning the weaknesses of the pilots, deputy Khokims said:

- The results are not visible enough at this point in order to be evaluated, because of short time of implementation;
- There is not enough information in the society about alternative types of care;
- Not many people know about FCSS;
- FCSS does not have official status and use personal connection and other officials for solving issue;
- Personnel of FCSS share job and are overloaded;
- There is the risk that existing staff of FCSS never leave their main post even when FCSS is embedded in the system;
- Capacity of people is not enough to cover the whole region, there is no transport for visiting families;
- There are not enough people at the district level. A similar structure has to be developed at that level;
- There is no eligibility criteria to access FCSS and target audience;
- No database of vulnerable families existed;
• There is lack of office equipment such as computers, copiers, printers, etc. Social workers in Tashkent told the evaluators that their ability to serve more families was restricted because they did not have access to transport or a car to make home visits.

Makhallas are also involved in child protection issues through an advisor who is responsible for child and family issues. According to the Deputy Khokim-Chilanzor district makhallas have an important role in child protection. Therefore questions about ownership by local government should also consider ownership of new approaches to child protection at makhalla level.

Despite the weaknesses reported above, the evaluators concluded FCSS had been accepted by senior local government officials in pilot regions as making a positive contribution to social welfare. Recommendations are made at the end of this report for strengthening ownership of FCSS by local khokimiyats through increasing their capacity to manage and supervise the teams.

Is there any evidence of political will from different Government stakeholders at national and local level to constructively analyze the results of the pilot initiative and ultimately be open to adopt a new system based on its results?

Based on the interviews with central and local public authorities in pilot regions it is possible to conclude that local public authorities are satisfied with the newly established services. There is no reason to think that local public authorities will not consider the results of the pilots. They appear ready to adopt new child protection systems but understandably they look to national government to lead on reforms.

What are the existing capacities of local authorities (Khokimiyats) to adopt a new approach of Family and Child Support Services?

What are the existing capacities of local departments of public education to start restructuring Trusteeship and Guardianship departments?

From the discussions with deputy Khokims of pilot regions concerning the integration of the FCSS into khokimiyat structure they appeared to hold three contrasting opinions about how best to proceed:

1. FCSS should be a part of the Department of Education as it would ensure that children, families and schools know about FCSS and would be able to apply for services whenever needed. Also was mentioned that at the local level schools should be the main social providers and post of social workers should be introduced in every mainstream school. In this case at the central level the coordination role will belong to the MoE.

2. FCSS might be a separate structure as well. At the oblast and rayon level this department will be one decision making body and will be responsible for all vulnerable and out of home care children. Practical preventative social work will be provided on Makhalla level. The same time rayon Family and Child Department will be responsible for the development of alternative care and social support of foster parents. In this case at the central level a new structure for the coordination should be established.

3. Establish FCSS under Social Protection Department at the oblast and rayon level and at the central level within the Ministry of Labour & Social Protection. One SPON inspector from a non-pilot region said, “My job has nothing in common with other units of the Department of Education. In order to help families I send them to Social Protection Department where they can get at least some allowances. Schools are not the best place for child social protection. Teachers from the schools usually live far away from the place where children are from. Makhalla is closer to the vulnerable children and knows better the family’s situation”.

There are arguments for and against all three opinions outlined above. It is the opinion of the evaluators that care of vulnerable children is not an education issue. It is a social care issue. Locating FCSS services within Ministry of Education and local Departments of Education misses the point that children are placed in institutions by many other non-education bodies. On the other hand the current culture and procedures of the Ministry and Departments of Labour & Social Protection emphasise financial solutions to
vulnerability. Creating a completely new department (of child protection?) risks failing to learn lessons from the experience of Kyrgyzstan where the new Family & Child Support Departments are effectively unconnected with other Ministries and local government departments that have social protection functions. The evaluators make a firm recommendation for the location of FCSS child protection functions and accountability at the end of this report.

All decision making staff from pilot regions support the idea of the development of FCSS as a model for a national child protection system. At the same time obstacles to national child protection reforms was mentioned:

- Lack of qualified staff and a need to train specialists;
- Establishment of similar structures at the district levels;
- A need to align legislation accordingly;
- Ensuring funding;
- Change of people’s mentality.

It is the opinion of the evaluators that attempting to restructure SPON departments misses several points in addition to the point made above, that care of vulnerable children and families is a social care issue, not an education issue. That without reforms to other components of the child protection system, for example, streamlining out-of-family decision-making, restructuring SPON departments is only a partial solution.

Local government officials at pilot oblast and District levels understood that in order to extend the FCSS service to cover the whole region central government would need to accept and promote the FCSS approach. Adoption of the FCSS approach was a strategic decision to be made by central government and for local public government to implement. In the same time it is necessary to mention that some deputy Khokims from non pilot regions do not know about FCSS or acknowledged that there was some information about FCSS but they do not have a thorough knowledge about it at this point.

What are the major factors which influence the scaling up of FCSS nationwide and the incorporation of social workers in the official system?

How to mainstream Family and Child Support Services into the national policy, strategies and action plans in Uzbekistan?

FCSS as they are currently organised demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of social work interventions to support vulnerable children and families. But in order to scale them up to a national level a number of issues need to be addressed:

- FCSS workers are undertaking FCSS duties in addition to their regular jobs – they are working part-time.
- FCSS pilots have been incorporated into local government structures but there is not a framework for them within central government structures. A line of accountability would need to be drawn from FCSS at the local level to an appropriate Ministry at central government level.
- First-line management support by the Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children has demonstrated the need and importance of regular supervision and monitoring of social workers but if social work assessment and intervention teams are to be scaled up then a more appropriate process is to train team leaders and other first-line managers in supervision and management skills.
- FCSS services that are located at oblast level are remote from knowledge about local needs and resources. A number of local government officials said it would be better to invest in social work services at the makhalla and district level.
- Currently State budgets are directed towards funding institutional care, not community-based alternatives. Any plan to scale up FCSS-type services would ideally reduce bed capacity and spending on institutions in order to reinvest the savings in community-based alternatives. See the Recommendations section at the end of this report.
Most importantly of all, current placement decision making systems do not route all children thought to be at risk through an FCSS service for a needs assessment. Children continue to ‘leak’ past FCSS to be placed in institutions without their needs being assessed and the possibility considered of supporting them in their family or substitute family.

The major factor that should influence the scaling up of FCSS nationwide and the incorporation of social workers in the official system is the National Plan of Actions for Securing Child Welfare in Uzbekistan. The Plan is a welcome statement of general principles for securing and improving the welfare of children of Uzbekistan generally. For example it discusses ways to improve child and maternal health, promoting and improving education, improving financial assistance to low income families. But without wishing to be critical the National Plan is not specific enough in setting out a strategic vision for the protection of vulnerable children and children lacking parental care.

The National Plan does discuss the importance of education and financial support to vulnerable children and families but an effective national environment that protects children is much more complex consisting as it does an inter-connected and integrated system of primary and secondary laws, regulations, standards, policies, procedures, capacities, structures, systems and services that together aim to protect children. The inter-connectedness of those components requires attention to be focussed on reforming each component simultaneously. The National Plan commits the Government of Uzbekistan and NGOs to better protect and promote the welfare of vulnerable children but a more detailed strategy for a child protection system is required within the framework of the National Plan, one that is recommended at the end of this report.

How to mainstream Social Work retraining program into the national retraining policy and action plans in Uzbekistan?

It is necessary to mention that Social Work retraining program is included into the national retraining policy and actually the four-month re-training program is provided by the Tashkent State Institute of Culture. The Department of Social Work was established in 2004 in Tashkent State Institute of Culture. The Department is teaching the undergraduate course leading to a BA degree and the four-month in-service diploma course. The Institute is also offering a Masters course. An undergraduate social work course is also taught in Samarkand State University. The Ministry of Higher & Specialized Secondary Education has recognized these programs and the official diploma of social workers is given to the staff that have completed a recognized social work course. Official recognition by the Ministry is giving sustainability to development of social work in Uzbekistan.

The interviews with the National Team showed that the participants had been generally satisfied both with the knowledge and level of the taught classes and organizational arrangements. Some staff who had completed the programme said it could be improved by incorporating work-place practical assignments.

Action to mainstream social work retraining into a national retraining plan, i.e., to increase national social work human resources, needs to be part of a larger child protection system reform strategy that includes plans to reduce institutional bed capacity and increase employment opportunities in community-based services. Simply enlarging a retraining program without paying attention to where it would be most effective to employ retrained staff is not a good way to go.

Relevance

In terms of relevance, the evaluation should provide UNICEF with feedback on the relevance of its approach in the area of child care system reform at the local level in order to:

- Reveal gaps in the approaches used and recommend corrections in the strategy.
- Reveal good practices in the approaches used to be further enhanced in the strategy.

In specific the following questions need to be answered:
- Is the piloted structure of FCSS coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services’ provision at local level and to the reality of the different regions of Uzbekistan?

- Are the piloted internal mechanisms of FCSS coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services’ provision at local level and to the reality of the different regions of Uzbekistan?

On the basis of interviews with stakeholders in the regions the team concluded that locating FCSS at the region (oblast) level was not the best solution. Because of large regional populations and large territory (long distances) FCSS that were located at oblast level were far from the communities and relating to the conditions for the activities was difficult. FCSS located at District level were closer to the communities they served but other factors such as the size of the District population and transport difficulties influenced their work.

For example, the population of the Syrdarya oblasti is 707,000 people. There are eight regional districts and three towns and cities. In the same time the team of FCSS was not provided with car and the number of inhabitants is too many for a small team of social workers. Social work requires a worker to visit family homes, relatives and other services to observe and assess a situation. For this issue FCSS are not provided with transport or money to use public transport. At the moment the services are not financially supported to do this type of activity, although this is expected of them. This means that FCSS are not completely coherently tailored to the needs of the reality of the different regions.

The internal mechanisms and procedures used in all pilot regions were the same. They are the ones proposed by Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children and provided during the training of social workers. These mechanisms and procedures attempt to respond to the local needs and situations. At the same time FCSS documentation is not endorsed by any ministries. Social workers have to complete officially approved documentation as well as tools for the piloting. A recommendation for official approval of FCSS documents and procedures is made at the end of this report.

Is the piloted structure and content of the 4-months retraining program coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services’ provision and to the reality of Uzbekistan?

Based on a review of the content and teaching methods of the four-month retraining course it is possible to say that the course is taught by modules and structured in a way that students attend lectures for 1.5 months and return to their work places to collect information and write their thesis papers.

The staffs of the Tashkent State Institute of Culture who are teaching the four-month retraining course use the following training methodology: interactive work, power point presentations, work on flip-charts, work with cases studies and role plays. When asked about other methodologies (coaching, mentoring), the respondents were not familiar with the terms. Also it was said that there are not enough opportunities for field education. Often practical skills are taught through analyzing illustrations and cases.

Going back home for 2.5 months the participants of the training usually are too focussed on their work and do not have full knowledge of the system of social protection. Though participants are employed in child care settings they had limited knowledge of other child care services and felt they would benefit their professional understanding to be able to visit and observe other services. The evaluators noted that the child protection system in Uzbekistan is very complicated and is not always clear even for those who are working in this system. There are several ministries and many departments responsible for children leading
to duplication. At the same time, absent or insufficient guidance and clear instructions in the fields create a problem with full implementation of primary legislations. For example, the Law on Guarantee of the Right of the Child is not fully operational due to lack of secondary legislation, instructions and practical tools for implementation.

Workers in the newly established Syrdarya team said their understanding and effectiveness would be improved if they were able to visit a more established FCSS team such as Samarkand or Tashkent to learn from their experience. It was suggested that it would be good to include a one-week practice (field visits) in order to familiarize students with specifics of other organizations and establishments working in the system of social protection of children (SPON, institutions, foster families etc), also to have time for more theory.

During focus group discussion with the staff that have completed the four-month retraining programme from Tashkent (14 participants) they mentioned that:

- the programme was well organized and was very interesting
- training needs were fully satisfied
- a good scope of knowledge was received
- a combination of theory with its immediate applicability in practice was very useful
- understanding of system approach was very helpful in reconsidering work practices
- programme helped in systematizing knowledge which is already existed
- interactive methods were interesting and helpful in analyzing material provided
- the programme was too short. It was supposed to be four months but it was less.
- there was a lot of information but not enough time to analyze everything due to intensity of the course
- the programme did not cover all aspects of work with children (i.e. children in conflict with law) and did not teach how to work with parents

Asked if the training had changed the way they thought about their job, the group agreed that the programme helped to bring many changes into work and personal life. The following examples regarding training changes were given by participants in focus group discussion.

Generally feedback from course participants underlined the importance of on-going training, that learning and competence did not stop after their initial training.

“A lot of things I used to do were done by intuition. The course helped me to get a theoretical back up to what I do.” (RCSAC, specialist)

“After completing the course, I changed my attitude to people around me and most importantly to my own family and children.” (Educator of boarding school)

“The programme helped to realize that we tend to look for problems in the child but not in his/her family and environment....” (Educator of school)

Regarding the challenge faced by trained staff in the training programme the following issues were highlighted by the group:

- It was difficult to understand an Assessment frame. It is very time consuming and not adapted to local situation (i.e. language, some questions). It seems like it was developed at theoretic level and is not fully applicable at the level of practice.
- There was too much information in a very short time.
• Some of the graduates did not receive training on supervision but others did. It would be good if it is provided also for those who did not receive it because it is very much needed in practice.

• There were not enough practical sessions when people could practice their newly acquired skills under supervision of trainers. It would be also useful to video record such sessions.

• Lack of field trips/visits.

During focus group discussion for the improvement of the retraining programme, was proposed:

• Materials could be better adapted to local conditions;

• The programme ought to be longer;

• The programme should have a foundation course to provide an overview of all directions of social work as an introduction in social work profession as such;

• It is very important to further develop the programme and train more people, even in a way the programme is now and not all changes recommended now are integrated.

Is it relevant to expand SPON (guardianship and trusteeship departments) and leave them within the system of public education? Or is it relevant to reorganize SPON departments by forming a multi-disciplinary team of professionally trained practitioners and place it under the authorities of local administrations (Khokimiyats)? In case the answer is “yes” to either of the questions, how should it be done?

The answers to those questions are not easy. The team has come to the firm conclusion that a greater emphasis needs to be placed on building the capacity of specialists at the mahalla level to assess the needs of children and devise intervention plans that prevent admission to institution. If mahalla staff assessed a child as being at high risk of placement in an institution they could refer the child to an FCSS team located at rayon level. Rayon level FCSS staff would case manage high risk cases, reintegration cases and supervise and monitor children in substitute families. Consideration could be given to mahalla child protection staff being supervised by rayon level FCSS staff.

Recommending exactly where in rayon level administration FCSS should be located is much harder. There is logic in locating the service within existing social protection systems rather than education systems. Care of vulnerable children is a social care issue, not an education issue. In social policy terms, the question about where FCSS should be located in local government structures will probably be dictated by which central government Ministry is given lead-responsibility for child protection. At the moment, responsibility is fragmented across too many Ministries and needs to be simplified and stream-lined.

Associated with discussions about the best location for FCSS, consideration is needed about how to reform placement decision-making. It too is fragmented across many levels and bodies of local government administration. Some countries have reformed their local Commissions on Minors as the decision making body. Others have reformed the local Guardianship & Trustee body. Others have given decision-making responsibilities to the assessing social work team. International good practice is that social worker recommendations for out-of-family placements should be subject to review and decision by a local independent body, independent of the social worker service.

The team makes a recommendation at the end of this report for an exercise be conducted to map where and who currently makes decisions about out-of-family placement. The results of the mapping exercise can feed into further consideration of reforms to decision-making.

The speed at which professionally trained practitioners could be deployed across all regions of Uzbekistan will be dictated in part by the supply of trained social workers by the institutions of higher education. It might be better therefore to consider a phased region by region approach as sufficient staffs are re-trained rather than attempt a single phase national scaling up.
There are four components to managing and controlling access to institutions:

1. An agency responsible for coordinating the assessment of the child’s situation.
2. A range of family support services in the community that are alternatives to care in an institution, including foster care (patronage) and adoption.
3. Decision-making based on assessment of the child’s needs and circumstances.
4. Information systems to monitor and review decisions and their outcomes.

The team has tried to address component #1 above in its discussion about FCSS services. The team has also attempted to discuss component #3 above. But UNICEF and the Government of Uzbekistan need also to consider the other two components.

The evaluation fieldwork has dramatically revealed the absence of robust local and national information systems to monitor and review placement decisions. Information systems are essential in order to monitor implementation of central government policy decisions.

Consideration is also required about how to redirect at least some government resources away from institutional care towards community-based alternatives that support children in families.

How to reform child protection systems so that institutions are used only as a last resort raises big strategic issues that need to be considered by UNICEF and central government. These strategic issues go beyond whether expand or reorganise SPON departments. The evaluators make recommendations at the end of this report for strategic planning of child protection system reforms in Uzbekistan.

---

2.4. Application of human rights-based approach and results based management approach throughout the project.

It is to be expected that the design and implementation of the FCSS project will reflect UNICEF’s commitment to human rights, specifically children’s rights; that it identifies the rights of children and the obligations and capacities of duty bearers. It would be expected that processes are in place to monitor and evaluate project outcomes on the basis of CRC principles and rights.

Identification & project design

Of the background documents reviewed by the team the one document that most clearly sets out the vision for the FCSS project is the undated project proposal prepared by Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children titled Piloting Good Model of Deinstitutionalisation under Khokimiyats of Samarkand and Tashkent (Chilanzor and Sobir-Rakhimov districts) by Creating Family & Child Support Services.

The document links the project proposal to the UNICEF-Government of Uzbekistan Country Programme and particularly to three research studies, two of which were supported by UNICEF, conducted in 2006; Study on the social protection system of vulnerable groups of children, Promotion of alternative forms of children’s placement, and Policy analyses regarding children with disabilities. The document makes a fleeting reference to the right of children to live in a family environment (p1).

It may be that project planning pre-dated the publication on 2nd June 2006 of the CRC Committee’s Concluding Observations on the 2nd periodic report of Uzbekistan13, which among other things made several recommendations to the Government of Uzbekistan:

- to strengthen and diversify its support to families,
- to ensure policies and procedures fully respect the provisions of the Convention,
- to increase and strengthen substitute family care,
- to ensure the periodic review of the care of children in institutions, and
- to place children in institutions only as a last resort.

While the team has not identified explicit references in project documentation to the CRC Committee’s recommendations or the CRC itself, it can be judged that the design of the project implicitly attempts to reflect a human rights-based approach, specifically the child’s right to live in a family, that decisions should be made in the best interests of the child, and the obligation of State duty-bearers to support parents in their parenting role.

Implementation

It is apparent at the field level that the work of the FCSS has focussed on preventing avoidable admissions to institutions by supporting the capacities of parents and carers to care for their children. Similarly, it is apparent that FCSS staff have successfully managed and supported the reintegration of a number of children formerly living in institutions back to their biological or extended family.

The project was explicitly designed to be a pilot, to demonstrate the possibilities for the re-design of the Government’s child protection policies and procedures to better protect children. The response of the Government to the pilots will indicate if they have succeeded in modifying the way it discharges its obligations as a duty-bearer of children’s rights.

Monitoring & evaluation

It may be the case that the Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children and UNICEF have established clear procedures to monitor the activities of the project, perhaps by monthly activity reports and the like, but the attention of the team has not been drawn to those procedures. It is understood, however, that RCSAC persons visited the pilots on a monthly basis to offer professional support and advice about individual cases though the team were told by the Syrdarya FCSS that they had not received enough

13 CRC/C/UZB/CO/2 at www2.ohchr.org
support from SCSAC. Monthly support and supervision visits are not quite the same as systematic monitoring and evaluation.

**Results based management approach**

If an effective system of results-based management was in place for the project it would be expected that the project partners; Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children, local government administrations and UNICEF, would measure project activity through a clear and comprehensive monitoring system that informed management decisions about the project.

If the RCSAC project proposal document referred to above is taken to be the project initiation document, the project was planned to run for two years in three pilot areas; Tashkent:Chilanzor, Tashkent:Sobir Rakhimov and Samarkand. The three pilot areas began operations in October 2007. However, according to a document passed to the evaluators with a heading date of 12th March 2008 and titled *Development of a Model of Effective Childcare System for Uzbekistan and expansion of pilot Family and Children Support Services to other regions* produced by the RCSAC, consideration was already being given to extending the pilots only six months after the first pilots began operations.

According to the project extension proposal the justification for the extension was that:

“In a short period of time these pilot teams have undertaken the following work:

- Working with 50 families and 65 children
- The return of 22 children back to their birth family
- 4 families assessed and prepared for patronage care
- 4 children placed with patronage careers
- 14 children placed for Trusteeship
- 3 children placed in care
- 4 children are given for adoption
- 14 families where work has been undertaken for children to be returned to education and for parents to find jobs

These numbers confirm a very positive beginning for these services and a high degree of success in a short period. This needs to be further embedded and publicized with national and local decision makers. These pilots provide the basis for a good practice model to be provided across the country.”

The extension proposal does not explain why the pilots could not be left to run the full two years that was set in the initial proposal before making a highly significant change to the original pilot concept. While the proposal to extend the pilot project is justified by referring to “positive beginnings” and provides numbers for children and families receiving a service, we do not conclude this constitute results-based management. We would have expected the pilots to have operated for longer before a decision was made to extend them.

The initial RCSAC project proposal document referred to above does refer to project goals and project actions but not to explicit objectives. The team was not shown a result log frame for the project with result-orientated objectives.

The RCSAC document does refer to the following indicators but not to targets or timings:

- MOU signed between pilot Khokimiyats, RCSAC, MoPE and UNICEF,
- Approved regulations on functional responsibilities of Services and staff of the (FCSS) services,
- Developed individual plans for children who came into the system,
- Number of cases revised by Commissions on Minors considering the recommendations of social workers of the Services,
- Number of children returned to biological families based on the recommendations of Services,
- Number of children being placed in foster families and family type orphanages (parents who were trained and are supervised by staff of the Services),
- Number of children entering the system and being placed in alternative forms of care instead of state institutions.
The last indicator above refers to monitoring the “number of children entering the system and being placed in alternative forms of care instead of State institutions”. It is not clear from the document whether ‘the system’ referred to FCSS alone, or whether it referred to the wider regional child protection system that included Guardian & Trustee and other bodies that decide the placement of children. It was apparent to the team on the field visits that placement decision-making systems included FCSS and Guardian & Trustee bodies plus other bodies. The team were shown output figures by FCSS staff for prevention and reintegration cases but it was not obvious to the team how those figures fed back into project management planning.

In the absence of clear and comprehensive monitoring activities, it is not possible to say conclusively that the project has adopted a result-based approach to management.
3. Conclusions

According to the RCSAC initial project proposal the goals of the project were:

Piloting a good model of de-institutionalization by establishing a special unit for families and children (the Service) to oversee child protection issues and promoting alternative forms of care for children and effective form of services in Tashkent and Samarkand cities for future scaling up throughout the country.

The project is intended to provide a working model of deinstitutionalisation in order to provide feedback to the on-going process on the issue in the country.

The project continues to develop matters related to the child care system, transfer of children to foster family, family type orphanage, etc.

This evaluation has concluded that those goals were achieved. It has been instrumental in changing the environment within the pilot sites in the following ways:

- It has demonstrated that with the appropriate practical social support, families can care for their own children without the need of admission to institutions.
- It has clarified the role of qualified social workers as an effective resource for supporting families in the community.
- It has opened the way for the training and teaching social workers to begin.
- It has promoted inter-sectoral planning and working in the planning of social support for vulnerable families with children.
- Overall it has been an important instrument to change the attitudes of people and decision-makers who have come into contact with the project.
- It has demonstrated the capacity of FCSS workers to use social work methods and approaches to prevent avoidable admission of children to institutions and to reintegrate children living in institutions back home or to substitute families.
- The absence of effective gatekeeping procedures in pilot regions to all ensure all children at risk of admission have their needs assessed means children continue to be placed in institutions in pilot regions without there first being a needs assessment. Placement decision-making must be stream-lined and simplified.
- The social work approach used by FCSS workers is a good model for reformed child protection services, but the current organisation of FCSS with staff continuing to work their ‘regular’ jobs while doing FCSS work part-time is not the best way to scale up the service. Individual MoUs with regional Khokhimiyyats is not an effective model for scaling up FCSS child protection services.
4. Recommendations

1. The Government of Uzbekistan with the assistance of UNICEF consider developing a national strategy, possibly within the framework of the National Plan of Action for Securing Child Welfare, to reform the child protection system at makhalla, rayon, region and national levels. The strategy should aim to strengthen local and national legislation, policies, procedures, structures, systems and capacities in order to establish:

   a) The Ministry of Labour & Social Protection as ministry with lead responsibility for child protection reforms. Structures at region, rayon and makhalla level should reflect and support government policy for ministerial leadership of child protection reforms.

   b) A Department within the Ministry of Labour & Social Protection should be established to plan, manage and coordinate implementation of government policy for the reform of the child protection system and protection of vulnerable children and families, a priority being protection of children lacking parental care. The national department should be replicated at the regional and rayon levels of local government with appropriate lines of accountability to the Minister of Labour & Social Protection and regional Khokims.

   c) Social work services at rayon level that assess the needs of vulnerable children and families and coordinates directly and indirectly provided services to support the child in its family or substitute family. The social work services be located within local Department of Labour & Social Protection structures.

   d) A body or bodies, at rayon level, independent of the social work service, which makes all decisions about out-of-family care and eliminates current fragmented and dispersed decision-making.

   e) An associated strategy to reduce residential care capacity and re-invest in community-based alternatives to care in institutions. The strategy should include plans to re-train and re-deploy staff currently employed in institutions for employment in community-based alternatives. The strategy should also include plans to relocate management of all residential facilities for children within the department of Ministry of Labour & Social Protection that leads on child protection.

   f) Information systems deployed that reflect lines of accountability and monitor out-of-family placement decisions.

   g) The strategy will likely include plans for a staged scaling up social work assessment services on a region-by-region basis.

A high-level inter-ministerial body, possibly the Interdepartmental Coordination Council (ICC), should oversee strategy development and coordinate implementation. The Ministry of Finance and the ministry responsible for legislative affairs should be members of the Council.

The strategy should be written and owned by the Government of Uzbekistan. It is an action for the medium term, i.e. completion and adoption within two years. UNICEF may want to consider how best to support government strategic planning for child protection reform perhaps by bringing in international expertise.

The strategy should begin with a review of the current child protection system in Uzbekistan to analyse its strengths, weaknesses and the opportunities for change. It is important that the review focuses on systems and not just services. As argued elsewhere in this report child protection consists of an integrated and overlapping network of legislation, policies, procedures, capacities, structures, systems and services, all of which should be reviewed. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to say in detail what the review should cover. Therefore UNICEF and the Government of Uzbekistan might want to consider commissioning a short scoping study to specify the areas, activities and issues the review
should cover. The scoping study should indicate the areas and issues of child protection that require closer review.

The scoping study would form the basis of a strategic review carried out by a technical sub-group under the guidance of the ICC and within the framework of the National Plan. The review itself will lead naturally to the development of a strategy to be presented to the ICC that covers points a) to g) above, plus other relevant issues revealed by the review.

In the meantime recommendations for short term action are made below.

2. FCSS pilots should continue in the short term supported by UNICEF and RCSAC until Government decides on a plan to scale up the service.

3. That FCSS staff be employed full-time on FCSS tasks and that they be provided with suitable office equipment and either a vehicle in which to make home visits or be reimbursed for necessary transport costs.

4. Eligibility criteria for receiving a service from FCSS should be developed and adopted in order that high risk cases receive preferential attention from a trained social worker. For example for preventative cases might include the following indicators:

- A written request from the parents to put the children in an institution;
- A written document from the referring agency that says the child may be at risk of institutionalisation;
- The parents say that that is what they are planning to do with the child
- When one or more siblings of the remaining children in the family are already in an institution (or have been there earlier and there is a risk of their going back)

Other warning indicators may be:

- It is a single-parent family where the parent is either (a) ill or (b) cannot cope and where the child is at risk of being sent to an institution
- The parents themselves were in institutions as children
- Either parents or children have disabilities
- Parent(s) are absent in prison or abroad

Introduction of eligibility criteria will improve interdepartmental cooperation between different agencies within Khokimiyat and will allow using time of social worker more effectively. It would also help families understand what kind of services they will be able to receive from FCSS.

5. A small working group should be established perhaps led by RCSAC with representative membership from the FCSS teams to prepare a list of FCSS documents and procedures to be submitted to the appropriate government department for official recognition and approval.

6. UNICEF might want to consider commissioning another evaluation of the FCSS pilots in two years time. The older pilots will have been operating for four years, which should be long enough for them to have firmly established themselves. Rather than looking at the raw numbers of children receiving a service, perhaps the evaluation could look for differences between pilots that will have evolved by then. For example, what precisely are the differences between FCSS at regional and district levels? What protective structures and systems have been supported to develop at makhalla level? What kinds of referral networks have been established by each pilot? What are the difference in professional support and supervision? How have eligibility criteria been applied? (See Recommendation 4 above.) The evaluation should aim to identify lessons learned about local effectiveness and feed into the strategic review recommended above.
7. The support of RCSAC has been critical for the development of FCSS but the Centre should consider how it can improve support and monitoring particularly to the newly established FCSS. If the Centre leads on the development of eligibility criteria it will want to monitor how those criteria are applied. It will want to satisfy itself that accurate and appropriate records are being kept by FCSS of children provided and not provided with an FCSS service. It will want to satisfy itself that FCSS recommendations for out-of-family placements are consistent across all FCSS teams.

8. Consideration should be given to commissioning the development of a training course for social work managers such as FCSS team leaders, in front-line management skills as a more sustainable alternative to the current support of RCSAC to FCSS pilots.

9. Consideration should be given to enabling local managers such as deputy Khokims to assume a more involved role to support and monitor FCSS teams by encouraging them to attend a front-line managers training course. This would be a more appropriate model for future development of FCSS management and supervision.

10. Consideration should be given to commissioning a mapping of out-of-family placement decision-making in local government administration with a view to making recommendations to the strategic review for the stream-lining of decision-making and improving gatekeeping access to institutions.

11. Consideration should be given to creating a working group, possibly of university social work teaching representatives, RCSAC, the National Team on Social Work and representatives of staff who have completed the four-month re-training course, to review the course and recommend ways in which it can be made even more relevant to local needs and strengthen the field-work element of the course.
Appendices

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Evaluation of “Family and Child Support Services” project in Uzbekistan (from October 2007 until present)

Background and Justification

Uzbekistan, together with other post-Soviet states, has faced many challenges in moving away from the Soviet system towards a market economy and a society open to the rest of the world. In addition during the current global crisis there is no country which is immune from negative impact of it to many areas of the socio-economic development. In the turmoil of transition and such economic turnovers it is often children who are most vulnerable. Not being an exception, children in Uzbekistan are also subject to a range of pressures and threats as a result of the increasing economic inequality and insecurity and exposure to the dangerous sides of globalization and global economic crisis. Hence, children are in greater risk of being placed in institutions if left without family care, becoming victims of violence, being engaged in worst forms of child labour, etc.

The need for providing substitute care for children unable to live with their families is by no means a new phenomenon in countries of the former Soviet Union. In Uzbekistan as in other post-Soviet countries, the system of services reflects the old-era preference for institutional care, instead of preventive family support systems and community- and family based alternative services. Placement of a child to the institution was by far the most common response by the state for orphaned, abandoned, neglected children, as well as for children with disabilities.

There are 28 state orphanages (Mehribonlik homes) and 13 Baby homes and 6 in the country housing 3,483 children (aged 0-18 years). Besides, according to official data, more than 15% of all children with disabilities are placed either in special orphanages or special boarding schools, and 179 (0-16 year olds) live in 2 SOS Kinderdorf children villages. The number of children in alternative care arrangements is very low – only 305 children, among whom 269 live in patronage (foster) families and 36 in 5 family-type homes.

In addition, there is a group of 34,505 children who are left without their parents and receive care by their extended families and/or neighbours (this cannot be considered as an official alternative form of care). This group of children is not registered by the official system of care, i.e. neither guardians nor children receive state support. In addition this group of children is not monitored by the state. This puts such children at risk of being abused, exploited, among other threats, since they are not covered by adequate social protection mechanisms (“Assessment of system of social protection of children”, Social Adaptation Centre, 2006).

Foster and guardianship care as alternatives to institutional care are being gradually introduced but still changes in legislation are required to make it operational and responsive to the needs of children.

The difficulty in providing adequate service to these children is partly due to the non existence of one body/system to oversee all issues of childcare: as of today, childcare is still divided among 3 main ministries and number of state agencies. In addition to that there are complexities in the decision-making mechanisms at local levels. There are Commission on Minors (CoMs) which has to make decisions regarding all children’s issues, and Guardian and Trusteeship Inspections (GTDs) responsible for recommendations on children’s placements. In reality, CoMs’s focus is only on children in conflict with the law, and general oversight of implementation/functioning of childcare agencies. Being officially abolished, GTDs performances have been limited to only one person who is overwhelmed with documentation and other tasks not related to children.
Finally, until recently, social workers were not part of the system, so that the required approaches for an integrated intervention with both children and families were not always possible.

In this context, UNICEF has been involved in the reforms of child care systems in Uzbekistan since 2004 based on the concluding recommendations of the CRC committee to the 1st and 2nd national CRC reports Uzbekistan has submitted. It is important to mention that there is very limited number of international NGOs/donors that are involved in childcare system reform in Uzbekistan: UNDP has started a project on access for people with disabilities; World Vision has projects for children with disabilities but their scope is narrowed and resources are limited; JICA supports some of the projects of World Vision on disability.

One main way of UNICEF engagement has been high level advocacy. The most significant policy result is the adoption of the Law on the Guarantees of the Rights of the Child which recognizes the child’s right to a family environment and child’s placement to an institution only as a last resort. This law became an important starting point for changes in secondary legislation, practice and individual understanding of the meaning of various children’s rights. Thus Ministry of Public Education has amended regulation on current orphanages changing the admission criteria, number of children per group per institution, as well as they have introduced the social worker unit with budgetary allocation to it. Following this, the minimum standards of care for current orphanages were developed. In addition, the government has also revised and amended two other regulations: on patronage and adoption, and on family type orphanage.

Besides, UNICEF together with the Centre for Social Adaptation of Children conducted two studies in 2006: “Assessment of Social Policy on Children with Disabilities” and “Assessment of System of Social Protection of Children at national and local level (mapping out the system)”. This research identified gaps (see annex) in the current system and most importantly led to the development of practical concepts to start off pilot initiatives to test the potential for the introduction of various services for children with disabilities and children without parental care at the local level.

One of these concepts also led to the piloting of Family and Child Support Services (FCSS) at local level to address the above mentioned gaps and support policy development for childcare system reform (for more details on project description, please see Annex). The overall goal of piloted project aimed at preventing children from being admitted to institutions, reintegrating children already living in institutions with their biological parents or extended family, or arranging substitute family care for children unable to live with their biological family, such as fostering and family type groups. FCSS have been staffed by suitably trained social work professionals who deliver prevention, reintegration and alternative family services. The project also aimed to achieve restructuring childcare system at the local level to ensure decrease of children in state institutions.

In parallel to this, the field of social work has been developed and officially recognized as a profession. Currently there are 3 universities that offer social work program at undergraduate level and one university that offers master program on social work. Given the time frame for the first social work graduates to become social workers, and that reforms’ process cannot stop to wait for professionals, an in-service training component of social work has been developed as well. Hence, a 4-month retraining diploma course on social work has been designed and approved by the Ministry of Higher Education in 2007 based on which those practitioners who already perform social work type of services can receive needed knowledge on social work to be able to adjust themselves in the new system of childcare (for more details on project description, please see annex).

Currently there are 5 regions (6 districts) with pilot Family and Child Support Services (FCSS) staffed with 30 certified social workers. In addition, there are 130 child protection practitioners (including the staff of FCSS) from these 5 regions retrained through 4-month diploma program on social work. Together with this 700 students are studying at undergraduate level and 10 at graduate level of the social work program.

As a result of these innovations, at the moment old-system elements still coexist with the pilot system at local level.
Given all above mentioned recent developments and considered the need of furthering the reforms in childcare system, it is now crucial to focus more on high level strategies based on the evidence shown by the pilot initiatives, and therefore influence system change at national level for creation of better functioning statutory bodies. There is also a need to take a step forward, based on the accumulated knowledge of lessons learned to technically assist the Government in the process of reform in the coming years.

In 2007 there was an evaluation conducted to assess UNICEF’s contribution to the overall childcare reform process in Central Asian countries. This evaluation was part of the Human Security Trust Fund project “Every child has a right to grow in a family environment” (2004-2007). The evaluation could identify achievements and remaining challenges of the childcare system reform in Uzbekistan. However, at that time the number of important initiatives in the childcare system was just introduced, and therefore it was not possible to assess their level of effectiveness.

Hence it is necessary to show the difference between the existing system and newly introduced one (pilot) in order to understand benefits, lessons learned and limitations (if any) of the project.

**Purpose of the evaluation:**

Given all above, it is proposed to conduct an evaluation of the pilot initiatives, including the Family and Child Support Services and the insertion of social workers in the childcare system, to have documented evidence for future policy development. Evaluation should look at the (i) work of pilot versus non-pilot regions; (ii) work of early established pilot FCSS versus recently established ones (to compare effectiveness and process of work generally).

The main users of the evaluation report will be the government (Cabinet of Ministers, Ministry of Public Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, Commission of Minors), implementing partners (Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children and regional Khokimiyats), UNICEF Country Office in Uzbekistan, CEE/CIS Regional Office, bilateral agencies, and other national and international and national development stakeholders. Overall, this evaluation report will be used for future programming to find into policy. The evaluation shall serve as bases for government to scale up FCCS further to other regions.

Given that 2009 is the last year of UNICEF’s current (2005-2009) programme cycle in Uzbekistan, the findings and recommendations of this evaluation will also strategically contribute to inform the next country program preparation process (2010-2015) and properly plan UNICEF intervention in support of the childcare system reform for the next six years.

**Focus and Scope:**

The objectives of the evaluation are:

1. Assess the impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the pilot project “Family and Child Support Services” and the insertion of social workers in the childcare system in comparison with the existing system in non-pilot areas.

   **Impact**

   In terms of impact, the evaluation should answer in general to this question: is the proposed system (pilot) better than the existing one and why? More in detail, this should be addressed considering this tentative and demonstrative set of questions:

   - What is the percentage of children without parental care placed in institutions per year, in pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?
   - What is the percentage of children without parental care returned to biological families per year, in both pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?
   - What is the percentage of children without parental care placed in alternative forms of care per year, in both pilot and non pilot areas out of the number of children reached by the service?
- What is the percentage of children whose families have been properly assessed by the system in pilot and non-pilot districts?
- In which way are the stakeholders satisfied with pilot services?
- What is the difference in work approach of childcare service providers in pilot versus non-pilot districts (existence and usage of tools, mechanisms, etc.)?
- Is there a difference between the level of knowledge of childcare professionals in pilot versus non-pilot districts on de-institutionalization, placements of children, alternative care for children without parental care? If yes, what is this difference?

**Effectiveness:**

Based on the analysis of the impact achieved through the pilot and the non pilot system, in terms of effectiveness (seen as the capacity to achieve childcare system’s objectives), the evaluation should answer in general to this question: what is the most effective way to restructure the existing system of childcare at the local level? More in detail, this should be addressed considering this tentative and demonstrative set of questions:

- Were there areas (technical or geographical) in which the pilot intervention (FCSS and social work) was more effective? If so, what factors could account for the difference?
- Were there areas (technical or geographical) in which the pilot intervention (FCSS and social work) was less effective? If so, what factors could account for the difference?
- What is the overall rate of usage of FCSS and SW services? What is the overall rate of usage of existing services in non-pilot districts?
- Are the piloted referral mechanisms working correctly/being applied correctly?
- Are the children/families served get better and more sustainable solutions as per the principles of de-institutionalisation and right of children to family life?

**Efficiency**

In terms of efficiency (seen as the capacity to achieve childcare system’s objectives in the most efficient way), the evaluation should answer to this tentative and demonstrative set of questions:

- On average, how long is the process from referral to destination of the child in pilot and non pilot areas?
- What is the level of cost-efficiency for the implementation/functioning of the pilot and non pilot system?

**Sustainability**

In terms of sustainability, this evaluation should ultimately give light to answer to the following question: in case the above analysis demonstrates that the pilot initiative is more effective, efficient and has a more positive impact on the provision of childcare services, is there potential for scaling up of FCSS countrywide and its official incorporation to the childcare system? More in detail, this should be addressed considering this tentative and demonstrative set of questions:

- What is the level of ownership adopted by the Government at local and national level on this pilot initiative and on the incorporation of social workers in the official childcare system?
- Is there any evidence of political will from different Government stakeholders at national and local level to constructively analyze the results of the pilot initiative and ultimately be open to adopt a new system based on its results?
- What are the existing capacities of local authorities (Khokimiyats) to adopt a new approach of Family and Child Support Services?
- What are the existing capacities of local departments of public education to start restructuring Trusteeship and Guardianship departments?
- What are the major factors which influence the scaling up of FCSS nationwide and the incorporation of social workers in the official system?
How to mainstream Family and Child Support Services into the national policy, strategies and action plans in Uzbekistan?
- How to mainstream Social Work retraining program into the national retraining policy and action plans in Uzbekistan?

**Relevance**

In terms of relevance, the evaluation should provide UNICEF with feedback on the relevance of its approach in the area of child care system reform at the local level in order to:

- Reveal gaps in the approaches used and recommend corrections in the strategy.
- Reveal good practices in the approaches used to be further enhanced in the strategy.

In specific the following questions need to be answered:

- Is the piloted structure of FCSS coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services' provision at local level and to the reality of the different regions of Uzbekistan?
- Are the piloted internal mechanisms of FCSS coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services' provision at local level and to the reality of the different regions of Uzbekistan?
- Is the job description of social work profession in the country coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services' provision at local level and to the reality of the different regions of Uzbekistan?
- Is the piloted structure and content of the 4-months retraining program coherently tailored to the needs of childcare services' provision and to the reality of Uzbekistan?
- Is it relevant to expand SPON (guardianship and trusteeship departments) and leave them within the system of public education? Or is it relevant to reorganize SPON departments by forming a multi-disciplinary team of professionally trained practitioners and place it under the authorities of local administrations (Khokimiyats)? In case the answer is “yes” to either of the questions, how should it be done?

2. Assess the application of human rights-based approach (HRBA) and results based management (RBM) approach throughout the project. UNICEF’s PBA framework should be used as a guide for this part of evaluation.

**Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming:**

The focus should be on assessing the extent to which the project has incorporated the UN and UNICEF’s commitment to the Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming and how it was translates into action.

**Results based management approach**

- Did the initial pilot initiative include a result log frame with result-oriented objectives (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound)? What indicators were planned to be used to monitor project performance?
- What indicators were used and how they were used? How did they influence any further adjustments in the project?
- To what extent M&E has informed management decision-making during the project implementation?

**Sources of information**

- Project documents and reports for the period 2005-2009
- Project training manuals, materials, etc.
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989;
- UNICEF online child protection resource package, in particular the part on child care system (http://ceecis.org/child_protection/)
- Background information on UNICEF strategies and projects
  - CPD, CPAP, AWPs (annual work plans)
  - Donor reports (“Every Child has a Right to Grow up in a Family Environment” funded by HSTF, 2005-2007)
- Annual reports of UNICEF on Child Protection part
- Any other relevant country level information related to child care system development and reform (such as laws, policies, action plans of Governments etc.).
- Reports of external consultants on child care reforms (2007-2008)

**Process and recommended methodology:**

The methods for collecting and analyzing data for the evaluation of country strategies in support of child care system reform should be both qualitative and quantitative.

**Data collection methods include:**

- **Desk research:** A comprehensive analysis of available information as specified in “sources of information”
- **Field data collection:** evaluation team will conduct site visits in the country.
- **Interviews and focus group discussion with key informants:** To ensure wide participation of country level participants in the evaluation, evaluation expert/team will organize structured and/or semi-structured interviews, focus group discussion and meetings with key informants (including UNICEF country office, Government counterparts in different Ministries, NGO-partners involved in the project, other project partners who contributed to the support to the child care system reform funded by UNICEF, other actors who are involved in the child care sector reform but who work with UNICEF on a technical level, or who work independently from UNICEF) whenever feasible and in collaboration with the country project staff. Model to be chosen should be decided upon jointly by Uzbekistan Country Office (Child Protection) staff and evaluators.
- **Interviews (via phone or email questionnaires) with key external resource people to benchmark some of the findings of the evaluation:** these resource people will provide a critical look at some of the findings and perhaps give some additional perspectives. External resource people would be Child Protection cluster in UNICEF RO, senior expert on childcare system reform for the RO, etc. – this TBD and TBC

- **National Level:**
  To enable evaluation experts/team gather all the information and have a full picture of the childcare reforms process, it will be necessary to interview key implementers of this process at the national level. Hence, it is envisaged to meet with local authorities of the Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children, National Team on Social Work, Tashkent State Institute of Culture, Samarkand State University (SW department), Ministry of Public Education, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Labour and Social Protection.

- **Local Level:**
  It is proposed to evaluate pilot regions with functioning FCSS against regions which are functioning within the same system of childcare system. The specificities of work in childcare system will be comparatively analyzed in three pilot regions ((1) Tashkent city: Chilanzar and Sobir-Rakhimov districts; (2) Samarkand region; (3) Andijan region) and three non-pilot regions (Tashkent city: Yunus-Abad and Khamza districts; (2) Kashkadarya region; (3) Fergana region.)
Proposed non-pilot districts were chosen based on similar to pilot characteristics in terms of number of institutions, number of children in formal care, etc.

Sample of interviews will be proposed by the evaluation team in the technical proposal and will be agreed finalized with UNICEF once successful candidate is identified.

When choosing sample the below group of people/professionals should be considered for personal interviews, focus groups and/or responding by the questionnaires:

- social workers in pilot FCSS in 4 proposed districts (there are 20 social workers - 5 in each team in each district)
- decision-makers (experts) in pilot FCSS in 4 proposed districts such as deputy-Khokim (deputy governor) and secretary of Commissions of Minors (there are 8 decision makers - 2 in each pilot district)
- Khokims (governors) in 4 proposed pilot districts (there are 4 Khokims – 1 in each pilot district)
- staff of various institutions in 4 pilot districts — main focus should be on those staff who are directly involved with work with children (various institutions include orphanages for children 0-3 age, 3-16 age, 7-18 age for children with severe mental disabilities) (there are around 100 of staff directly involved in work with children in 4 pilot districts)
- various childcare practitioners gone through 4-months retraining program on social work (there are 49 practitioners with social work professional training in all 4 pilot districts)
- guardianship and trusteeship department inspectors (SPON) (there are 8 SPON inspectors in 4 non-pilot districts)
- decision-makers of 4 non-pilot districts such as deputy-khokims and secretaries of Commissions of Minors) (there are 8 such decision makers in 4 non-pilot districts)
- Khokims (governors) in 4 proposed non-pilot districts (there are 4 Khokims in 4 non-pilot districts)
- staff of various institutions in 4 non-pilot districts — main focus should be on those staff who are directly involved with work with children (various institutions include orphanages for children 0-3 age, 3-16 age, 7-18 age for children with severe mental disabilities) (there are around 100 of staff directly involved in work with children in 4 non-pilot districts)
- various childcare practitioners who have not gone through retraining program on social work (in all 4 non-pilot districts)
- # of parents (of bio-families, substitute families, patronage families, etc.) in pilot districts served by FCSS
- # of parents (of bio-families, substitute families, patronage families, etc.) from non-pilot districts served by SPON (5 from each)

**Stakeholder participation:**

Stakeholders will be mainly involved into the evaluation process as sources for data collection. There would be a validation meeting organized at the end of evaluation in order to develop ownership of the evaluation results to further fine tune conclusion and recommendations. Upon finalization of the Evaluation Report, stakeholders will further follow up to address key findings and recommendations to take actions while planning the program strategy for the next programme cycle.

**Accountabilities:**

**UNICEF**

UNICEF programme (Child Protection Officer and Child Protection Assistant) will be accountable for coordination of stakeholders’ involvement, organizing field-visits, focus groups, and other logistical issues
as well as for reviewing/approving of intermediate and final evaluation results. UNICEF will contract national consultant to provide support to the evaluation team in the fields.

**Republican Centre for Social Adaptation Center**

For the whole process of evaluation, the Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children (RCSAC) will provide constant support to evaluation team at all stages of evaluation in terms of information confirmation, etc. There will be one focal person from RCSAC mainly responsible for logistical support for evaluation team, e.g. ensure availability of staff at pilot and non-pilot districts for meetings, etc. In addition, Ministry of Public Education will be part of the evaluation process to provide support in gathering information from government representatives, staff of institutions, etc.

**National Consultant:**

It is expected that national consultant will be contracted to co-facilitate evaluation work in the fields. This person will be affiliated with social research and will have understanding and knowledge on the process/projects. In specific, national consultant will:

1. Accompany international research expert/team in the field in pilot and non-pilot districts (Tashkent city, Samarkand, Kashkadarya, Fergana and Andijan);
2. Provide support to international research expert/team during evaluation process in the country, i.e. at the meetings, interviews, focus groups, etc. (including translation);
3. Provide support to the international research expert/team in analysing evaluation results for preliminary draft report to be presented at the validation workshop;
4. Provide support to the international research expert/team in facilitation of validation workshop with partners;
5. Serve as focal point for contacting/liaising with necessary partners in the fields.

Funding for this will be coming separately – it is not included into this budget.

**Evaluation Experts/Team:**

Evaluation experts/team will be overall responsible for (a) successful completion of evaluation (including all steps of development of evaluation framework and tools and methodology); (b) for managing and carrying out all consultations, meetings and interviews with key informants; (c) for preparation of logistics, organization of travel, financial and other arrangements that are related to the implementation of the evaluation (travel arrangements to and from the country, DSA payments, etc); (d) for timely submission of deliverables and invoices.

The evaluation experts/team shall be independent in evaluation exercise, however taking into account sensitive issues which may arise during the course of evaluation. There are no specific concerns related to conflict of interest.

**Qualification or Specialized Knowledge/Experience and competencies required:**

In view of the purpose, scope, focus of the evaluative work, the evaluation will be conducted by a team of external experts with expertise in evaluation methodology as well as in child protection systems with special focus on childcare system, quality of childcare system, social work profession development, curriculum development, childcare policies, formulation of education plans, assessment of education programmes and coordination of research work.

Competencies required to carry out the evaluation are a combination of expertise in the subject area and of evaluation methods as per below:
- University degree in Social Sciences or Program Evaluation and extensive experience, knowledge and expertise in M&E, in conducting research and different kinds of surveys, assessments, comparison studies, etc.
- Thorough understanding of child rights, child protection mechanisms and child care system design and its reform (at least 5 to 7 years of practical experience in the field of child protection and/or childcare system)
- Good knowledge of evaluation methodology design
- Ability to conduct interviews, focus group discussions and writing reports for publication
- Experience in conducting desk reviews and field visits.
- Strong analytical and conceptual thinking;
- Ability to work under tight schedule, to cope with time pressure and ability to absorb high amount of information in a short period of time, to be flexible and adapt to rapidly changing time schedule, etc.
- Fluency in speaking, reading and writing in English
- Previous experience working in CEE/CIS region and good knowledge of local contexts in the Central Asian republics.
- Good knowledge of Russian (reading and understanding) will be an asset

**Procedures and logistics:**

UNICEF will provide visa support for evaluation team to travel. The evaluation team will be assisted with logistics related to the assignment, such as office space, a car for site visits (in the places specified as by road in the below estimated days of work) and official meetings, interpreter. It is expected that evaluation team will come with laptop(s) (if deemed necessary).

It will be the evaluation team’s responsibility to take care of purchasing air tickets (both international and local), train tickets to travel to the regions as well. For travel to/from Uzbekistan, the air travel should be the most direct, most economical route at economy class. UNICEF will assist with booking tickets for domestic travels.

Any additional specific information regarding the procedures, benefits, travel arrangements and other logistical issues will be discussed with successful candidates.

**Estimated Days of work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Description of Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Desk Review of all necessary documents related to pilot projects and UNICEF Program of Cooperation implemented in Uzbekistan (on-line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Technical preparation of the consultancy (scenarios for Focus Groups Discussions, Interview Sheets, Questionnaires, etc.) (on-line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Traveling of evaluator(s) to the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Introductory meeting with UNICEF Child Protection team, interviews with partners and other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Traveling to pilot region (Samarkand) (by road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.5 days   | Research work in the field - pilot region (Samarkand)
|            | Traveling to non-pilot region (Kashkadarya) (by road) |
| 2 days     | Research work in the field – non-pilot region Kashkadarya
|            | Traveling back to Tashkent (in the evening, by air)
|            | Traveling to pilot region (Andijan) (by road) |
| 2 days     | Research work in the field – pilot region (Andijan)
<p>|            | Traveling to non-pilot region (Fergana) (by road) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Research work in the field – non-pilot region (Fergana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveling back to Tashkent (by road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Research work in the field (Tashkent city) – pilot/non-pilot districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Drafting power point presentation on key findings, conclusions and recommendations for the validation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Debriefing with UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Validation meeting with partners and other stakeholders to present first draft of evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Return of evaluator(s) back to duty station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Writing of first draft of evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Writing of final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Final Report translated in Russian (by UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Editing of Russian version of the report (by UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Report disseminated (by UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In country – 17 days</th>
<th>Out of country – 19 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total: 36 days

It is expected that potential candidates will come up with tentative time line in the technical proposal for each assignment specified in the table. It should be noted however that evaluation should start in the second week of September, 2009.

Additional details concerning the time schedule will be discussed with successful candidates. The evaluation experts/team is responsible for submission of deliverables and final products by agreed deadlines.

The travel dates will be also identified based on actual agreement with successful candidates.

**Deliverables:**

1. Evaluation design/framework agreed upon with UNICEF (prior to field work)
2. Tools / questionnaires (prior to field work)
3. Field work (interview, etc.) (to be completed by the mid of assignment)
4. Agenda for validation meeting (after field work)
5. Power Point Presentation for validation meeting (prior to validation meeting)
6. 1st draft Evaluation report according to an outline agreed with UNICEF (in a week time after validation meeting)
7. Final Evaluation Report (including executive summary in English of approx. 5-10 pages) based on UNICEF comments (in 4 days time after receiving UNICEF feedback to the 1st draft)
8. List of documents consulted (UNICEF documents and other documents) (by the end of assignment)
9. List of people interviewed, consulted, etc, (to be included into the final report; by the end of the assignment)

Deliverables should be guided by UNICEF guidelines and standards for Evaluations:

- The Evaluation Report, which should include executive summary, description of sampling and evaluation methodology used, data collection instruments, types of data analysis, assessment of methodology (including limitations), findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned, attachments with developed list of indicators and questionnaires
- The report should be provided in both hard copy and electronic version in English in the required UNICEF format.
- Completed data sets (filled out questionnaires, records of individual interviews and focus group discussion, etc.)
- Assessment of evaluation methodology, including limitations of objectives-oriented approach
UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if work/outputs are incomplete, not delivered of for failure to meet deadlines.

**Payment schedule:**
30% prepayment of the total contract fee for the field trip expenses and 70% for the consultancy fees after the receipt of final products

Payment will be made in a form of lump-sum by bank transfer to evaluation team’ account

**Note:** No cash will be paid in the country for any kind of incurred expenses. The payment will be made on the basis of 30% of pre-payment of the total contract fee. The rest of the payment shall be made only upon the submission of deliverables, i.e. 70% of payment for the contract fee.

**Estimated Cost of Consultancy:**
It is expected that evaluation experts/team will come up with proposed budget for consideration. The rate per day of professional fees will be in accordance with the complexity of the TOR and the level of the expertise required. In the case there is more then 1 expert proposed, the responsibilities for each expert should be divided accordingly with budget reflection as well.

*When calculating the budget evaluation experts/team should refer to UNICEF DSA rates for different regions of Uzbekistan (attached in a separate document).

**Final budget will be negotiated and agreed on based on the proposals of potential candidates.**

**All materials developed will remain the copyright of UNICEF and that UNICEF will be free to adapt and modify them in the future**

**Prepared by:**
Guzal Kamalova  
Child Protection Officer  
UNICEF Uzbekistan

**Reviewed by:**
Siyma Barkin Kuzmin  
Child Protection Specialist  
UNICEF Uzbekistan

Silvia Mestroni  
Programme Officer M&E  
UNICEF Uzbekistan  
PARC

**Approved by:**
Andro Shilakadze,  
Deputy Representative  
UNICEF Uzbekistan
Annex 1

**Detailed information on description of the project**

This project is aimed to achieve the following:

- By the end of 2009 at least 40% of vulnerable children in pilot areas have access to community social services

This entails working towards the following output:

- Communities in priority areas have social work services established to work with vulnerable children and families to support reforms in child care system

In 2006 the Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children jointly with UNICEF carried out the Assessment of Social Protection System of Children to map out system characteristics at both national and local levels.

**Results of the assessment showed that:**

- The most widespread form of protection and help for the children left without parental care is placement of these children in institutions, that in turn raises the risk of difficulties of their integration in the society;
- The mechanisms of considering child’s needs to live and be brought up in a family (satisfaction of these needs directly influences success in physical, mental and intellectual development of the child) are insufficiently developed;
- Putting into practice social arrangement of children left without parental care and forms of replacing the parental family (foster care, substitute family and other forms of alternative placement) requires careful development;
- Management of the social protection system of vulnerable groups of children, having a huge network of supervising organizations and departments, social institutions and experts, who directly work with children, frequently duplicate each other, not always cooperate effectively with each other;
- Expenses for education of the children in governmental institutions in aggregate exceed real expenses in family conditions;
- There is an issue of preparing the experts (social workers, psychologists, teachers), who are directly engaged in social protection of children at a high professional level and use modern technologies of social work with children and families;
- The matters of developing legal documents that realize the mechanism of rendering services to children requiring respective form of arrangement have not been yet solved.

The same assessment results specifically indicated that childcare system reform process can be introduced using the existing resources in the following areas:

- the system of local governance (district administrations, the Commissions of Minors Affairs at district administrations),
- public associations (Makhallas),
- opportunity of readdressing financial resources from institutions to the alternative forms of children placement,
- transfer of children from institutions to family environments (either their biological parents or substitute family care),

In addition, this assessment also called for *immediate action* for the following areas:

- training of practitioners (social workers), who will ensure maximal use of the possible resources for placement of children taking their best interest into consideration;
- revision of procedures and criteria for placement of children in state institutions, and in alternative care;
development of a special structure that realizes and supervises the procedure of identification, selection, preparation and monitoring transfer of children to alternative care such as foster family, family-type orphanage; and is accountable for making decisions regarding children’s placement.

Following the outcomes of 2006 assessment the Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children (RCSAC), jointly with local administrations and with support of UNICEF, initiated piloting of Family and Child Support Services in two districts of Tashkent city and in Samarkand city. This concept was developed with technical inputs and support of "EveryChild" UK NGO. The model of “Family and Child Support Services” (FCSS) has been introduced and is implemented in number of CIS countries. These services are aimed at preventing children from being admitted to institutions, reintegration of children already living in institutions with their biological parents or extended family, or arranging substitute family care for children unable to live with their biological family, such as fostering and family type groups. FCSS have been staffed by suitably trained social work professionals who deliver prevention, reintegration and alternative family services. Considering the fact that there are different departments and ministries responsible for children’s issues, the pilot services have been established under local administrations to ease the process of piloting and ensure coordination at the local level.

Two pilot Services started their work in autumn of 2007. Based on positive work and performance of Services in Tashkent and Samarkand cities, in 2008 RCSAC initiated scaling up of piloting in 3 additional regions of Uzbekistan: Andijan, Bukhara and Sirdarya regions.

The responsibilities and duties of the new services include assessment and responding to the needs of all children in or at risk of placement in institutions under Ministry of Health (Baby Homes), Ministry of Public Education (orphanages and special boarding schools) as well as Ministry of Labor and Social Protection (orphanages for children with mental disabilities).

**Functioning of the Service in social protection system of the child:**

Preventive work of the Service is realized in cooperation with systems of public education, health services, court system, social protection services, and local communities (Mahalla). Based on the concept newly created service must closely collaborate with one of the most important sections in the system of the social protection of children – commission on minors. The social workers of service meet regularly and generally work in close collaboration with the secretary of commission so that members of the commission could have full and correct information on a child/family before agreeing for a decision.

In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of work on preventing placement to the governmental institutions and reintegration into the family, an agreement is being negotiated with the respective bodies (responsible for the placement), state institutions themselves and administrations in the pilot regions.

All of these initiatives/developments could not be achieved without having suitably trained social work professionals who delivered prevention, reintegration and alternative family services – being an integral part of newly introduced services. As mentioned above, the current number of pre-service students (500) will not meet the needs in personnel for the sphere of social protection of children considering fast move towards reforms in this field. This is why in line with academic activities covered by the above mentioned joint UNICEF projects on promotion of social work, country decided to also develop practical direction on providing re-training for professionals, working in the system of social protection of children in the pilot regions which are establishing childcare models. Hence, a 4 months retraining program in line with international standards and approved by the Ministry of Higher Education is designed specifically for those who have extensive experience working in the system but without needed knowledge and skills to respond to all needs and risks of a child/family. This certified program offers 6 large components with the focus on child protection: SW foundations, Child Abuse and Neglect, Social Work Practice with Children and Families, Social Work with Children with Disabilities, Alternative Forms of Care of Children and Management in Social Work. National team on social work (comprises of various academicians from higher education schools) have been prepared by international consultants to teach mentioned-above courses. The program includes both theoretical and practical parts of the program with interactive methods of teaching, and where students have an opportunity to reflect their experiences and knowledge. This program is being implemented in partnership with Tashkent State Institute of Culture, Republican Centre for Social Adaptation of Children, UNICEF and Ministry of Higher Education. Since social work development has direct link with reforms process in childcare system, the main focus of the re-training
program has been on 5 pilot regions of Uzbekistan where FCSS are being introduced. Thus, 130 childcare practitioners (including staff of pilot FCSS) have graduated with diploma in social work. In addition to above-mentioned, Tashkent State Institute of Culture has also developed and introduced a model of practicum (based on field work and supervision component) for students; based on this undergraduate students have an opportunity to carry out their field practicum in the agencies on child protection and gain their practical experience in social work field. Having attained state social work diplomas personnel of FCSS apply social work knowledge and tools when working with children and families. Thus social workers use comprehensive approach in working with a child and family identifying strengths of child/family. Social work education also helped professionals look at their work with different view and they base their work on best interests of children.
Annex 2: Desk review of background documents

- Memorandum of understanding between Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children, Khokymyat (LPA district / blasty level) and UNICEF, regarding piloting of FCSS;
- Regulations on FCSS, approved by Khokymyat (LPA district / blasty level);
- The standard form on reporting of FCSS;
- Training materials for FCSS;
- Recommendations of the International Forum on “Effective Forms and Methods of Providing Support to Socially Vulnerable Children” May 5-6, 2005, Tashkent;
- Recommendation of the International Forum “Reforms in the System of Social Protection of Children” (held in November 15-16 2006, in Tashkent city) is forwarded to be used in work;
- “Perspectives for development of child social protection system in the Republic of Uzbekistan” Program for actions by the results of the Republican conference (November 29-30, 2007, Tashkent city);
- Descriptive Report On the outcomes of the project «Promotion of Development of Social Work in Uzbekistan» for the period from 1 July 2006 to 5 January 2007 presented by Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children to UNICEF;
- Project Proposal of State Institute of Culture to UNICEF Uzbekistan “Dissemination of social work training program and promotion of social work profession in Uzbekistan”;
- Minimum compulsory standards for the Meribolick children’s homes, approved by MoE;
- Regulations on Children’s home, annex 3 to the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministry of the Republic of Uzbekistan of 18.02.1995, nr. 59;
- Project Proposal of State Institute of Culture to UNICEF Uzbekistan “Development of the retraining program in the field of social work”;
- Report regarding “Situation of Children in Uzbekistan”;
- Independent Consultant report, Ruth Jenkins, 10.03.08;
- Strengthening social work field in Uzbekistan, report of international consultant Helen Woolley (2008);
- Project proposal Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children “Development of a Model of Effective Childcare System for Uzbekistan and expansion of pilot Family and Children Support Services to other regions” (2008);
- Project proposal Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children “Piloting good model of de-institutionalization under Khokimiyats of Samarkand and Tashkent (Chilanzar and Sobir Rakhimov districts) by creating the Family and Child Support Services” (2007);
- Plan of Actions on Securing Child Welfare in Uzbekistan, approved at the meeting of the Social Affairs Complex of the Cabinet of Ministries of the Republic of Uzbekistan (January 2007);
- Format for MTR Country Report:
  - Logframe of the UNICEF Child Protection Program;
  - Policy and Progress on Social Work Development in Uzbekistan report of international consultant Helen Woolley (2007);
  - Thematic evaluation of UNICEF contribution to the Child Care System reform in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan (Final report, part I: Country reports, Synthesis, February 2008, Oxford Policy Management);
  - Thematic evaluation of UNICEF contribution to the Child Care System reform in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan (Final report, part II: Country reports, February 2008, Oxford Policy Management);
• Concluding observations: Uzbekistan of the Committee on the Child, Consideration of the reports by states parties under article 44 of the convention, forty – second session (2006);
• Child Protection Mapping out Uzbekistan Key results expected from the Country Programme 2005-2009;
• Consultancy Report for Everychild Uzbekistan, 24th August to 5th September 2007, Eileen M Brady;
• Evaluation report – Study on the system of social protection of children in Uzbekistan, UNICEF and Republican Centre for the Social Adaptation of Children, (2007);
• UNICEF annual report for 2005;
• UNICEF annual report for 2006;
• UNICEF annual report for 2007;
• UNICEF annual report for 2008.
Annex 3. List of people met by the evaluators

- **National level**
  - Roza Dzhubatova – Chief Paediatrician of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Ministry of Health
  - Gulnara Khalilova – Head of Scientific Department and Main Specialist responsible for Baby’s Homes of Ministry of Health
  - Mukhabat Usmanova – Main specialist of the Main Department of Mother and Child Care of Ministry of Health
  - Sharhrri Berdieva – Head of Department of Public Education, Ministry of Public Education
  - Matliuba Akhunova – Head of Sub-Division of Social Projection and Rehabilitation of Children, Ministry of Ministry of Public Education
  - Anvar Karimov – Head of the Department of Monitoring of Social Protection, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection
  - Otobek - Acting head of Department of Law Enforcement Regarding Minors

- **Samarkand (pilot):**
  - Khikoyat Rakhatova - Deputy Khokim, Khokimiyat of Samarkand city
  - Halina Kukanants – Senior social worker of FCSS; Khokimiyat of Samarkand city
  - Utkir Bakhronov – Secretary of the Commission on Minors, Khokimiyat of Samarkand city
  - Tatiana Korobitsina – social worker of FCSS; Head doctor of children’s polyclinic No5
  - Lutfia Bakhridinova – social worker of FCSS; Department of public education of Khamza district.
  - Tillaeva Svetlana – Adviser of Makhallia Aksakal (Maslakhatchi)
  - Metina Berdieva – Representative of Makhallia
  - Kime Abdurashidova - Representative of Makhallia
  - Adolad Usamova – Social worker, Children’s Home “Mekhribonlik” №6
  - Shokhista Turdieva – psychologist of Children’s Home “Mekhribonlik” №9
  - Oyshirin Shaieva – Social worker, Children’s Home “Mekhribonlik” #10
  - Nigora Ergasheva – Teacher of Children’s Home “Mekhribonlik” #10
  - Adolat Rakhmanova – educator, social worker of Children’s Home #11
  - Zhytnik Elena – Guardian
  - Other families clients of FCSS

**Children from Families, which have been benefiting from FCSS**

- Kiril – 7 years old
- Nikita – 5 year old
- Timofey – 4 years old
- Evelina – 5 years

**Samarkand State University**

- Mukhtor Nasyrov – Head of International relations department of Samarkand University
- Farkhod Nabiev – Professor of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Lukmon Djuraev - Assistant professor of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Djamila Vafaeva - Assistant professor of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Yusuf Salimov - Assistant professor of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Maruf Sherov - Assistant professor of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Sokhib Narzikulov - Assistant professor of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Khairiniso Khusanova – Lecturer of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Umid Abdurakhmonov – Lecturer of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Bekhzod Khamzaev - Lecturer of the Department of sociology and social work of Samarkand State University
- Rakhima Kulieva – NGO Samarkand city teachers association

• Kashkadaria (non-pilot):
  - Inobat Sharipova, Deputy Khokim, Khokimiyat of Kashkadaria region;
  - Zamira Shonazarova, Assistant Deputy Khokim, Khokimiyat of Kashkadaria region;
  - Nuriddin Rahmatov, Secretary of the Commission on Minors, Khokimiyat of Kashkadaria region;
  - Asror Khodzhaev, Inspector of SPON, Department of public education of Karshi city.
  - Dilfuza Abdujalilova, Department of public education of Karshi city. (Responsible for prevention of orphanhood and work with vulnerable families).
  - Dolli Allaev – Head of the Oblast Department of Makhallia Fund
  - Khadicha Karimova – Director of Children’s Home #3
  - Sharofat Shaymardanova – Director of Children’s Home #4
  - Martaba Rustamova – specialist of the social protection department, psychologist of Children’s Home #6

• Sobir Rakhimov district, Tashkent (pilot):
  - Mukaddam Rasulova – Deputy khokim;
  - Akbar Radjabov - Secretary of Commission on Minors;
  - Rano Rakhimova - Senior social worker of FCSS; Department of public education of S.Rakhimov district
  - Dilorom Nishanbaeva - Social worker of FCSS; Department of Internal affairs of S.Rakhimov district
  - D.Kh.Vorisova – Director of Children’s Home #24
  - S. E. Abdurakhmonova – Deputy Director of Children’s Home #24
  - E.B. Khachaturova – Social worker of Children’s Home #24
  - D.Tursunova – Logopedician; psychologist of Children’s Home #24
  - F.Djalolova – Senior teacher of Children’s Home #24

• Khamza district, Tashkent (non-pilot):
  - Botir Umarov, Deputy Khokim, Khokimiyat of Khamza district;
  - Luiza Turaeva, Secretary of the Commission on Minors, Khokimiyat of Khamza district;
  - Utkir Kurbanov, Inspector of SPON, Department of public education of Khamza district.

RCSAC:
  - Jamoliddin Fazilov – Deputy Director;
  - Gulchekhra Sadullaeva – FCSS Project Manager;
  - Sayyora Iskanderova – coordinator of pilot FCSS in Tashkent;
  - Shakhnoza Ganibaeva – coordinator of pilot FCSS in Gulistan, Syrdarya region;
  - Salomat Tadjibaeva – coordinator of pilot FCSS in Andijan;
- Dilfuza Islamova – coordinator of pilot FCSS in Bukhara.

**Institute of Culture (in UNICEF office):**

- Erkin Khudayberdiev – dean of the department of improvement of qualification and re-qualification;
- Veronika Polyakova – 1st year graduate student/ Social work development project assistant;
- Alfiya Bekbulatova – SW course instructor;
- Anor Norbekov – dean of the department of social work;
- Alisher Yunusov – dean of the department of socio-cultural activities; a member of the National Team on Social Work; an instructor of the courses on Foundations of SW and Child Abuse and Neglect;
- Manzura Yuldasheva – trainer in the retraining course; an instructor of SW course on alternative care; Social work development project manager;
- Mansur Bekmuratov (joined later) – Social work development project director; a vice rector of TSIC.

**Graduates of a 4 months retraining programme (in RCSAC):**

- Kudrat Inagamov, RCSAC, specialist of the unit on work with children with disabilities
- Dilya Gulyamova, NGO Joint, social worker;
- Nigora Sanginova, RCSAC, specialist of the unit on work with children with disabilities;
- Ella Nazarova, RCSAC, a head of the unit on work with children with disabilities;
- Venera Khisamutdinova, RCSAC, specialist of the unit on work with children with disabilities;
- Yuliya Ivanova, RCSAC, a specialist of the unit on work with children at risk (conflict with law);
- Zarafat Uktamova, RCSAC, specialist of the unit on work with children with disabilities;
- Lilya Ismailova, TSIC, specialist of the sub-department on social work abroad;
- Bashorat Akhmedjanova, Boarding school for children with disabilities, educator;
- Feruza Rakhmatova, Boarding school for children with disabilities, educator;
- Rano Mirfayazova, Boarding school for children with hearing impairment, educator;
- Nina Turabekova, College for children with disabilities, deputy director;
- Botir Fazilov, SOS Children’s Villages Uzbekistan, youth leader.

**National team on social work**

- Lyudmila Kim – project manager RCSAC (lecturer, Institute of Culture)
- Marietta Karamian – assistant professor of National University of Uzbekistan
- Nodira Latipova - assistant professor of National University of Uzbekistan
- Maia Ganieva – Chairman of the Department of sociology, National University of Uzbekistan
- Yana Chicherina – project manager UNDP, senior lecture of Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan
- Adelia Shubina - RCSAC
- Diana Isaeva – coordinator of courses RCSAC

**Syrdarya (pilot):**

- Gulchiroy Rakhmonova – leading SW of FCSS; inspector of SPON of Yangi Yer town; national trainer on child rights in Syrdarya region;
- Pokiza Akhmedjanova – Director of children’s town of Gulistan city; SW of FCSS.
- Barno Karimova – an educator in children’s town; SW of FCSS;
- Oyhan Latipova – a teacher in boarding school for children from low income families.
- Ziyad Mahmudov – Department of public education of Syrdarya region; regional inspector of SPON;
- Lenaria Shoizakova – methodologist, Children’s home for younger children (0 to 5) of Gulistan city;
- Mekhnat Jumaeva – educator, Children’s home for younger children (0 to 5) of Gulistan city;
- Khalima Saidnazarova - educator, Children’s town;
- Sharifa Isaeva – educator, Children’s town;
- Ziyoda Khonkhodjaeva – educator, Children’s town;
- Nasiba Berdibekova – educator, Children’s town;
- Marina Primkulova – educator, Children’s town;
- Gulchekhra Usmonkulova – educator, Children’s town;
- Mekhnat Jumaeva – educator, Children’s town;
- Khalima Saidnazarova - educator, Children’s town;
- Sharifa Isaeva – educator, Children’s town;
- Ziyoda Khonkhodjaeva – educator, Children’s town;
- Nasiba Berdibekova – educator, Children’s town;
- Marina Primkulova – educator, Children’s town;
- Gulchekhra Usmonkulova – educator, Children’s town;
- Matluba Khudayberdieva – deputy director, Children’s town;
- Dilshoda Khaydarova – Deputy khokim of Syrdarya region;
- Gulom Abdusalomov – Regional secretary of the Commission on Minors, Khokimiyat of Syrdarya region;
- 2 caregivers.

- **Djizzak (non-pilot):**
  - Boriboy Kalandarov – Khokimiat of Djizzak region, Deputy khokim
  - Tatiana Kizienko – Department of public education of Djizzak region, Regional SPON inspector
  - Bakhromjon Komilov – Khokimiat of Djizzak region, Secretary of the Regional Commission on Minors
  - Ismat Rasulov – Department of public education of Djizzak city, SPON inspector
  - Norkul Tagaev – Director of Children’s Home #29
  - Sharifakhon Gafurova – Deputy Director of Children’s Home #29
  - Gavkhar Khudoykulova – staff of Children’s Home #29, Kamalot leader
  - Nodir Inatov – Director of a boarding school for children with mental disabilities
  - Okila Rakhimova – Deputy Director of a boarding school for children with mental disabilities
  - Aygul Tagaeva – Educator of a boarding school for children with mental disabilities
  - Tolkun Katabekov – Director of a boarding school for children with hearing impairments
  - Abdurazak Kholmuradov – Director of a boarding school for deaf and dumb children
  - Mukhtar Kuchkarov – Deputy Director of a boarding school for deaf and dumb children
  - Marifat Shakirova – Deputy Director of a boarding school for blind children and children with visual impairments;
  - Guzal Rakhimova - Deputy Director of a boarding school for blind children and children with visual impairments;
  - Gulnora Yarlakanova – Educator of a boarding school for blind children and children with visual impairments;
  - 5 caregivers and 6 children

- **Chilanzar district, Tashkent (pilot):**
  - Muattar Sadykova – deputy khokim;
  - Khusnutdin Makhkamov – khokim;
  - Kabuljon Mukhamedov – head of the district department of finance;
  - Utkirjon Fayziev – head of the district department of culture and sports;
  - Shavkat Yakubjanov – head of Centre of religion and enlightenment;
  - Sayora Rakhmanova- secretary of Commission on Minors;
- Umida Rikhsieva – head of department of social protection;
- Muhabbat Tadjieva – director of pedagogical college;
- Dilobar Saidhanova – paediatrician/leading specialist on work with adolescents, district department of health;
- Yuldash Shorustamov – head of the department of public education;
- Mavluda Mirziyatova – inspector of SPON; leading social worker of FCSS;
- Elena Vorobyova – head of the department of social adaptation of people returning from prisons; social worker of FCSS
- Umida Shakirova – deputy director, school # 66 for children with mental deficiencies;
- Nigora Khodjaeva – director, school # 66 for children with mental deficiencies;
- Nasiba Yahyaeva – orthopaedist, boarding school #4 for children with scoliosis;
- Dilbar Radjapova – teacher of a primary school, boarding school #4 for children with scoliosis;
- Shohida Akhmedova – director, boarding school #4 for children with scoliosis;
- Dilbar Rashidova – deputy director, boarding school #4 for children with scoliosis;
- Nailya Mukhamedjanova – doctor-paediatrician, children’s home #23.
- Victoria Narecheva – social worker; defectologist at school for children with mental deficiencies;
- Almira Dajanova – social worker; deputy director of school (responsible for prevention of orphanhood and work with vulnerable families).
- 4 caregivers.

- **Yunus Abad district, Tashkent (non-pilot):**
  - Hamid Kayumov, Secretary of the Commission on Minors, Khokimiyat of Yunus Abad district;
  - Elyor Akbarov, Deputy Khokim, Khokimiyat of Yunus Abad district;
  - Munira Narzullaeva, Inspector of SPON, Department of public education of Yunus Abad district.

- **NGOs**
  - Halina Smirnova – Director of the Centre of the Fund “You are not alone”
Annex 4. The system of social protection of children in Uzbekistan

Annex 5. Comprehensive Model of Service Provision

To ensure that every child is growing and developing in a safe family environment within their community

Steps along the way

2010

5% Support to families and prevention → 95%

Appropriate state policy and state programmes aimed at ensuring the economic welfare of families with children

95% State care (residential and family type) → 5%

The development of family support services and early intervention services in all regions and relocate financial support for families in crisis circumstances.

Priorities of family type care:
1. Guardianship of extended family
2. National adoption
3. Fostering
4. Family type children’s houses