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Executive Summary

Context: Super Typhoon Haiyan (called Yolanda in the Philippines) made landfall 8 November 2014. An estimated 14 million people were affected and at least 6000 were killed. The global Child Protection Working Group and global Education Cluster launched a joint assessment in Typhoon Yolanda-affected municipalities in February-May 2014 with the following objectives:

- Determine the scale of the needs and protection risks for children affected by Typhoon Yolanda
- Identify reasons for children being excluded from accessing education (including ECCD and in particular specific vulnerable groups)
- Gain feedback from Key Informants on the current Child Protection and Education response

The assessment was launched with the recognition of the potential for collaboration of education and child protection actions under the Strategic Response Plan (SRP) Strategic Objective (SO) 5 for the typhoon response: Affected people quickly regain access to barangay and local government services, including basic education and a strengthened protective environment.

Methodology: From the purposively selected affected municipalities, based on OCHA severity scores, 112 barangays were chosen randomly (within which 125 schools were included) using stratification of urban/rural; school/no school; and barangays with displaced populations and without displaced populations, based on the International Organization on Migration displacement tracking matrix. The following techniques for data collection were used:

- Desk research comprising a secondary data review (Annex A)
- Key informant (KI) interviews with community and school informants
- Direct observations (DOs) in barangays
- Focus group discussions (FGDs)

Further analysis occurred at regional interpretation workshops following full data collection.

Key Findings

Child Protection: Key child protection concerns emerging from the needs assessment include ongoing psychosocial distress amongst boys and girls, dangerous child labor, physical risks outside the home, early pregnancy, and out of school children.

Psychosocial Distress: 80% of assessed barangays report changes in children’s behavior (93% in Region VIII).

- Most common behavior changes cited were fear of wind and rain (reported in 90% of barangays for girls, 84% for boys) and unusual crying and screaming (68% for girls, 54% for boys)
- Over 83% of assessed barangays reported children stressed about a lack of food and shelter

Child Labor: 54% of assessed barangays report children involved in harsh or dangerous labor, including, but not only the worst forms of child labor (WFCL)

- 39% report increases in children participating in harsh/dangerous labor since Typhoon Yolanda
- 75% of assessed barangays report children working who are not accessing education

Physical Dangers: 42% of barangays report that children have died or were seriously injured in their barangays since Typhoon Yolanda
• 80% of assessed barangays report children are at risk due to dangers outside the home (roads, flooding, wires hanging); 93% report this in Region VIII.
• 51% of assessed barangays report early pregnancy is a risk children are facing; 82% report this risk in Region VI.
• 36% of assessed barangays report children involved in crime; 82% of these report looting (including theft); 40% of these report gang membership

Sexual Violence: 46% report children are most at risk of sexual violence at home; 35% report the risk is greatest on the way to school
• 12% of assessed barangays report sexual violence incidents have increased since Typhoon Yolanda

Unaccompanied/Separated Children (UASC): 32% of assessed barangays report children separated from their normal caregivers.
• In Region VIII, the main cause of separation reported was losing caregivers/children due to death following typhoon (64%); in Region VI, the main cause reported was caregivers needing to travel for work (57%)

Access to Services: 55% of assessed barangays report groups of children with less access to basic services; of these, 56% report that these are children from poor households; 19% report that these are disabled children

Education: The education portion of the assessment gathered information from barangay key informants as well as head teachers in 125 public schools, including 15 senior schools, 84 elementary schools, and 26 day care centers. The assessment key findings define the various barriers to accessing education and learning well, including damaged learning environments and challenges that teachers face.

Out of School Children: Schools in Region VIII reported decreases in attendance since Typhoon Yolanda. Many day care centers remained closed at the time of the assessment.
• 63% of assessed barangays and 58% of schools report more boys than girls are not accessing education
• 44% of assessed schools report children not accessing school due to cost of transport
• 44% of assessed schools in Region VIII and 27% in Region VI report specific groups of children not accessing education; these include children without parents, children from poor households, ethnic populations in Region VI and disabled populations in Region VIII

Barriers to Children Learning Well: 76% of assessed schools report barriers to children learning well
• 63% of assessed schools report lack of classroom supplies (textbooks, teaching/learning materials) are a barrier; 42% schools report they have 0-25% of teaching and learning materials needed
• 30% of assessed schools report stress, psychological needs are a barrier to children’s learning well
• 45% of assessed schools report damaged schools are a barrier to children learning well
• 48% of assessed schools report children with special education needs

Challenges for Teachers: 63% of schools report school building and classroom destruction; 43% report stress and psychological impact; 43% report financial constraints are main challenges for teachers

Support Received: 73% of assessed schools report receiving education materials since the typhoon; 68% report education officials have provided support since the typhoon
Cross-Cutting Issues: The assessment findings indicate the importance of integrated cluster responses. The priority cross-cutting issues are: Psychosocial Distress; Adolescent Risks (early pregnancy, child labor, out of school children); Disaster Risk Reduction; and Access to Education and/or safe Alternatives (such as livelihoods).

Recommendations:

Cross-Cutting Issues:

- Tailor services to indigenous populations, children with disabilities, adolescents, and children from poor households; Implement child-friendly referral systems on sexual violence, UASC, WFCL
- Link barangay-level and school-based organizations for complementary DRR planning and child protection, including support for out of school children
- Involve children, adolescents, caregivers, and government agencies in DRR capacity-building, including distribution of materials
- Implement inclusive messaging on prevention of child labor and available alternative livelihoods, prevention of early pregnancy, and prevention and response to sexual violence

Child Protection:

- Prioritize provision of higher-level PSS (involve Mental Health sub-Cluster); Provide ongoing PSS through peer groups, parent groups, and tailor PSS for adolescent boys
- Update family tracing and reunification and UASC support in all barangays, including child-headed households; roll out national DSWD UASC referral pathway through DSWD leadership
- Increase awareness on sexual violence and survivors of various types of sexual abuse
- Conduct awareness-raising with families, communities, and private sector on dangers of child labor; establish barangay-level focal points on child labor; ensure safe workplace for adolescents who work
- Encourage safe livelihoods and access to education/alternative education for children involved in labor and previously out of school

Education:

- Track transferred/displaced/OOSC and provide reintegration/relocation/registration support or alternative education
- Support children with disabilities through tailored services, including access to school/transport
- Provide Education in Emergencies (EiE) teacher training, inclusive of child development and child protection in emergencies components and DRR; link school DRR with barangay DRR planning
- Continue provision of TLS, school supplies and school feeding for damaged schools
- Link schools in need of support with donors through centralized database
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Key Terms

Barangay: Community-level political unit. Analysis of the assessment is at the barangay level.

Caregiver: Defined in the questionnaires as parent/guardian who normally cares for a child.

Child: People under 18 years of age

Child Labor: Work undertaken by children under the legal minimum working age. Hazardous work is work that is hazardous for the health, safety or moral development of children working in conditions that are hazardous for their wellbeing and development.

Child Protection: The prevention of and response to abuse, neglect, exploitation of and violence against children.

Early Marriage and Pregnancy: Any marriage/pregnancy of a person under the age of 18, whether legal in the country in which the marriage occurred or not.

Psychosocial support: Processes and actions that promote the holistic wellbeing of people in their social world. It includes support provided by family, friends and the wider community.

Sexual Violence: Any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic a person’s sexuality, using coercion, threats of harm or physical force, by any person regardless of relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work. Sexual violence takes many forms, including rape, sexual slavery and/or trafficking, forced pregnancy, sexual harassment, sexual exploitation and/or abuse, and forced abortion.

Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda): Super-typhoon Haiyan, called Yolanda in Philippines, made landfall November 8, 2014. Throughout the report, the typhoon is most often referred to as Yolanda, its name in the Philippines, and the name used during interviews and focus groups.

Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL): Forced or bonded labor, hazardous labor, trafficking for exploitation, sexual exploitation, illicit work or other work that is likely to harm their health, safety or morals, involvement in armed conflict.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Ps</td>
<td>Pantawid Family Pilipino Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Administrative Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPC</td>
<td>Barangay Councils for the Protection of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Child Friendly Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSI</td>
<td>Community and Family Services International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHH</td>
<td>Child-Headed Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNSP</td>
<td>Children in Need of Special Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>Child Protection Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEA</td>
<td>Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Council for the Welfare of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWD</td>
<td>Children with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DepEd</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLE</td>
<td>Department of Labor and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPWH</td>
<td>Department of Public Works and Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSWD</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTR</td>
<td>Family Tracing and Reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACAT</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Council Against Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Interagency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Information, Education and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEE</td>
<td>International Network for Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Indigenous Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IW</td>
<td>Interpretation Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Government Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRA</td>
<td>Multi-cluster/sector Initial Rapid Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDRRM</td>
<td>National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOSC</td>
<td>Out of School Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>Philippine National Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>Physical and Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCA</td>
<td>Parents, Teachers and Community Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY</td>
<td>Reconstruction Assistance on Yolanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Separated Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Save the Children International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>Secondary Data Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>Strategic Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUAC</td>
<td>Separated and Unaccompanied Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TdH</td>
<td>Terre des Hommes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS</td>
<td>Temporary Learning Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>Unaccompanied Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UASC</td>
<td>Unaccompanied and Separated Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Populations Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAWC</td>
<td>Violence Against Women and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCPU</td>
<td>Women and Children Protection Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFCL</td>
<td>Worst Forms of Child Labor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Context

A. Background and Cluster Response

Super Typhoon Haiyan (called Yolanda in the Philippines) made landfall 8 November 2014. An estimated 14 million people were affected and at least 6000 were killed. The winds and intense storm surge destroyed 1.1 million homes, displacing 4 million individuals. Of those affected by the typhoon, an estimated 41% are children.¹ Children were heavily impacted by the destruction of their homes, schools, communities, and hardships their families continue to face as a result of the typhoon. The impact of the storm threatens to increase protection risks at the same time that weakened support structures are unable to fully prevent and respond to these risks.

The United Nations responded to the Philippines government’s acceptance of offered assistance via a Cluster Coordination emergency response mechanism 9 November 2013. A State of Calamity was issued 11 November 2013 by President Benigno S. Aquino III.

The humanitarian community response is implemented through a Strategic Response Plan (SRP). The SRP is designed to support the Government of the Philippines’ response to the immediate humanitarian needs of the people affected by Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda), and complements the Government’s Reconstruction Assistance on Yolanda (RAY). The strategic objectives (SOs) cover three million affected people over a 12 month time period, from the date of the disaster.

The Education Cluster and Protection Cluster, within which is the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG), report under the SRP Strategic Objective 5: Affected people quickly regain access to barangay and local government services, including basic education and a strengthened protective environment.

CPWG: The CPWG, under the Protection Cluster, reports under SO 5C: Girls and boys are protected from violence, exploitation (including trafficking), abuse and neglect; and the existing national, provincial and local mechanisms for child protection are strengthened. After Yolanda, children faced significant and increased risks of psychosocial distress, family separations, and an increase in their participation in the Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL), including trafficking and other forms of exploitation and abuse. Priorities were to ensure functional referral mechanisms for UASC, ensure functional child protection referral mechanisms, establish child-friendly spaces (CFS) for girls and boys of all ages, conduct awareness raising activities to prevent abuse and violence against children, identify and mitigate risks for children in evacuation centers and displacement sites, train responders in psychological first aid, and provide caregivers with information and skills to provide psychosocial support for children.²

The Education Cluster reports under the following SOs:

- Education Cluster Objective 5A: Access to education improved
- Education Cluster Objective 5B: Quality age-appropriate learning for boys and girls
- Education Cluster Objective 5C: Governance of the education system

The Education Cluster, led by DepEd and co-chaired by UNICEF and Save the Children, initially estimated 1,148,393 school-aged children displaced, in particular in Region VIII, where high rates of poverty already increased children’s vulnerability. Urgent priorities were to allow establishment of temporary learning spaces (TLS) while schools were repaired/rehabilitated, support the government to establish safe and secure TLSs prior to the resumption of regular school activities, to replace damaged or missing school supplies and teaching and learning materials, and to strengthen the disaster risk reduction (DRR) and management capacity of local school communities. 

B. The Joint Needs Assessment

The global CPWG and global Education Cluster launched a joint assessment in the Philippines in February 2014 to gain affected population feedback on its cluster-coordinated L3 emergency response activities at the six month mark, identify ongoing protection and education needs of children affected by Typhoon Yolanda, and with recognition of the potential for collaboration of education and child protection actions under SRP SO 5 for the typhoon response.

The joint needs assessment covers the period of time under the ‘critical immediate needs’ timeframe of the SRP, to be completed by June 2014, and prepares information to inform activities during the second half of the SRP period, (June – November 2014), and to frame longer-term recovery actions.

At a national level, the assessment seeks to inform planning priorities for updating the Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) SRP SO 5, CPWG and Education Cluster workplans, and to provide information for education and child protection humanitarian partners and government agencies responding to ongoing needs and conducting emergency preparedness for future disasters in the Philippines.

At a global level, the joint assessment considers the complementary nature of child protection and education activities and potential collaboration between the two clusters in emergency situations, including the assessment of needs, and to contribute to the consideration of emergency preparedness for future disasters globally.

The global CPWG and global Education Cluster launched the joint assessment in the Philippines with the following objectives as defined in the agreed-upon TOR (Annex E):

- Determine the scale of the needs and protection risks for children affected by Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda)
- Identify reasons for children being excluded from accessing education (including ECCD and in particular specific vulnerable groups)
- Gain feedback from Key Informants on the current Child Protection and Education response

The assessment was launched in Regions VI and VIII in the Philippines to be concluded before the end of the 2013-2014 school year at the end of March 2014. Clusters jointly defined the assessment terms of reference (TOR) and priority themes. Themes selected for inclusion are based on the CPWG and

---

3 Ibid., 8.
II. Methodology

A. What We Need To Know (WWNK)

The clusters defined the following What We Need to Know as themes for the assessment (full WWNK in Annex F):

- Child Protection:
  - Separation of Children from their caregivers (UASC)
  - Physical Danger and Violence Against Children
  - Psychosocial Distress and Mental Disorders
  - Access to Services
  - Information Needs and Communication Channels
  - Exploitation of Children
  - Children Associated with Armed Forces and Groups (CAAFAG)
  - Capacities to Respond to Child Protection Issues at National and Community Levels

- Education:
  - Access to Education Services
  - Safe and Protective Learning Environment
  - Quality of Education and Learning Environment
  - Availability, Status, and Support to Education Personnel

B. Sampling

Location

The assessment was conducted in Regions VI and VIII, selected due to the impact that the typhoon had in these regions. Within each region, purposive sampling was used to sample from 171 most-affected municipalities, based on, OCHA severity scores for priority areas most affected by the typhoon. These 171 municipalities are those targeted through the SRP, and thus where the assessment can seek to inform ongoing programming conducted by Education Cluster and CPWG.

Within these most-affected municipalities, barangays were chosen randomly to limit any possible selection bias. The assessment aimed for a strong coverage of 120 barangays across the sample, 15 in each strata (60% from Region VIII, split between Leyte and Samar Provinces, and 40% in Region VI), the percentage split within the SRP 171 municipalities. The sample size was selected with the intention of providing a solid foundation for analysis of the geographic area targeted by the assessment and the Typhoon Haiyan

---

4 The What We Need to Know (WWNK) are themes and questions within themes. These were defined by cluster partners and child protection and education technical leaders and used as guidance for writing the education and child protection questionnaires for key informant interviews.

5 In the Philippines, the barangay is the local unit of government. Barangays make up municipalities, which make up regions. Within regions, there are also divisions at the provincial level.
response effort under the SRP. The final number of barangays selected was 112, 84 in Region VIII and 28 in Region VI due to limitations with the stratification used.

Schools were selected based on the barangay selection. In some barangays, there were no schools at all (those in the no school strata, or those where schools were all still closed). In other barangays in the no-school strata, children attended schools in adjacent barangays that were not selected via the random sampling. To increase coverage on education information, at times schools in these adjacent barangays were also included, and thus deviated from the sample frame. As such, the results of the education questionnaire demonstrate the situation only in those 125 public schools included in the survey.

This is a community level assessment - the unit of analysis for the assessment is either at the barangay and school levels.

The scope of the assessment results pertain only to those municipalities included in the overall sampling, i.e., those most-affected by Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda), and is not to be considered representative for all typhoon-affected areas or of Region VI and VIII more generally. However the use of a stratified sample frame enables results to be used as an indication of prevalent Child Protection and Education issues across the two regions should distinct differences between strata be observable. Further, data from the key information interviews was triangulated with other sources to enable wider consideration.

Population Affected
The community key informant criteria included those who could speak on behalf of their communities, including at least two individuals who work directly with children, one or two women (depending on community size), one non-government official. School key informants were head teachers.

Barangays were randomly selected within the purposively selected municipalities using the following stratification:

- **Strata 1**: Urban (40%) and Rural (60%) (using National Census classification)
- **Strata 2**: School (49%) and no school (51%) (using the Department Education list of schools)
- **Strata 3**: Displacement (36%) and non-displacement (64%) (using the IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix)

The goal to include 15 barangays per strata (within 8 categories following the stratification) in Region VI was not achieved because the strata Urban/School/IDPs; Rural/School/IDPs; and Rural/No School/IDPs did not have sufficient number of barangays. Of the 120 barangays intended, 112 were selected with 93% achieved.

C. Data Collection
The joint needs assessment utilized the following techniques for data collection:

---

6 Barangays with displacement were barangays with any family registered as currently displaced.
Desk research comprising a secondary data review (Annex A)
- Key informant (KI) interviews with community and school informants
- Direct observations (DOs) in barangays
- Focus group discussions (FGDs)

C.1 Key Informant Interview Data Collection
The first phase of the joint assessment was conducted in all 112 of the selected barangays between March 22-28, 2014. In each barangay, four tools were used to gather information:
- Education Questionnaire
- Community Site Report, which consolidated:
  - Child Protection Questionnaires
  - Direct Observation Tool

Education Questionnaire (Annex G.2):
In each barangay selected through the sampling methodology, the assessors sought to interview head teachers from up to two public schools. If there were senior schools and primary schools in the barangay, these were prioritized. In other barangays, day care centers were also included where they had reopened. Day care centers are supported by the DSWD, whereas senior and elementary schools are supported by DepEd.

The DepEd permitted the assessment to take place in public schools in the selected locations and sent a letter of support with the assessment teams. Head teachers were contacted in advance, where possible, to schedule the interview.

---

Ian Simcox-Heath.
A total of 125 head teachers were interviewed (from 125 schools) using the education questionnaire.

*Child Protection Questionnaire (Annex G.1):*
CPWG partners helped to modify the Child Protection Rapid Assessment (CPRA) questionnaire based on the TOR, WWNK, and for the local context.

Key informants selected for the interview were barangay-level leaders who could reasonably be expected to speak to the situation of children in the barangay due to their roles. Types of key informants included barangay captain and officials, social workers, health workers, religious leaders, barangay-based organization leaders, teachers, and other barangay representatives. In barangays with populations of less than 5000, three key informants were selected. In barangays with populations larger than 5000, five key informants were selected.

Assessors were instructed to select key informants for the child protection questionnaire using the following criteria:
- At least two individuals who work with children
- At least one woman (two if interviewing five key informants)
- At least one non-government informant (two if interviewing five key informants)

The DSWD supported the assessment. Letters from the regional directors requesting support were sent to municipal mayors ahead of the assessment, and barangay captains were notified in advance where possible. Upon arriving in barangays, assessment teams visited barangay captains to introduce the assessment, to provide the DSWD regional letter of support, and to begin to arrange interviews.

A total of 380 key informants were interviewed (in 112 barangays) using the child protection questionnaire.

*Direct Observations (Annex G.3)*
In each barangay, assessment teams also conducted semi-structured direct observations using a questionnaire. These considered observable key child protection risks such issues as child labor, dangers present in the community, or children living on the street. Team leaders assigned a team member to conduct this observation in a public space where children are present, such as a play area, the market, or the town center. The team member who conducted the observation discussed any relevant findings during the completion of the site reports, triangulating information from the observation with key informant interview responses.

*Community Site Reports (Annex G.4)*
Within each barangay, the child protection questionnaires and direct observations were consolidated into a singular site report. The site report seeks to remove potential bias and determine, as realistically as possible, the barangay-level child protection situation for more reliable analysis. Team leaders led the assessment teams (of five assessors each) in the consolidation of these tools.
Data Entry

Data entry staff were hired in both regions and began data entry immediately as KIIIs were conducted. The child protection questionnaire was entered into Excel using a modified Child Protection Rapid Assessment (CPRA) tool that automatically generates topline analysis. The tool was cleaned by data entry staff. IM leads and the assessment coordinator verified the quality of data entry and cleaning by randomly checking site reports against the data entry worksheet.

The education questionnaire data was entered into a Google Doc. The spreadsheet created by the Google Doc was then cleaned by the IM team and similarly checked by IM leads and the assessment coordinator.

Data Analysis

Both data entry tools automatically generated results on topline data, all of which were verified by the assessment coordinator and IM staff. The data was further analyzed at the regional and strata level (for urban/rural; displacement/non-displacement) using Excel. Some data was analyzed also at the level of school/no-school and province.

The analysis and data provided per region and strata is included for the purpose of cross-tabulation and to illustrate potential differences within these regions or strata where particularly significant.

Generally, findings should be read as indicative of trends and perceptions about the education and child protection situation across the barangays sampled, as data is not representative and percentages are based on calculating response rates. For topline data, results are considered strong if reported by more than 70%, and highly indicative if reported by more than 50% of the total sample of barangays/schools. Some data included in the findings section was of particular interest because they signified an education or protection concern for a sub-population, even when the concern was reported by fewer than 50% of barangays/schools.

Child protection and education questionnaire data was used together to triangulate results from community- and school-based key informants. Topline results were again triangulated through FGDs and analyzed by participants in the interpretation workshops in each region.

E. Focus Group Discussions

Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) were implemented between April 14-22, 2014 in one barangay per strata (a total of 8 barangays) per region (a grand total of 16 barangays) to triangulate and obtain more detailed and nuanced information received via key informant interviews.

Following initial topline analysis of the Key Informant Interview data, the CPWG and Education Cluster determined the priority themes for FGDs – those about which additional information was needed for enhanced understanding of protection concerns and barriers to accessing education, including for marginalized populations. Based on the KII data and ongoing cluster concerns, the selected themes were:

- Dangers children face (including psychosocial distress) and support services available
- Quality of education and access to education services
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- Child labor, including WFCL, and impact on access to education services

In each region, child protection and education partners provided staff to lead FGDs. These staff attended a one-day FGD training during which they were trained on child protection and assessment best practices and principles, child protection and education in emergencies, and leading FGDs with children and adults. They practiced using and translating the FGD tool and leading child-friendly activities.

Agencies that led FGDs selected from list of a barangays within a strata assigned to the agency. The list of barangays included only those that were initially included in the assessment. Attempts were made to include regional and ethnic diversity in the FGD locations, though convenience sampling was used based on logistics feasibility for implementing agencies.

In each location for FGDs, five FGDs were conducted with a maximum of 10 participants each:

- Adult Female (caregivers and some teachers, if possible)
- Adult Male (caregivers and some teachers, if possible)
- Adolescent Females (13-17)
- Adolescent Males (13-17)
- Young Children (8-12)

Two staff led each FGD in each location, one notetaker, and one moderator. Males were moderators in adult and adolescent male groups and females were moderators in adult and adolescent female groups.

In children’s groups, child-friendly activities, including introductory games and participatory mapping and drawing, ensured child safeguarding measures were used. Agencies were able to conduct referrals immediately after focus groups if any cases were disclosed, using agency-specific referral mechanisms that had already been activated.

FGD data fall within multiple themes included in KI interviews. As such, FGD data is included throughout the key findings section of the report.

The FGD questionnaire and consent forms for adults and children are included in Annex G.5-7.

Data Entry and Analysis

Notetaking forms were transmitted for translation within each region and entered into a database in English for data analysis. Responses were then coded and IM staff calculated frequencies of total respondents (by region and by male/female and adult/adolescent/children) and out of total number of groups reporting.

The FGD data was also analyzed at the level of gender/age group most affected by the issue being discussed by FGD participants – boys or girls, and boys or girls over or under 14 years old, or all children.

FGD analysis included the translation and coding of each individual participant’s response. The most frequent responses (overall, and then the majority responses per group) are included in the below report to triangulate KI data.
F. Interpretation Workshop

Interpretation workshops were held in Roxas City, Region VI May 7, 2014, and Tacloban City, Region VIII, May 13, 2014 with CPWG and Education Cluster partners, led by the assessment coordinator and cluster leads and co-leads. The invitation and agenda and minutes of each workshop (including list of participants) are included in Annex H.1-4. The interpretation workshops provided an opportunity to present and analyze key findings of the assessment and to determine recommendations and related action points for both clusters. The workshops also included a platform for considering lessons learned on the joint assessment process.

Education and child protection participants worked together in groups to analyze data per theme and presented their findings and recommendations. Themes discussed were:

- Psychosocial Distress
- Access to Services
- UASC
- Physical Dangers (including CAAFAG)
- Sexual Violence
- Child Labor
- Access to Education Services (including Safe and Protective Learning Environment)
- Quality of Education and Learning Environment (including Education Personnel)

Together, each region’s participants defined action points. Recommendations and action points defined during the IWs are included in the Recommendations section of the report and in Annex H.

Focal points to follow up on action points in each cluster were also nominated. These individuals hold the assessment materials and the outputs from the workshops in each region, including recommendations specific for DepEd, DSWD, the CPWG, and Education Cluster.

G. Ethical Considerations

The assessment was conducted with the support of the national, regional, municipal, and local-level officials. All cluster members, including members of the humanitarian community and government representatives, had the opportunity to define the WWNKs and to review the questionnaires themselves, ensuring appropriateness for the local context.

To ensure acceptance at the community level, assessors had letters of support from the regional and municipal level and asked for the support of head teachers and barangay captains prior to conducting interviews.

Moreover, child safeguarding measures were enforced throughout the assessment process. Assessors were trained in child protection principles, child protection and education in emergencies, best practices during assessments, urgent actions, and referral systems to ensure that a Do No Harm approach was understood and used, and that any urgent actions were taken within 24 hours, as per partner agency policy. The best
interest of the child principle was also included in the training and enacted throughout the assessment process.

Finally, the use of site reports enabled the reduction of key informant bias from the results by triangulating information from various key informants and further, by encompassing direct observations into final barangay-level data.

H. Gender Mainstreaming

Throughout the assessment, gender considerations were streamlined to ensure information considered the responses and ongoing needs of male, female, and transgender populations in the coverage area. Ways in which gender considerations include:

*Key Informant Interviews:*

- Male and female assessors in each assessment team
- Key Informants Interviews required selection of female and male respondents
- Female and male responses considered during qualitative analysis and production of site reports
- 75% female key informants
- Questions disaggregated to refer specifically to concerns of boys/girls/transgender children separately

*FGDs:*

- Male and female groups were separated for adolescents and adults
- Moderators the same gender as FGD participants for gender-divided groups
- Responses were disaggregated by male and female informant
- Data analyzed at level of whether discussed concern was specifically a concern for males, females, or transgender. Moderators asked specifically about gender and age group affected during all FGD questions for more in-depth information to triangulate KI data.
- Transgender category also included for FGD participant gender

I. Limitations

*Design of Assessment:*

- **Sampling:** Under the three strata used, there were not enough barangays in Region VI to be included under in each stratification for the goal of 40% barangays from Region VI per strata. Therefore there were fewer barangays from Region VI included overall, decreasing the proportion of Region VI barangays in the total survey results (from 40%, as planned, to 25%).
- **Education Key Informants:** Only head teachers were included as the key informants for the education questionnaire due to their ability to speak on behalf of their schools with information only they possess. However, head teachers have less interaction with students on a day to day basis, so may be less informed about the situation of children within their school on issues that
students encounter outside of school. Teachers were included in FGDs and as key informants in some locations to add their perspective.

- **Educational Institutions:** Private schools were also not included in the assessment
- **Focus Group Discussion interviews sampling:** The FGDs site selection used convenience sampling within purposive stratification selection.

**Assessment Implementation and post design:**

- **Strata:** In some barangays in the ‘no-school’ strata, the situation was more similar to barangays with schools, due to the proximity of schools that fall within the boundaries of adjacent barangays. Additionally, several schools were assessed that fell outside of the sample frame. The assessment suggests avoiding analysis at the school/no-school level for these reasons.
- **Barangays:** There were four barangays that assessment teams were unable to access during PKI interviews, two due to distance and lack of motorbike, and two due to security issues. In all of these situations, replacement barangays were selected randomly that fell within the same strata of each barangay to ensure adherence to the sampling methodology.
- **Translation:** The questionnaires and all tools were written and approved in English, though assessors translated questions and answers between local languages and English during the assessment. Attempts were made to mitigate potential mistranslations, or inconsistencies, by including a session during assessor training on translation of key terms (and sharing definitions between regions). Nonetheless, the possibility of inconsistency or mistranslation remains a limitation.
- **Gender of KIs:** Though attempts were made to have equal numbers of male and female key informants, about 75% of key informants were female due to their possession of key leadership roles in communities and their greater availability (whereas men were often away working in jobs that they have to supplement their leadership roles during the work day, when the assessment took place). More assessors were female as well, potentially influencing the KI gender breakdown. Assessors considered gender of respondents during the completion of site reports and did not report noticeable differences in answers. Overall results broken down by male and female respondents did not indicate much variance either.
- **Timeframe and Impact of Typhoon Yolanda:** In some locations in Region VI, barangays were not observed to be heavily affected by the typhoon. As such, some key informants’ responses to the questionnaire may have referenced the weeks just after the typhoon while recovery was still taking place, not the timeframe up until the assessment (though all questions specify that the time period for consideration was from Typhoon Yolanda until the present). It could have added value to disaggregate response options by timeframe.
- **Influence on responses:** Assessors confirmed that for the question on type of behavior change children demonstrate in the child protection questionnaire, they provided examples of answer choices to respondents, though instructed not to do so. The results of this question are still included in the key findings, and have been triangulated with other sources to ascertain their validity. The answers provided most often were validated by FGDs, as described below, and also consistent with responses from other studies.
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- **FGD locations**: Implementing agencies selected sites within each strata, but based on the ability of partners to implement them. Western Leyte was not included.
- **Interpretation Workshop**: Not all relevant stakeholders were able to participate in the interpretation workshops in each region due to scheduling conflicts. Specifically, one co-lead for the Education Cluster in Region VI and some Department of Education regional-level officials in Region VI and VIII were attending other trainings the same date as the IWs.
- **Educational Institutions**: A number of daycare centers had not yet reopened at the time of the assessment because of damage they suffered due to Typhoon Yolanda. Therefore there were many fewer daycare centers included in the assessment than exist in the selected barangays.

### III. Key Findings

**Themes**: Analysis is conducted based on the WWNK themes. Cross-cutting themes that emerged during the assessment are also analyzed. Information from the assessment was triangulated by FGDs, IW analysis, and other data sources.

All analysis is the perception of those barangays/schools reporting during KI interviews. The overall proportion of Region VI barangays is 25%, skewing the results toward Region VIII (results are disaggregated by region where significant differences were reported).

For some questions, as indicated in the Child Protection and Education Questionnaires (Annex G.1-2), respondents only answered subsequent questions if answering ‘yes’ to the first question in the category. The data included below indicate whether the percentage refers to total number of barangay/schools, or to only those responding to a certain question (A ‘no answer’ category is also included for each question).

In addition, multiple answer choices were possible for many of the questions. Only top answers are discussed as per the analysis guidelines. Region and strata differences are noted where prominent. Full tables with all raw data are included in Annex C.

Finally, with regard to strata, most displacement sites were urban and in Region VIII, perhaps influencing the urban/rural analysis.

### Theme 1: Psychosocial Distress and Community Support Mechanisms
Behavior Change Amongst Boys and Girls

In 80% of overall assessed barangays, respondents reported changes in children’s behaviors.

- More prominent in Region VIII: 92% of assessed barangays reported changes in children’s behavior.
- Consistent across strata, though marginally higher in displacement sites and urban sites.

While the reported incidence between regions differed, the type of behavior changes reported in both regions was consistent, and also is consistent with FGD reports on behavior changes and other data sources included in the SDR.

Types of behavior change boys and girls were reported to have demonstrated: Assessors uniquely gave examples for the question on type of behavior changes noticed amongst boys and girls. Still, the answers provided were validated by FGDs, as described below, and also are consistent with responses from other studies cited in the SDR.
Fear of wind and rain was the most frequent response. 90% of assessed barangays reported this change in girls, and 84% in boys.

Unusual Crying and Screaming was the second most frequently reported change in behavior, reported by 68% of barangays as a change in girls', and 55% as a change in boys' behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of Wind and Rain</strong></td>
<td>Adults secondly specified fear of wind and rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult FGDs most often reported fear of weather when asked about children’s change in behavior (10 groups/16)</td>
<td>Children specified fear of weather most frequently (14 groups/24, mostly referring to all children).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 children’s groups said fears of weather were affecting children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unusual Crying and Screaming/Psychosocial Distress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults most often reported that children experienced ‘psychosocial distress’ generally (12 groups/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 children’s groups said children experienced psychosocial distress (1 specified for younger children only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 children’s groups reported psychosocial distress was a risk children still were facing; 5 specified for older children (mostly girls), and 4 specified for younger children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Behavior Changes reported by FGDs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 children’s groups report that children are better behaved since Yolanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 groups/24 report children better behaved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 children’s FGDs reported that children were no longer interested in school and were working instead; 2 adult groups in each region (4 total) reported that children are no longer interested in school and are working more since Typhoon Yolanda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There is more helping each other than before.” – Adolescent Girls Region VIII, Leyte

**Analysis: Behavior Change**

Psychosocial distress appears to be an ongoing issue as reported through responses about fear of weather, a form of psychosocial distress in some cases, as well as respondents specifying crying, screaming, and/or psychosocial distress as a general concern. Other behavior changes were less often-reported by key informants, but also indicate ongoing psychosocial distress: aggressive behavior (12% of assessed barangays reported this for boys and girls), sadness (girls in 17% of assessed barangays and boys in 15%), and nightmares/unable to sleep (girls in 14% and boys in 13% of assessed barangays). (Multiple answers allowed)

It is possible that some children in need of PSS never received adequate support. Assessments conducted early in the emergency found that “response measures were insufficient to meet the needs of the affected
population, particularly UASC and children who have lost family members.\(^8\) Understaffing of DSWD, reported by the CPWG, also limited the reach of social workers. Social workers exist only at the provincial or municipal level.

While other assessments conducted during the same timeframe highlight that the behavior changes children experience are expected, particularly due to weather,\(^9\) interpretation workshop participants found that the high percentages reporting unusual crying and screaming is cause for concern and indicates an acute need for continued and targeted PSS. Participants recommended implementing higher levels of PSS, explaining that there was only emphasis on stress relief during the response, and general activities to help children forget experiences. During the initial response, they reported that humanitarian actors prioritized the first two levels of PSS.

In addition to children who lost family members and those in need of higher level PSS, certain groups of children may be more at risk of ongoing psychosocial distress. When comparing displacement as opposed to non-IDP sites, the fear of wind and rain, sadness, and unusual crying and screaming are all slightly more frequently reported in displacement sites for both boys and girls than in non-IDP sites. This is likely related to the psychological impact of being displaced and perhaps initially having experienced the typhoon in barangays more strongly affected. Other data sources also found that displaced populations did not feel they had adequate information or were included in planning the response, which contributed to psychosocial distress.\(^10\)

In addition, the lack of understanding about appropriate PSS for adolescent boys was highlighted during interpretation workshops. The lack of targeted psychosocial support for this group, and perhaps the lack of understanding about how adolescent boys express psychosocial distress, may indicate that adolescent boys are still at risk and in need of targeted support in Yolanda-affected communities and before and after future emergencies.

Other factors related to ongoing psychosocial distress, in addition to fears of weather, may be the changes in the physical qualities of children’s communities. In addition to exposure to physical dangers, a child’s ability to thrive may be affected by the daily reminders of the typhoon and the related fears and loss it caused. In community mapping conducted in children’s focus groups, 50% of groups discussed their experience during evacuation and damage specifically related to the typhoon. The impact of the evacuation is therefore still prominent in the minds of children, as evidenced by the many references to this during open discussion. Children likewise lost their play areas, or these suffered damaged.

Based on these responses and responses to other surveys, the strong fear of weather indicates a need for better understanding of how to prepare for and respond to weather-related disasters and better understand what weather reports mean. The inclusion of PSS training in disaster risk reduction (DRR) may be necessary to respond to the causes and impact of fears and stresses about weather.

\(^10\) ACAPS, 68.
Psychosocial distress also relates symbiotically to education. In schools, children may find outlets for reducing psychosocial distress through peer interaction and normal developmental activities. However, schools were closed, sometimes for many months after the typhoon, limiting their ability to help children recover and return to normalcy. At the same time, responses about psychosocial distress indicate that psychosocial distress and/or fear may be one reason children are unwilling to attend school, in addition to other factors. Unwillingness to go to school was reported by 17% of assessed barangays regarding girls’ change in behavior, and 15% of assessed barangays regarding boys. Anecdotally, it was reported that some younger children are fearful of walking to school by themselves, especially during rainstorms or when their schools might be surrounded by water/unsafe environmental risks. Even in reopened schools, damages to schools may continue to impact children’s return to normalcy.

*Causes of stress for boys and girls since Yolanda*

The primary causes of stress amongst both boys and girls in barangays were reported to be lack of food and lack of shelter (over 83% of all assessed barangays reporting these stresses in both regions).

In Region VIII, girls in 27% of assessed barangays are also reported to be stressed by lack of hygiene/sanitation, as are boys in 23% of barangays. (Multiple answers allowed)

*Support for boys and girls experiencing stress:*

- In 93% of assessed barangays for boys and 92% of barangays for girls, respondents said that parents can best support girls and boys experiencing problems or stress.
- Barangay captains, community leaders, and peer groups, as well as other relatives, were also sources of support mentioned in 22%-32% of assessed barangays (consistent across regions and strata, except that peer groups were rarely mentioned in Region VI).

Interpretation Workshop participants highlighted and questioned the low response rate for teachers as a source of support (6% for girls and 8% for boys overall), citing this as unusual.

*Changes in caregivers’ attitude toward their children*

In 70% of assessed barangays, respondents reported noticeable changes in caregivers’ attitudes toward their children (74% in Region VIII, 57% in Region VI).

*Type of attitude change displayed by caregivers:* The attitude changes reported in most barangays were positive attitude changes.

---

11 Ibid, 38.
What kind of changes (positive or negative) have you noticed in caregivers’ attitude towards their children?

Differences in some strata responses indicate again greater impact of the typhoon on affected populations in displacement sites, and greater concern about children amongst caregivers in urban sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caregiver Attitude Change:</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Displacement</th>
<th>Non-Displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More attention to children’s needs</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend more time with children</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers pay less attention to children</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FGDs again corroborated what key informants reported for this question:

**Region VI**

Positive Attitude Changes: Adult FGDs

6 adult groups reported parents being more concerned about children, spending more time with them, and paying more attention to their needs than before.

Children’s FGD Responses

3 children’s groups reported that their parents were more concerned about them

1 children’s group said that their parents kept them indoors

2 children’s groups said caregivers were afraid of weather

Other Behavior Changes reported by FGDs

Both regions, adult FGDs discussed caregivers becoming more religious

1 adult group in each region reported that caregivers are experiencing psychosocial distress
Analysis: Caregiver Attitude Change

While caregivers’ attitude changes were reported to be mostly positive, through other responses, informants anecdotally highlighted the challenges caregivers face, including having less time to spend with children (for example, it was reported that they are unable to take children to school or are busy searching for work). The positive attitude changes reported should be considered within the context of the question, which was not about challenges caregivers face but about attitude change, perhaps focusing more on purposeful and conscious attitude changes.

Caregivers in displacement sites appear to be slightly more concerned about children’s needs and are careful to spend time with them. This may be the result of moving to a new location, where greater care and attention to safety may be required in an unfamiliar environment. More displacement sites are urban, perhaps also accounting for the more frequent reports in urban barangays. Other dangers present in urban barangays may also contribute to the higher reports of caregiver attitude changes in these locations.

Stresses for Caregivers

The main sources of stress for caregivers were reported to be:

- Lost livelihoods (80% of assessed barangays)
- Lack of food (66%)
- Lack of shelter/unable to rebuild homes (57%).
- Children’s safety (22%)

(Multiple answers allowed)

Analysis: Stress for Caregivers and Children

The loss of livelihoods is one of the factors that anecdotally was reported as forcing parents to spend less time with their children while they sought new ways of earning. Other sources indicate that caregivers’ stresses also impact their children. Adolescents especially expressed fears about fiscal and livelihood stability, particularly their parents’ difficulty earning money and how that would impact their futures. Other studies also highlight that adolescents feel an obligation to help their families during the difficult rebuilding period, and some adolescents reportedly felt frustrated by the lack of structured and meaningful ways they could contribute. This may pose additional stresses on children and affect their educations and safety. Children may instead seek dangerous employment to supplement their families’ earnings at the detriment to their educations.

Moreover, children who are separated from their parents, often because their parents are seeking employment elsewhere, are reported to often reside with elderly family members. Elderly adults may be

---

12 ACAPS.
less able to rebuild their homes or support children in other ways. Therefore, children living with older caregivers are especially at risk of stress due to additional responsibilities, some involving physical labor, like rebuilding the home.\textsuperscript{13}

**Theme 2: Access to Services**

*External Support*

In 100% of assessed barangays visited, adults and children were receiving some form of external support in the form of financial, social services, food, or NFI support.

- In 89% of assessed barangays, the support comes from the DSWD
- In 90% of assessed barangays support was from NGOs/UN agencies (not necessarily the same barangays as those receiving DSWD support)
- 40% of assessed barangays also report receiving support from the church. (Multiple responses allowed)

This indicates that barangays receiving support from these sources may be overrepresented in this assessment.

*Children with less access to services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there children who have less access to basic services like food distributions, educational and recreational?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55% of barangays said that there were children with less access to basic services (73% of urban barangays, compared to 43% of rural barangays).

- In 56% of these barangays, children excluded from services were children from poor households
- In 19%, excluded children were reported as those with a disability.

36% of assessed barangays reported children with less access to specialized services (46% in Region VI).

- Region VI: 38% report girls have less access to specialized services

In response to a question on where children can go for support if they experience some type of physical or mental danger, FGDs provided some information on access to services:

- 2 adult female groups in Region VIII reported that there were not services available to meet these needs.
- Otherwise, Region VIII FGDs mostly said children could go to DSWD, NGOs, the police, or relatives.
- Region VI adult groups all responded that children could get assistance from barangay officials (16 groups, and 11 said DSWD).

\textsuperscript{13} Save the Children, 37.
Access to Services: Analysis

FGD respondents in Region VI frequently reported that barangay officials as resources, similarly to responses from KIs in both regions about referrals of UASC and cases of sexual violence. This may indicate that ‘access to services’ is interpreted as referrals conducted by barangay officials, without consideration of how accessible services actually are after officials provide individuals with information about where to get assistance.

More barangays reported a lack of access to basic services than specialized services. This may be the result of KI’s lack of direct experience with accessing specialized services, though no further information was available to better understand this data.

Further, interpretation workshops highlighted some imbalance in the children targeted for intended services. These services reportedly were targeted to certain communities, with the effect that children in other communities felt unsupported. Support was more concentrated in Region VIII. While the impact of Typhoon Yolanda was less severe in most of Region VI, because responses were targeted in Region VIII, there are some needs that are now more pronounced in Region VI. Similarly, interpretation workshop participants explained that some response interventions targeted most-affected areas without consideration of pre-existing differences in communities’ access to services. Reportedly, some barangays that were less affected by Yolanda but pre-typhoon were at higher risk did not receive adequate support through the response effort. IW participants expressed need for government agency capacity-building on how to most effectively distribute aid provided by humanitarian actors for future emergencies.

Pre-existing differences were also important considerations when targeting support to specific groups of children. Children from impoverished households, disabled children, and children from indigenous populations are all groups with pre-existing vulnerability that have greater vulnerability post-typhoon. For example, a key recommendation from the 2012 Child Protection Situational Analysis was to specifically target services to impoverished communities that are more vulnerable to protection concerns and most at risk of limited access to responsive services.14 Through the assessment, KIs and IW participants in Region VI discussed the risks faced by children from poor households.15 IW participants also expressed concern that some Yolanda victims were not included in the 4Ps recipient list. Currently, DSWD reports that it is expanding the program’s reach to include some typhoon victims.

For the ongoing response and post-typhoon recovery, specifically tailoring information and service provision to indigenous populations, poor households, and CWD is essential, as are services for adolescents and children living with elderly caregivers, as discussed under Theme 1.

Additional Activities: 79% of assessed barangays reported that there are people capable of organizing recreational and/or educational activities for children, 67% of which mentioned teaching, 71% organizing collective children’s activities, and 20% for keeping children safe.

---

15 This was discussed more often in Region VI, though official measures of poverty indicate higher levels of poverty in Region VIII.
Information: 97% of assessed barangays report that radio is the main source of information used to acquire information, and 71% answered TV. (Multiple answers allowed)

Theme 3: Unaccompanied and Separated Children (UASC) and Care for UASC

Assessors explained the difference between unaccompanied and separated children to respondents during this set of questions:

- Separated Child: Child living currently with someone other than his or her usual parent or guardian
- Unaccompanied Child: Child living without any adult

These questions were meant to ascertain the situation of UASC in the community where the interview took place only, not from where children came.

Separated Children

32% of assessed barangays reported that there were separated children (33% in Region VIII and 29% in Region VI). There was a slightly higher percentage of urban barangays with separated children, and of barangays with displacement (45%, while 25% of non-IDP sites reported separated children).

Demographics of separated children (of those assessed barangays reporting SC):

- 17% report that there were young children and infants separated
- 6% report separated children mainly under 5 years old.
- 68% report separated children mostly between 5 and 14 years old.
- 74% report between 1-10 separated children, usually based on respondents’ personal observation.
- In Region VI, 57% of barangays reported that separated children were mostly female.

Unaccompanied Children

15% of barangays reported unaccompanied children, 18% in Region VIII and 14% in Region VI.

Demographics of UAC (of barangays reporting UAC):

- 47% report between 1 and 5 unaccompanied children
- Six assessed barangays reported between 6 and 10 unaccompanied children.
• Three assessed barangays report unaccompanied children mainly under 5 years old.
• 53% report UAC mainly between 5 and 14 years old.
• 50% of barangays in Region VIII reported more girls than boys; 40% in Region VI reported more boys than girls.

UASC: Analysis

DSWD did not have data on CHH prior to Typhoon Yolanda, leaving a gap in response services for the most vulnerable.

The cause of separation that caregivers needed to travel for work is similar to the response that caregivers voluntarily send children to extended family or friends, as this often resulted from caregivers leaving children behind while they searched for livelihoods.\(^{16}\)

DSWD reports 130 verified unaccompanied and separated children, though this figure has not been updated since the rapid FTR was conducted in select municipalities.\(^{17}\) IW participants in Region VI explained that prior to Yolanda, it was not well understood that UASC could be an issue, but that the needs are now understood as profound. They expressed need for FTR training and to conduct additional FTR to ensure that all UASC receive adequate support. The CWC is formalizing referral mechanisms and UASC guidelines as of May 2014. This will be rolled out at the municipal level once finalized. At that point, DSWD will be responsible for regional oversight and support of LGU social workers/welfare assistants on UASC identification and case management.

Care for UASC

In 93% of assessed barangays, respondents did not know of a list of separated children; 93% also did not know of a list of parents missing their children (not the same barangays).

---

\(^{16}\) Children separated from caregivers while caregivers look for work was a pre-existing issue that likely increased as a result of Typhoon Yolanda. NGOs have estimated that roughly 4-6 million children are left behind when parents are working overseas alone, without consideration of internal relocation for work. NGOs report that few actions have been taken to support the increasing number of children separated from one or both caregivers as a result of this increasing phenomenon.

\(^{17}\) 10 March 2014 Protection Cluster Brief
Government care or care by barangay captain likely refers to reporting to DSWD (usually via the barangay captain), which manages the case.

7% of barangays have childcare institutions/homes. Four barangays reported having institutions that provide residential care (3 in Region VIII and 1 in Region VI).

Assessed barangays reported that if respondents encountered a separated child:

If you come across a child who does not have anyone who can care for him/her, what would you do? (Total)

- Take the child to the Barangay Captain: 63%
- Care for the children myself: 60%
- Inform the police about the child’s situation: 39%
- Take the child to an agency/NGO that deals with children: 37%
- Inform others: 18%
- Find someone in the community to care for the child: 12%
- Take the child to the Teacher: 3%
- Find someone outside the community to adopt the child: 2%

Taking the child to an NGO/agency that deals with children (usually the DSWD) would likely occur via the barangay captain. (Multiple answers allowed)

Care for UASC: Analysis

IW participants had different regional-level analysis regarding key informants’ response that they would care for UASC themselves. In Region VIII, this was interpreted as respondents not being aware of what to
do if UASC are identified. In Region VI, this possibility was raised, but the response was also interpreted to be a result of larger, close-by extended families in rural barangays, therefore with more individuals from the family unit available to care for a separated child. Participants in both regions reported a serious gap in understanding of UASC, both due to the limited scope of the FTR process and also understanding of care and referrals needed for UASC.

**Theme 4: Dangers and Injuries, Physical Violence and Other Harmful Practices**

**Deaths and Injuries to Children**

42% of assessed barangays reported children seriously injured or killed as a result of physical dangers since Typhoon Yolanda (50% in Region VIII, more in urban and displacement barangays as well). Of these:

- 56% of assessed barangays reported between 1 and 5 deaths/injuries.
- In Region VIII, 9 assessed barangays reported between 11 and 20 deaths/injuries, 8 barangays reported between 6 and 10 injured or killed.
- Most barangays said that this information was acquired through personal observation (69%).

**Physical risks children face**

The most common dangers reported for children were risks outside the home and early pregnancy.

**Risks outside of the home:**

- Reported in 80% of assessed barangays (most reported physical risk in Region VIII)
- Risks include flooding, hanging wires, dangers in the road, and other dangerous infrastructure.
- Reported as affecting mostly children between 6-14 years old
- 34% reported these risks affect boys most.
- Relatedly, car accidents were a risk reported in 38% of barangays.

**Early Pregnancy:**

- Most reported physical risk in Region VI
- Reported to mostly affect girls 14 and older
- 15 assessed barangays reported the risk was greatest for girls 6-14

**Risks at home (child abuse) were reported in 31% of barangays, 46% in Region VIII.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Risks</td>
<td>Reported in 93% of Region VIII barangays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 children’s groups report outdoor risks; 5 adult groups</td>
<td>4 adult groups report outdoor risks; 2 children’s groups specified the risk for young girls and boys; 1 specified the risk for older girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mappings conducted by children’s groups in both regions often showed risks outside, including road dangers, dangerous waterways, fallen trees, and others as pictured above (example from Eastern Samar).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82% of Region VI barangays reported early pregnancy a risk (the most reported risk in Region VI)</td>
<td>Reported in 51% of total assessed barangays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FGDs total reported risk of early pregnancy; 1 adult male group specified this risk for older girls.</td>
<td>13 FGDs total in Region VIII reported the risk of early pregnancy; 2 adult male groups; 5 children’s groups reported this risk specifically for older girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse reported by FGDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 FGDs reported substance abuse a risk for all children; 5 specified for adolescent boys</td>
<td>7 FGDs reported substance abuse a risk for adolescent boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 reported substance abuse a risk for young boys (under 14)</td>
<td>3 reported substance abuse a risk for young boys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Risks are Greatest:

- 86% report outside the home
- 46% report on the way to school
- 22% report that risks to children are most common at home

Physical Dangers: Analysis

**Dangers Outside:** The dangers outside the home may relate to parents’ inability to walk their children places due to increased limitations on their time post-Yolanda, and may also impact access to school for children who do not feel safe walking there. Dangerous roadways were discussed during IWs. Participants highlighted the need to coordinate with the DPWH in future emergencies and to consider communication strategies to limit dangers on the roads in the immediate post-emergency phase. As discussed in the PSS section in Theme 1, the dangers still present in communities six months after the typhoon impact physical and mental health and children’s abilities to recover, access safe play areas, and access education safely.

**Early Pregnancy:** Assessors said that early marriage was not ever mentioned by respondents, but that respondents reported increases in early pregnancy (anecdotally, key informants also acknowledged early
pregnancy as a risk pre-existing Typhoon Yolanda). Other data sources found that sexual initiation begins as early as 14 years old for females and 15 years old for males. In Region VI, during interpretation workshop, participants noted that 60% reported early pregnancy a risk in urban settings. They interpreted this as the result of population density, influence from peers, and cultural differences.

Some respondents and assessors reported that early pregnancy at times resulted from shared living conditions in bunkhouses. While data did not indicate this in a significant way, it is important to consider this pre-existing and ongoing risk for adolescents, especially during relocations and in designing bunkhouses, temporary shelters, and services available in these locations including awareness-raising about safe sexual practices and the importance of health care during pregnancy. Other data sources found that young girls try to conceal pregnancies for as long as possible, neglecting to access potentially life-saving health services.

In results divided by urban and rural locations, the physical risks reported are similar, with the exception that sexual violence and harmful traditional practices are only reported in rural barangays (10% and 4% respectively), none in urban barangays. Car accidents and abuse at home are reported slightly more frequently in urban environments.

Where physical risks are greatest: The question considers overall dangers, not the specific dangers that respondents mentioned. These responses likely refer to the dangers outside the home identified most frequently as the risks children face in barangays, and also may contribute to information about why children are afraid to go to school. Risks at home, work, and outside reported, especially in Region VI, possibly refer to early pregnancy, the dominant risk reported in the region.

Urgent Messages Needed in Barangays/Schools

Urgent Messages Needed: Analysis

DRR was not a priority in the early phases of the response, and though communities had some experience with DRR and previous typhoons, stress and physical risks resulted from a lack of understanding about

---

18 Save the Children MSA, 45-46.
urgent actions to take in the post-emergency phases for the immediate and longer term. Streamlined DRR and information on dangerous weather is needed at the barangay and school levels, incorporating PSS and what to do in the immediate post-emergency phase. In future emergencies, incorporating this type of awareness-raising with immediate distributions at the earliest stages would help to reduce mental and physical risks. Along with urgently-needed services and distributions, affected populations would immediately improve their own ability to help themselves and each other to reduce psychological distress and physical risks experienced. This could also target adolescents, empowering them to support their communities in safe ways.

Children Committing Acts of Violence

36% of assessed barangays report children are committing acts of violence in the barangay. In comparing by strata, a higher percentage of urban barangays reported children committing acts of violence (47%) than rural barangays (28%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Looting/Theft</th>
<th>Gangs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 36% of barangays reporting children involved in violent crime:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% of barangays reporting children committing acts of violence reported</td>
<td>40% reported gang activities (47% of those in Region VIII and 20% in Region VI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looting/pillaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three FGDs in Region VIII discussed looting as ongoing, perhaps referring to</td>
<td>2 adult FGDs and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petty theft that was a pre-existing issue.</td>
<td>children’s group in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region VIII (different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>locations) specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gangs as a risk for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>older children; 2 adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups, 1 adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boy group, and 1 active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group in Region VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reported that gangs were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a risk for all children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"After the typhoon people became worse, there is looting everywhere, the people fight for each other and they are always panic." Adolescent girls focus group, Region VIII.

Children involved in Violent Crime: Analysis

Gang membership was reported through other questions in the questionnaire. For example, gang members were a specific group identified as not attending school, and in one community, listed as a form of harsh/dangerous labor.

Petty theft seems to be a pre-existing concern; UNICEF reported that of 50,000 children arrested and detained since 1995, most often the reason was petty theft, in addition to sniffing solvent and vagrancy.\(^\text{19}\)

Theme 5: Children Associated with Armed Forces and Armed Groups

1% of assessed barangays reported that there are children working with/being used by armed forces and groups. The barangay reported that recruitment events have been held in child care institutions.

Five barangays did not answer this question.

---

\(^{19}\) ACAPS, 71.
Tapaz in Region VI was avoided due to possible sensitivities with armed forces and groups, based on local security advice from partner agencies.

**Theme 6: Sexual Violence**

When asked about actions taken in the case of sexual violence, 32% of assessed barangays reported that sexual violence never occurs in their barangay.

12% of assessed barangays reported that there have been increases in sexual violence since Typhoon Yolanda, 14% in Region VIII and 4% in Region VI.

*Those affected by sexual violence:*

96% of assessed barangays report more girls than boys are affected by sexual violence.

**Where sexual violence is a risk:**

30% reporting the risk for children working away from home may reference children who leave their barangay and work in other cities or countries. This practice was reported by nine children in FGDs.

In Region VI, 29% report the risk is greatest in common areas, and 21% say while working in the fields (lower percentages reported this in Region VIII).

*Support for children:* 98% of barangays report that there are services for survivors of sexual violence in their barangays and in 99% of them, that children can also seek help. These are possibly the barangay captain and/or DSWD.
Though 32% report that sexual violence does not happen in the barangay, 85% of barangays say that adolescents would seek help (fewer in Region VI than VIII), mostly from their mother.

If they knew of a case of sexual violence, 87% of assessed barangays reported that individuals would report the case to police or community justice systems. 77% report that they would bring cases to community social workers.

Sexual violence was not asked about explicitly in FGDs.

**Sexual Violence: Analysis**

IW participants reported that understanding of what sexual violence entails, and who is affected, is still limited. According to participants, children are unaware of what sexual violence is and do not therefore know how to protect themselves. Key informants reported that sexual violence was not increasing following Typhoon Yolanda, in most cases. However, IW participants experience that sexual violence is both occurring and increasing, as is often the case after emergencies. This perhaps suggests that there is a lack of understanding that sexual violence is often not reported because it is a taboo, even if resources exist.

Community leaders’ responses further indicate a lack of full understanding of sexual violence. The overwhelming percentage reporting that sexual violence mostly affects girls may indicate a lack of knowledge about sexual violence affecting boys. Further research is needed to better understand the risks of sexual violence for boys and transgendered children and how to best respond to these risks given the lack of awareness.

**Care for sexual violence survivors**: Though 32% of assessed barangays report that sexual violence never happens, the overwhelming majority report that adolescents would report sexual violence if it occurred. The lower percentage reporting that adolescents would seek assistance in Region VI may indicate greater understanding that adolescents might not seek help, or may indicate greater cultural barriers or fewer resources available to help. Respondents reported available services for sexual violence survivors, including
children, in almost all cases. However, there might not be an understanding of the types of services needed, or the limitations of certain services, such as barangay officials, to respond to sexual violence.

Social workers are not based in barangays themselves but are at the municipal level. Referrals to ‘community social workers’ would likely occur via the barangay captain or other community-based workers to the MSWDO. Still, service provision is reportedly limited for sexual violence survivors, despite KIs’ reliance upon these mechanisms. Other data sources report that there is “inadequate presence of safe havens for women in crisis, geographical coverage of GBV prevention and response, and capacity to legally process cases of GBV survivors in a timely manner” 20 and that “specialized services for males are inadequate.”21

Further, health care needs of survivors are not well understood based on assessment data and are reported to be severely understaffed by other data sources, as are formal justice mechanisms.22 Though BCPCs could serve as a support network at the barangay level, many are not fully functional or require additional capacity-building. These limitations might be why in some cases, barangay officials reportedly attempt to settle the issue of sexual violence themselves. They assist families of perpetrators and survivors with reconciliation, but this practice may neglect the needs of the survivor, both in terms of physical and mental health, particularly child survivors.

**Theme 7: Child Labor**

For the set of questions on child labor, harsh and dangerous child labor was defined as “work that is unacceptable because the children involved are too young and should be in school, or because even though they have reached the minimum working age (15 years), the work they do is harmful to the emotional, developmental and physical wellbeing of a person below the age of 18,” as well as worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

**Trafficking**

The child protection questionnaire asked about children taken from their barangays by outsiders and by community members.

6% of assessed barangays reported that there were outsiders offering to remove children from barangays. Most sources referred to NGOs that were conducting family tracing. Two referrals of suspected trafficking were made in relation to the answers provided for this question. Eight barangays did not answer this question. One barangay official reported that he refused an offer of assistance because he feared that the representative might be involved in trafficking.

In 4% of assessed barangays, there were reports of community members offering to remove children, mostly referring to children’s relatives or churches in barangays providing support for specific children whose parents had left, were missing, or been killed.

20 10 March 2014 Protection Cluster Brief
22 There is only one fully functional Women and Children Protection Unit (WCPU) in the Western Visayas region.
Children involvement in harsh and dangerous labor

54% of assessed barangays reported that there were children in the barangay involved in harsh and dangerous labor.

In an FGD question on risks children are facing, in Region VIII, 4 children’s groups and 1 adult male group said child labor was a risk children face. In Region VI, 1 adult female group specified this risk for older boys.

Why Children Work

The main reason for children’s involvement in harsh and dangerous labor was reported to be voluntary, to support themselves or families (in 82% of barangays). 18% of assessed barangays did not answer why, possibly barangays where harsh and dangerous labor was not reported to be occurring, as even respondents who did not report this practice answered why children work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why Children Work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes About Child Labor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 children’s FGDs and 6 adult groups reported children helping to support their families since the typhoon</td>
<td>Most FGDs with adults and children reported that it is not acceptable for children to work and not acceptable for children to work and not attend school; 25% of adult groups said it is the parents’ responsibility to make sure that children can go to school (when asked about children working who are not in school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 young children’s group specified that children are helping with household chores since the typhoon</td>
<td>4 adult groups and 3 children’s groups in Region VI reported that due to dire financial need since Typhoon Yolanda, it is acceptable for children to work in the current context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 adult groups and 7 children’s groups in Region VIII reported that due to dire financial need since Typhoon Yolanda, it is acceptable for children to work in the current context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of work in which children participate

- Farm work reported by 37% overall, 64% in Region VI
- Household helper in other homes reported by 23% of assessed barangays
- Other forms of harsh and dangerous labor mentioned were vendors, construction, fishing, collecting scrap materials, and transporting goods.
- 3% of assessed barangays reported children involvement in sexual transactions.
- One barangay reported drug running, and one barangay reported gang membership as a type of dangerous labor.
In FGDs with both adults and children, the only type of labor mentioned with any regularity was children working as ‘laborers,’ reported by 7 children’s groups in Region VIII, mostly affecting older boys. Two groups also reported that fishing and domestic labor were types of labor in which children are involved, again, mostly affecting older boys.

Through other FGD questions, adults reported older girls staying home to help take care of younger siblings. Through other questions as well, adults mentioned older boys helping to rebuild homes as an added responsibility, though neither of these responsibilities is considered child labor, even if they may pose physical risks or stress for children.

2 adult groups and 2 children’s groups in Region VIII reported that children left the barangay and were working in other cities when asked if children were working who were not in school. This may indicate a danger for hazardous labor or trafficking; other sources report that girls are often trafficked for domestic servitude.23

Changes in child labor since Typhoon Yolanda: 39% of assessed barangays reported that more children are involved in harsh and dangerous labor than before Yolanda.

Though in FGDs, it was not usually specified that more child labor is occurring since Yolanda, groups reported that it is more acceptable for children to work due to dire financial need since Yolanda. In other questions, groups specified that children had been working before Yolanda as well.

27% of assessed barangays reported that new types of child labor have emerged since Typhoon Yolanda.

- Barangays reporting new forms of harsh and dangerous labor is higher in barangays with displacement

---

23 Government of the Philippines, Department of Labour, 2012; ACAPS, 71.
• In Region VIII, 31% of assessed barangays reported increases in type of child labor; 19% in Region VI.
• Forms of child labor emerging since the typhoon include farming, serving as household help in other barangays, children working as pedicab drivers, construction work, welding, or collecting materials. Sexual transactions were not reported to be increasing in any barangay.

Information on child labor’s impact on access to education are included in Theme 8: Access to Education, which follows.

Child Labor: Analysis

Other data sources estimate that there are 255,000 children in Region VI and 213,000 children in Region VIII participating in hazardous labor. In these regions, 20.2% and 24% of the total population of children is working, respectively. Sources also explain that an underlying issue in the Philippines is that there is a gap between the minimum working age (15) and compulsory education (12), leaving children 12-14 vulnerable.\(^{24}\) Of children who reached the minimum working age, employment data from April 2006 shows that 36 million of the 55.4 million population 15 years old and over had entered the labor force.

IW participants reported that child labor has been an ongoing issue in the Philippines, but in part due to the labor context and legislation, it has not been well understood as a risk. There is a lack of understanding about child labor risks, child labor and child protection laws. This includes amongst families, who may not understand the risks that their children, including adolescents, face while participating in some forms of labor. The private sector and law enforcement also lack understanding about why child labor is a risk and about legislation in place to prevent dangerous child labor. In the immediate, barangays require understanding and actionable preventative measures to take to ensure that workplaces where children are present are safe for children. This requires inter-cluster coordination. IPs have additional, specific needs regarding child labor. There is no single agency working to address dangerous child labor.

Children are reportedly stressed about the lack of shelter and food, and perhaps their inability to safely contribute to their families to reduce these stresses. This stress places them at risk of unsafe employment that would enable them to immediately contribute to their families’ needs. In the post-emergency context, despite the need for livelihoods, it is essential to limit children’s involvement in labor and participation in hazardous labor, particularly when children may be at risk of dropping out of school.

Finally, the risk of trafficking is well-documented, particularly in Typhoon-affected regions. While there were many actions taken via IACAT and R/IACAT after Typhoon Yolanda and by partner agencies as noted in the SDR, the trafficking response is limited by the difficulty identifying traffickers and lack of awareness at the barangay level about what trafficking might look like.

Theme 8: Access to Education Services

\(^{24}\) ACAPS, 70.
The child protection and education questionnaires asked about children’s access to school. Head teachers were respondents where responses are at the school level, and community key informants for barangay level.

Groups of children not attending school

In all levels of education in both regions, there have been drops in attendance between the period before Typhoon Yolanda in November 2013 and the end of March 2014, according to attendance numbers provided by head teachers.\(^{25}\)

- Region VIII: The decrease in attendance is higher, on average; 90%-94% of students attending in March 2014 of those attending before Typhoon Yolanda. In Region VI, attendance is 95%-99% of what it was before Typhoon Yolanda.
- In particular, attendance was reported to have decreased more significantly in Tacloban City: 83% of girls and 84% of boys attending elementary schools and 86% of boys and 88% of girls attending senior schools compared to pre-Yolanda attendance.
- In all provinces’ senior schools, boys’ attendance has decreased more than girls’ attendance has.
- Though data from the assessment indicates that elementary school has the highest percentage decrease in attendance, other sources indicate that senior school has higher decreases in attendance.
- In FGDs, 31 children’s groups said that they were able to access school.
- In one Region VIII displacement site, adolescent girls said that they stopped going to school.
- One adolescent girl FGD in Region VI was comprised of multiple participants who reported that they were unable to return to school.

Gender:

- Barangays: 63% reported more boys not attending schools, 96% in Region VI. 30% of barangays said that there is no difference.
- Schools: 58% reported more boys out of school than girls, and 70% in Region VI. 14% of schools reported more girls out of school than boys.
- Higher percentages of schools in non-IDP sites and rural sites reported more boys out of school than girls.

Why Children are not in School:

Schools and communities reported that children are not accessing schools for three primary reasons: lack of transportation to schools/displacement, financial limitations, and psychosocial needs. These are detailed on the subsequent page:

---

\(^{25}\) According to assessors, some head teachers only provided estimations on attendance, particularly for pre-Typhoon Yolanda. In contrast, official figures of attendance from the Department of Education, provided to DepEd by head teachers, conflict with the assessment findings in some provinces.
## Why Children Are Not in School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer/ Distance to School</th>
<th>School Respondents</th>
<th>Community Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46% of schools report that children are not in school because they have transferred outside of the region, presumably to a different school (58% of schools in displacement sites reported this). This may mean that these children are in school elsewhere.</td>
<td>37% of barangays in Region VIII, reported that children had transferred out of the region, presumably to a different school, though other data indicates this may also be for work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DepEd mandated that principals allow new students who have relocated to register immediately after Yolanda, though information from the Education Cluster suggests that many students did not want to change schools near the end of the school year and that families’ residences are still unstable.</td>
<td>44% of barangays reported that children are not in school because of the cost of transport, related to distance to school (reported by 19%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DepEd student tracking data was not available to verify whether students who had relocated were registered in other schools. Action points from interpretation workshops are to follow up on these students and determine whether there are children who were relocated but not registered in new schools.</td>
<td>84% of assessed barangays reported that children are not attending school because they lack materials, including textbooks, supplies, uniforms, or other clothing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% head teachers report that the lack of school materials (textbooks, materials, uniforms, etc.) is preventing children from attending schools.</td>
<td>28% of schools in Region VI reported that homelessness is inhibiting students’ access to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of barangays in Region VIII reported that the need to work kept children from accessing education.</td>
<td>50% of assessed barangays in Region VI said that children were not in school for some financial reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73% of assessed schools in displacement sites reported that children were not in school due to psychosocial needs.</td>
<td>Region VI FGDs: 7 adult groups and 6 children’s groups reported financial problems; 4 adult groups also reported that children were helping parents. Region VIII FGDs: 3 adult groups and 9 children’s groups reported children were working; 4 groups specified that children had moved to find work; 3 adult groups reported children out of school to find livelihoods and 2 reported financial problems generally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple children in one young children’s FGD in Region VIII reported that psychosocial distress prevented their return to school. In Region VIII, 4 adult groups said children need recreational activities and 3 said children need stress debriefing; 1 adult female group in Region VIII reported that it was still unsafe at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of assessed barangays (overall total) reported that children are not in school because of psychosocial needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most FGDs reported children being able to access school since Yolanda. When asked why some children were not accessing school, if this was occurring in their barangay, other responses were:

- Damaged schools are hindrances to children’s return to school: 14 children’s groups.
- Children not interested in school: 8 children’s groups in Region VIII and 5 in Region VI.
- Children out of school due to early pregnancy: 5 groups in Region VIII and 1 in Region VI.
- Children were already out of school before Typhoon Yolanda: 2 FGDs in Region VI and 3 in Region VIII.

There was no answer for destruction of school in key informant interviews and this did not come up within ‘other’ answers from head teachers.

**Specific groups of children not accessing education:**

![Graph showing percentage of school non-attendance by region and group.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% “other” likely encompasses out of school youth.</td>
<td>50% of barangays reported that a group of children not in school was ‘out of school youth.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of barangays reported that specific ethnic groups were unable to access education</td>
<td>17% of barangays reported disabled children not accessing school (19% of barangays report disabled children with less access to basic services)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why specific groups of children are not in school: 56% of community respondents reported financial issues; 40% report that in Region VI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Head Teacher Responses</strong></th>
<th><strong>Head Teacher Responses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27% of head teachers report specific groups of children not attending school</td>
<td>44% of schools report specific groups of children not attending school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20% of these (5 schools) report children without a parent or guardian not attending. 4 schools report children with disabilities and 4 schools report children working were out of school. Other responses reference children with financial constraints, lack of parental attention or encouragement of children to attend school.

Why specific groups of children are not in school: transferring outside the region, lacking school materials, mostly in Region VIII, or needing to work.

Children Not in School Who are Working

75% of assessed barangays reported that there are children working who are not able to go to school, 83% of assessed barangays with displacement.

When FGDs were asked if there were children working who were not in school since Typhoon Yolanda:

- Children not able to return to school since Typhoon Yolanda are not returning because they are working: 11 children’s groups in Region VIII; 6 in Region VI.
- Children prefer to work: 12 children’s groups in Region VIII; 3 adult groups in Region VIII; 3 children’s groups in Region VI.
- Children are helping their parents: 3 adult groups in Region VI and 3 children’s groups in Region VI; 4 adult groups in Region VIII.
- Financial problems: 3 children’s groups in Region VIII; 2 in Region VI
- Children working still access education: 3 adult groups and 3 children’s groups in Region VI; 4 children’s groups in Region VIII.

Access to Educational Services: Analysis

Only 15 senior schools were included in the assessment and many daycare centers intended for inclusion had not yet reopened at the time of the assessment due to damage from Typhoon Yolanda. Therefore, data was not able to capture the attendance trends by school type.

In its consideration of out of school children (OOSC), the assessment was limited in its understanding of whether children were out of school since Typhoon Yolanda and how many children were already out of school prior to the emergency. Similarly, it is unclear whether children who were working already were out of school and working before Yolanda, whether their labor has increased or become dangerous since the Typhoon, and how that impacts their educations.

DepEd data shows how many children were in school prior to Yolanda as opposed to attendance after the typhoon, at the time of the assessment in March 2014. However, there is not a system that captures information on out of school children, or much programming that reaches this group of children. Further, data on alternative learning programs was not available. The Education Cluster with the CPWG and DSWD are considering inter-agency approaches to tracking and reaching OOSC through mapping, particularly in displacement sites, and better understanding reasons for non-attendance.

In general, the structured DepEd calendar posed some challenges for children who missed school, particularly those who missed exams as a result of displacement caused by the Typhoon. Though DepEd
immediately allowed for enrolment in other schools, children’s feelings of safety and confidence while returning to schools familiar to them were not prioritized.

Specific Groups of Children Not Accessing Schools: The assessment findings provide information on the types of children who may be at greater risk for non-attendance, in particular adolescent boys. The comparable percentage decreases in school attendance for boys’ and girls’ attendance suggests that the greater percentage of schools and barangays reporting more boys than girls out of school was a phenomenon that pre-dated Typhoon Yolanda. Boys out of school may be related to higher percentages of boys working full-time outside the home than girls, especially older boys.

Moreover, the 50% of assessed barangays in Region VIII reporting out of school youth relates to a number of other child protection risks identified through the assessment. This group of children may correspond with children affected by child labor activities, early pregnancy, and other protection risks affecting adolescents. Finally, with regard to CWD, there is similarly a high percentage of schools (48%) reporting children with special needs. This high percentages indicates a need to target initiatives early on to children with special needs. A mapping would help to understand what services for CWD are currently available and which services were available before the Typhoon and require rebuilding. Also, disabled children may have attended private schools that were also damaged, but not included in the assessment, which only considered public schools.

Reasons Children are Not Accessing Schools: Analysis

Labor: Though 75% of assessed barangays report children working who were not accessing schools, the need to work was not reported by many key informant respondents. This perhaps indicates that children out of school who are working is not seen as unusual, or was not something unusual and specific to the post-Yolanda period. OOSC, including those who were out of school before Typhoon Yolanda, could be targeted for enrolment in alternative learning through DepEd and partners.

For children who were specifically seeking employment after Typhoon Yolanda due to dire financial need, there is risk of ERD and Shelter activities pulling children into the labor force. Children who were earning cash for work through these sectors may not return to school after the summer holiday without joint cluster coordination on back to school activities and safeguards for cash for work activities. Future emergencies should consider this potential pull and consider alternative activities for children until schools reopen. Ideally, these activities would be conducted in coordination with the education system to seamlessly support children’s registration and attendance as soon as schools reopen, and could concurrently fill the gap of children’s, especially adolescents’, peer to peer interaction while schools are closed.

In interpretation workshops, cluster partners observed that in addition to children who are working not attending school, their non-attendance may also impact their siblings. Distance to school may be a cause for non-attendance and if older children are working instead of walking to school with siblings, their siblings may not attend either.

Potential correlations exist indicating certain at-risk barangays: barangays with displacement more frequently report increases in children participating in harsh or dangerous labor and in emerging types of
harsh and dangerous labor. Also, the heavier impact of damage in Region VIII and related delay in schools opening (discussed in Theme 9), children in displacement centers working as opposed to returning to new schools in their new locations, and schools reopening more slowly in rural areas than urban centers may drive some of the increase in children participating in harsh and dangerous labor, in particular those working at the expense of their educations.

Transport/Financial: For families who are still displaced or who are unable to pay costs of transport to school, solutions must be discussed immediately with DepEd and cluster partners from education and child protection to ensure that children feel confident and safe accessing school. This is particularly important if children’s living circumstances remain in flux or they have been assigned to a new school while living in a bunkhouse/displacement site, but prefer to go to their original school. Transportation, particularly partner-supported school buses, was successful in the post-Yolanda months.

In addition to the reasons for children’s nonattendance explained in the findings section, it is possible that homelessness, reported by 24% of Region VI schools, indicates displacement or damaged homes, though fewer shelters were destroyed in Region VI. This perhaps indicates fewer shelter services provided in Region VI.

Lastly, results on dangers children face in their communities, specifically on the way to school or at school, may impact access to education:

![Bar chart showing sexual violence most often occurs](chart1)

Where do you think physical risks are high/highest for children?

- In school
- On the way to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In School</th>
<th>On the Way to School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region VI</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VIII</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual violence most often occurs on the way to school**

**Back to School:**

Individual meetings between principals and families to encourage the return to school were particularly effective at quickly boosting attendance in areas affected by the typhoon. However, for those children who were unable to sit for exams or who were absent for an extended period of schooling due to displacement, the ability to make up missed classes and reenter the formal education system has proven difficult. It is essential to have increased DepEd flexibility regarding missing school following disaster so that children affected can continue with regular education by making up weeks of missed lessons and exams. As of now, for some students alternative education is the only option.

The back to school campaigns launched in May and June 2014 prior to the reopening of schools should target OOSC and those working over the summer, therefore involving many clusters. For children affected
by financial concerns, it is important that they understand that lacking materials for school is not a reason for nonattendance, and that they feel confident they will receive support and not be stigmatized when they do return to school.

**Theme 9: Safe and Protective Learning Environment**

*School Damage and Closure*

In 83% of the schools visited, the school had been closed for some period after the typhoon.

- **Average number of days the school closed:**
  - Region VIII: 19
  - Region VI: 14
  - Day Care Centers: 26.22
  - Elementary Schools: 13.02
  - Senior Schools: 13.71

- The school year in Region VIII was extended, while it was implemented as per the original calendar in Region VI.

- In 67% of assessed schools, there have been provisions for catch-up classes since the typhoon (76% in Region VIII).
  - Most of these schools reported make-up school sessions took place on Saturdays, mostly a full day (8 hours).

- In 59% of schools, the exam schedule has been affected by the typhoon (64% in Region VIII).
  - Region VIII: 94% of these assessed schools reported that the exam dates changed.

**Damaged Schools: Analysis**

Damaged schools were a primary reason that schools remained closed for multiple weeks and months in some locations. In FGDs, 14 groups reported that damaged schools were a hindrance to accessing schools. But the impact on students and teachers was not only missing classes. The lack of physical infrastructure affects the quality of a child’s learning while they attend schools that are still damaged. According to head teachers in 45% of assessed schools, one of the most common barriers to children learning well was damaged schools. 16 children’s groups in Region VI and 12 in Region VIII discussed damaged schools as a change in children’s educations since returning to school.

Likewise, 63% of assessed schools report that school building and classroom destruction are one of the main challenges teachers face. Moreover, damaged classrooms result in more double-shifting or multi-grade teaching, posing additional demands on teachers.

Of 25% of assessed schools that report that support received was not appropriate, many head teachers further explained that this was because schools still have structural damage that has not been repaired.

Beyond damage to schools themselves, many schools are located on highways or in areas that may flood during heavy rains. Schools were also used as displacement shelters, and some in Tacloban City area still
were being used as displacement centers in January 2014, three months after Typhoon Yolanda, despite guidelines that mandate a maximum of eight days for individuals to use schools for shelter after disasters.

The humanitarian community was unable to fill certain gaps regarding the education environment, in part due to DepEd guidelines. It would be useful to create an immediate link between DepEd and donors to more efficiently target funding to schools that are still damaged or to repair unsafe areas surrounding schools, support extra days of teacher salaries if needed, and cover transportation where necessary so that children can return to school more rapidly.

Also, in School Improvement Plans, alternatives are needed for school buildings that remain unsafe for a prolonged period. Inclusion of actions to take to limit physical dangers that inhibit access to school and to avail safe transportation options for students affected by these dangers are necessary in the School Improvement Plans.

Finally, families seeking shelter in schools should be targeted for assistance in the week following an emergency through coordination with Shelter and CCCM clusters.

**Parents and Teachers Associations**

In 85% of assessed barangays, there are active Parent and Teacher Associations (PTAs) in schools. This percentage was similar to the number of schools reporting PTAs. In 74% of the barangays, PTAs supported the school post-Yolanda by undertaking school repairs and improvements, mostly including clean-up drives at schools. PTAs also provided financial support, governance and decision-making in schools, and support to return to school programming (21—28% of barangays). In some locations, respondents explained that the PTA provided no support after Typhoon Yolanda, as members were also victims of Yolanda.

**Theme 10: Quality of Education and Learning Environment**

**Barriers to Children’s Learning Well**

76% of assessed schools reported that there are barriers to children learning well in their schools.

The most common barriers to children learning well according to head teachers’ responses were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region VI</th>
<th>Region VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Damage to School/Infrastructure/Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged schools reported in 62% of schools</td>
<td>Damaged schools reported in 57% of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of head teachers also reported ‘environmental damages’ – indicating that the area around the school was unsafe (33% Region VI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of classroom supplies reported by 54% of schools</td>
<td>Lack of classroom supplies reported by 64% of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73% of head teachers reported that their schools received education materials since the typhoon) (textbooks, materials, uniforms, etc.). (See graph below on types of materials still needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychosocial Distress</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress and psychological needs were reported as a barrier to children’s learning well in about 30% of schools in both regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% of teachers request additional training on PSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 58% of schools report that more recreational facilities would help children who suffer from psychosocial distress and stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 22% of schools say that support from social services, and 4% say specifically DSWD referrals, are needed to help children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 40% of schools specifically requested messaging on psychosocial activities and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% schools request additional recreational facilities to help children suffering from psychosocial distress/stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requests for additional support for children experiencing stress/psychosocial distress is largely the same amongst strata, though in rural and non-IDP schools, requests for teacher training is slightly higher, and in IDP and urban schools, requests for recreational facilities is slightly higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% of head teachers report that stress and psychological impact are the main challenges for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% of head teachers report that stress and psychological impact are the main challenges facing teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 2% report receiving psychological and stress support for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% report living conditions a major challenge for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Other’ answers from head teachers include lack of food, lack of parental support, and need for stress debriefing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 children groups report teachers different than before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 children’s groups report teachers different than before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children’s groups report studying while also helping parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 children’s groups report studying while also helping parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most children’s FGDs report being happy to be back in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges Teachers Face

- 63% of assessed schools report that the lack of materials and/or school building and classroom destruction are the main challenge facing teachers.
- 43% of assessed schools report that financial constraints (for teachers) are a main challenge. Relatedly, 32% identified living conditions as a main challenge.
- 33% report that stress and psychological impact is a main challenge teachers are facing.
- Other challenges were lack of parental motivation for students, student absence, various materials lacking, and a lack of support.

The average class size in 41% of the assessed schools included in the assessment is over 36 students. In 15% of the schools, there are between 31-35 students in a class, in 18% 25-30, and in 15% 21-25. 41% of schools surveyed have multiple shifts. This was the case in 15% of elementary schools and 13% of high schools (out of 15 high schools total).

Teacher Support Deemed Most Important

- Financial support - 64% of schools (72% in Region VI)
- Additional teaching materials – 58% of schools (68% in Region VIII)
- Additional training – 34% of schools

Support Received
19% of head teachers reported having received training on DRR and emergency procedures.

Participants in interpretation workshops reported that in some schools, there was not enough budget to send teachers to trainings when offered.

Schools largely reported still needing additional materials:

| Percentage of Required Teaching and Learning Materials School Has Available |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Many (51-75%)               | 12%             |
| All (76-100%)               | 16%             |
| Some (26-50%)               | 29%             |
| None (0-25%)                | 42%             |

When asked the types of learning materials that they still need:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Materials Children Still Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing, Children have enough material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise books, pens, pencils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core textbooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91% of assessed barangays reported that children still require materials

Psychosocial Support Received:

- In 51% of assessed schools, recreational activities are helping children suffering from stress
- In 50%, there was teacher training on psychosocial support.
- Teachers themselves report having received psychological and social support in 26% of schools, 40% in Region VIII but just 2% in Region VI.

71% of assessed schools report that the support children received was appropriate, 79% in Region VIII and 57% in Region VI, in particular noting that students were well supported through learning supplies, food rations and feeding programs, and that hygiene assistance was helpful for their learning. 25% said that support was not appropriate, mostly because not all students received support and because schools still have structural damage that has not been repaired.
Multi-Grading and Shifts

41% of assessed schools surveyed have multiple shifts.

Reasons for multi-grading in the schools reporting this are:

- In 50% of the assessed schools with multi-grading, not enough classrooms
- In 44% of these assessed schools, not enough teachers
- 13% of these schools said they used multi-grading because there were fewer students than before Yolanda (multiple answers allowed).

Educational Support Received: Analysis

Teachers reported being under a great deal of stress, both because of their personal experiences during Typhoon Yolanda and the challenges they face at work. Many head teachers in both regions lamented that while they were tasked with reopening and running schools, they were still working to rebuild their own homes and lives. They expressed personal stress on behalf of teachers and educators more generally, who also are caring for students experiencing stress and psychosocial distress.

Overall, head teachers in Region VI report still needing different types of support, perhaps because they also report receiving less support since the typhoon. This trend indicates that initially, needs were more dire in Region VIII and thus support was targeted to schools in this region. However, this came at the expense of the less dire support required in schools in Region VI that remains unmet six months after the typhoon. In particular, head teachers reported receiving less psychosocial support in Region VI.

The response effort was focused on distributing supplies, particularly in the initial phases. However, there is need to prioritize PSS more immediately in post-disaster contexts based on the assessment findings of ongoing psychosocial distress reported by key informants, teachers, FGD participants, and IW participants. In addition, the quality of such support and learning supplies, including tailoring these forms of support to particular groups of children, was not adequately prioritized in the earliest stages.

Finally, IW participants reported that teachers were not involved enough in determining what was needed where during the early response planning stages. Their involvement would perhaps have helped to tailor support, in the form of PSS and distribution of supplies, with consideration of pre-existing conditions in schools. In the future, teachers should also be involved in DRR and School Improvement Planning.

Theme 11: Availability, Status, and Support to Education Personnel

Support Received from Education Officials

68% of assessed schools report that education officials provided support since Yolanda:

- 79% in Region VIII
- 45% in Region VI
Slightly under 40% of these assessed schools reported that they received support from education officials in the form of assessment of damage, arrangement for repairs, and/or allocation of teaching and learning materials.

Teachers

85% of schools reported that there was no reduction in teachers since the typhoon. In the 7% that said there were fewer teachers, the reason was most often due to family responsibilities or missing personnel.

80% of community respondents said that there are other people in the barangay available to teach.

Cross-Cutting Issues

Natural disasters, including typhoons, have been deemed a ‘new normal’ in the Philippines. The assessment identified a number of ongoing needs that require multi-sectoral actions for prevention and response. Likewise, additional coordination amongst clusters and stakeholders is required to counter the risks that children face.

1. Adolescent Concerns

1.1 Adolescent Boys: Adolescents were often the most-affected group by child protection and education concerns, and in some situations, adolescent boys even more. Exacerbating issues since Typhoon Yolanda, such as child labor, limited access to education, psychosocial distress, and early pregnancy and sexual violence prevention must be tailored for adolescent boys and girls.

In future emergencies and in the Philippines generally, response efforts should reach out to adolescent boys, their families, and communities to improve understanding that this is an at-risk and vulnerable group. This level of outreach, down to the family level, is essential for ending practices that pre-exist Yolanda and that may cause boys’ psychosocial distress, specifically labor (including physically demanding household chores) and less access to education.

1.2 Child Labor and Adolescents: Boys’ responsibility to earn livelihoods places them at risk of leaving the education system and working in dangerous situations or of trafficking within and outside of their communities. They are also then more vulnerable to some outdoor risks. Girls’ participation in labor should not be understated either, particularly regarding dangers of domestic labor and trafficking.

While some labor may be temporary, there is the risk that these practices will continue into the school year, leaving adolescent boys and girls permanently outside of the education system. Adolescents already out of school require safe ways to contribute to their families and communities, both post-disaster and in the long-term. Coordinated actions should be a priority to reduce dangerous labor (including WFCL) and to limit any encouragement of adolescent participation in labor at the expense of his or her own quality of life, both by providing safe alternatives and limiting any adolescent participation in what could be dangerous.

1.3 Early Pregnancy: Adolescents are vulnerable to early pregnancy in the Philippines. Early pregnancy impacts their ability to safely earn livelihoods and access education permanently. A coordinated prevention and response to early pregnancy needs to include the CPWG, Shelter, CCCM, Health, and GBV clusters.
For all adolescent concerns, GBV, Protection, Shelter, Education, and Early Recovery and Livelihoods Clusters, as well as DepEd and LGUs, are important actors.

2. DRR and Community Preparedness to Reduce Physical Dangers

For all adolescents and younger children, as well as their families, ongoing fears of weather are causing psychosocial distress, thus requiring a need to incorporate PSS into DRR communications and trainings.

The destruction in communities, present six months after the typhoon, has an impact on the mental and physical health of children and their communities. In addition, dangers outside the home inhibit the return to normalcy, access to education, and quality of education. Communities need stronger understanding of how to create more resilient structures and to target clean up to reduce dangers to which children are exposed outside of their homes and on the way to or at school.

DRR should be a priority for community-based structures, such as LGUs, BCPCs, if functional, and at the DRRMC, DepEd and DSWD levels. A purposefully coordinated response amongst actors would benefit preparedness and response planning through consistent messaging, avoiding duplication, and therefore increasing effectiveness of DRM. Teachers, students, and caregivers, particularly those affected by Yolanda, should provide feedback on ongoing needs and what was needed prior to Yolanda to hasten a safe return to quality education for students and teachers and to prepare for future disasters.

3. Access to Education

Access to education is a cross-cutting issue, linked to labor, PSS, UASC, physical dangers, and quality of education. UASC and vulnerable adolescents and youth need to be targeted immediately following disasters to limit the time out of school. Support is also needed for adolescents, especially alternative forms of education and safe ways to support families prior to schools reopening. Likewise, it is necessary to address younger children’s fears regarding weather and returning to schools where physical dangers were previously present.

The response requires the Education Cluster and CPWG to work together to target OOSC, including those who were out of school prior to Yolanda, to increase access to education, provide alternatives for continued education, and to encourage enrollment and attendance, even if children have been helping families meet dire needs in the months after Yolanda.

Moreover, enhancing quality of education through a child’s comfort and confidence to return to school, reducing psychosocial distress, and reaching those not registered for continuing education in the 2014 school year requires a joint effort on behalf of DepEd, DSWD, CPWG, and the Education Cluster.

Support should ensure that children can return to the regular school system at a school where they are comfortable, even if circumstances did not allow them to access that school in the months following the typhoon. Alternative learning should not be the only option if students missed classes due to post-emergency displacement.
Involving teachers, families, and clusters, specifically Shelter, Early Recovery and Livelihoods, and CCCM Clusters, with heavy investment from DepEd, DSWD, MPWH, and both education and child protection in back to school campaigns can help to ensure that children can return to school safely and with confidence.

4. Continued Psychosocial Support

Children and their families still are suffering from weather-related fears, causing ongoing psychosocial distress. Stress is linked with a lack of information about DRR and what to do during and after weather-related disasters. In addition, higher level psychosocial distress has not received adequate attention during the response.

Children are also stressed about the lack of shelter and food, and perhaps their inability to safely contribute to their families to reduce these stresses. Many issues that have emerged or reported to be exacerbated since Yolanda, such as child labor, early pregnancy, reduced access to education, reduced quality of education, and exposure to dangers in their communities that were not present before can cause psychosocial distress in children and their families. The increases in these stressors in communities indicates a need for additional and higher level PSS to help children and families cope after Yolanda, with consideration given to emerging negative coping mechanisms, such as child labor, in the immediate, and prevention of these in future emergency situations.

Schools can be a nexus for enhanced understanding of these issues and reducing the stress experienced on a daily basis, as well as simultaneously increasing preparedness for future emergencies. This can be achieved by streamlining PSS, both as a response to Yolanda and as a component of DRR support.

The need for child development, including PSS, in the classroom after emergency and in the regular curriculum has been recognized relatively recently. Child development and DRR training are said to be under review by DepEd through a joint effort between the National Health and Education Clusters and CPWG.

Higher level PSS and ongoing PSS in communities targeted to certain at-risk groups should be coordinated with the CPWG, GBV Sub-Cluster, Education and Health Clusters and DSWD, DepEd, and DOH, at minimum.

5. Local Actor Coordination

Challenges have existed in coordinating the different levels of the decentralized governance systems of DSWD and DepEd, as well as other departments, in order to address many of the cross-cutting issues highlighted above.

At a local level, it is essential to have DepEd and DSWD national support in formally connecting head teachers and school-based structures, such as PTAs and school-based child protection committees, with LGUs, BCPCs, and via these bodies, other local organizations. On the ground, with the ability and ongoing support to coordinate, these bodies could much more effectively target children’s needs in the immediate disaster period, without a need to wait for regional or even national approval for taking action. They could also formalize and strengthen the child protection systems currently in place at the local level, in particular referral networks and understanding of child protection. Strengthening BCPCs and coordination on OOSC
(pre-dating Yolanda as well as children unable to attend school due to emergency), back to school campaigns, psychosocial distress, and prevention of physical risks, child labor, early pregnancy, and sexual violence, are some of the issues that require joint coordination.

Finally, strengthening of child protections systems, identifying gaps and training service providers, such as social workers, police and government officials, on the most pressing concerns post-disaster is needed immediately. This should establish a foundation for overall system-strengthening in the recovery phase. The gaps identified can inform advocacy at the national level to contribute to the prevention of ongoing issues such as labor, trafficking, early pregnancy, and sexual violence.

### IV. Referrals Made as a Result of the Assessment

- 3 referrals for sexual violence (inclusive of survival sex with multiple community members)
- 4 referrals for physical/mental impairment
- 1 case of child labor
- 1 referral of street children
- 1 missing child
- 1 referral of child abuse
- 3 schools with dangerous conditions (missing roof/IDPs/extreme heat)
- 2 reports of suspected trafficking

### V. Recommendations

The recommendations come largely from the education and child protection clusters and the participants’ feedback and interpretation of assessment data during the regional interpretation workshops.

Overall recommendations are included in the Recommendations section, V, while action points for each region, based on the interpretation workshop decisions, are included in Annex I of the report, divided by group from each IW.

**Recommendations for Future Emergency Situations:**

**General:**

- All programming to include provisions for poor households, CHH, children with elderly caregivers, CWD, IPs, and adolescents specifically
- Stronger recognition of cross-cutting issues affecting multiple clusters is needed to avoid missed opportunities, with trainings specifically.
- Reestablish and utilize increased access to local media
- Establish stronger link between CPWG and Mental Health/Psychosocial Support Sub-Cluster (MHPSS); between CP structures and DepEd; and between CP, Education, and DOH regarding referral and provision of psychosocial support
- Incorporate DRR/emergency response/weather awareness-raising with immediate distributions at the earliest stages to reduce mental and physical risks; tailor this information to adolescents and children.
• Target clean up to reduce dangers to which children are exposed outside of their homes and on the way or at school via DPWH, DRR/LGUs/school-based structures
• Prioritize prevention of harsh and dangerous child labor throughout the Philippines and in DRR planning, so that prevention is ongoing and launched immediately after the disaster. Introduce temporary, safe, meaningful ways that adolescents can effectively contribute to their communities after disasters while they are not in school.

Child Protection:

• Prevent child labor as a negative coping mechanism post emergency by coordinating with Shelter/ERD to offer alternative livelihoods to youth and adolescents; limit drop outs; enforce safeguarding mechanisms in cash for work and other activities; support children’s registration in schools, and enable children to contribute to communities in ways interesting to them.
• Communicate about road safety from the beginning of the response effort in future emergencies; involve C4D strategies, DPWH, and CP actors
• Research sexual violence and trafficking in advance or immediately and conduct context-specific advocacy accordingly after disasters. Tailor advocacy on prevention and available response services in bunkhouses and displacement sites.

Education:

• Consider funding transportation support, such as buses, while families’ living situations are still unstable.
• Immediately map the services available for disabled children pre- and post- disaster and define solutions for disabled children while schools are being reopened and facilities made usable for these students
• Conduct ongoing registration and track children who are not registered or enrolled in schools; ensure that students and families know that they can attend school even if they did not previously register or circumstances have changed since January
• Increase DepEd flexibility for students who need to make up weeks of missed lessons and exams so that alternative education is not the only option
• Distribute hygiene materials for emergency preparation and support alternative distribution/activities for schools not targeted
• Focus early on quality of psychosocial support and learning supplies distribution
• Establish a central database on school needs and donor support available post emergency to allow for more effective rebuilding support, support extra days of teacher salaries, and fund transportation
Post-Yolanda Child Protection Recommendations (theme):

**Psychosocial Distress:**

- Provide higher level PSS; follow up on PSS for specific cases, and continue PSS activities
- Launch caregivers support groups to help them process experiences and respond to children’s stresses; train caregivers on positive discipline and other parenting skills (incorporate stress debriefing)
- Establish a youth-led peer counseling/peer empowerment program for adolescents and children; include DRR information, discourage drop-outs, child labor, and early pregnancy and provide information on sexual violence response and services.
- Build capacity of prevention and response for adolescent boys’ challenges – need more study, data, analysis on this group
- Immediately provide additional psychosocial support training for teachers for themselves and for recognizing and addressing psychosocial distress that their students are experiencing (referral mechanisms for advanced PSS)
- Establish stronger link between CPWG and Mental Health/Psychosocial Support Sub-Cluster (MHPSS); between CP structures and DepEd; and between CP, Education, and DOH regarding referral and provision of psychosocial support
- Link PSS and DRR trainings; consider roll out of trainings on necessary actions to take in the case of dangerous weather/emergency

**Access to Services:**

- All CP programming to include provisions for poor households, CHH, children with elderly caregivers, CWD, IPs, and adolescents specifically
- Strengthen and maintain cluster coordination and collaboration; utilize cluster IM system
- Strengthen community CP systems (referral mechanisms, understanding of sexual violence and child labor, UASC)
- More research required on nutrition and disability

**UASC:**

- Update data from all Yolanda-affected barangays to ensure all UASC receive support, including CHH
- Train LGUs, BCPC, other partners on DSWD referral pathway for UASC; Roll out referral mechanism for UASC
- FTR training needed in Region VI – include DSWD and PNP; equip agencies with resources for disaster preparedness
- Conduct FTR training in Region VI – include DSWD and PNP; equip agencies with resources for disaster preparedness
- Provision of Social Welfare Assistants at MSWDO level to assist with identification of UASC and support the administration work of Social Workers
• Activate surge teams at the national level to be deployable within 24 hours of emergency to conduct identification of UASC using FTR system.
• School teacher training and involvement in the referral mechanism for UASC

Physical Dangers:

• Streamline DRR at the barangay and school levels, incorporating PSS, what to do in the immediate post-emergency phases, and information on dangerous weather; target adolescents to empower them to support their communities in safe ways
• Research building more resilient structures
• Target community clean up to reduce dangers to which children are exposed outside of their homes and on the way to or at school.
• Prevention of and response to early pregnancy in tailored PSS, provision of health services to teenage girls and boys in public spaces and bunkhouses and within education system through sexual education.
• Develop system for referrals to functional health clinics at no cost (child-friendly, incorporate adolescent pregnancy and CWD)
• Establish recreational / reading centers to improve safety and well-being of children; serve as CFS in longer-term

Sexual Violence:

• Conduct awareness-raising with local structures to increase understanding about types of ans survivors of sexual violence and limitations to reporting it because it is a taboo, even if resources exist to support survivors. Target BCPC, private sector, POs, NGOs, religious, faith-based organizations; Tanods; include in monthly 4Ps training on family development
• Review IEC materials; incorporate protecting selves from being abused, referrals to parents, teachers, barangay officials, Tanod, and barangay-level health worker
• Provision of more social workers; increase their awareness of what to do in case of sexual violence including of the health services needed
• Provision of adolescent-targeted programming on protecting selves; drug abuse, sexual violence (via peer support groups)
• Further research to better understand the risks of sexual violence for boys and how to best respond to these risks given the lack of awareness
• Teacher involvement in referral mechanisms for sexual violence and trained on types and individuals impacted by it

Child Labor:

• Conduct awareness-raising with families, private sector, and law enforcement about psychological impact of labor on children, including adolescent boys
• Target law enforcement agencies to enforce child labor laws; Need awareness at all levels about child labor and child protection laws (households, LGUs, etc.)
- Target private sector with information on their accountability for dangerous employment; train on actionable, preventative measures to take to ensure safe workplace for children 15-17 who are allowed to work with barangay level officials and clusters
- Target children attending school and also involved in labor; children previously out of school due to their participation in labor to tailor ongoing responses.
- Establish community based organization with children, youth, women, parents, teachers/school-based committees, and private sector to disseminate info, detect dangerous labor and refer cases

**Post-Yolanda Education Recommendations:**

**Access to Education:**

- Support to DepEd to identify OOSC through school mapping mechanism; track reasons of non-attendance, transferred/displacement. Support reintegration for children out of school – (transport, relocation, and registration of children)
- Map the services available for disabled children pre- and post- disaster and define solutions for disabled children while schools are being reopened and facilities made usable for these students
- Conduct ongoing registration and track children who are not registered or enrolled; ensure that students and families know that they can attend school even if they did not previously register or circumstances have changed since January

**Alternative Education:**

- Strengthen messaging on alternative education systems to target OOSC and adolescents who prefer to work
- Collect data on alternative education enrollment; Encourage safe livelihoods and access to alternative education for children participating in labor

**Education in Emergencies:**

- Increase DepEd flexibility for students who need to make up weeks of missed lessons and exams so that alternative education is not the only option
- Integrate EiE into DepEd curriculum via child development (with CPIE, PSS) and DRR (school improvement plans, CCA, link with barangay planning); DepEd to consider current DRR curriculum and modify/strengthen based on ongoing needs post-disaster
- Distribute hygiene materials for emergency preparation; alternative distribution/activities for schools not targeted
- Involve teachers in planning barangay-level DRR and School Improvement Planning
- Refer teachers and students to CPWG/MHPSS if still experiencing stress; formalize referral mechanism between schools and PSS

**Learning Environment:**

- Immediately consider alternative semi-permanent learning structures for unsafe school buildings
- Immediately prioritize the accessibility hindrances for disabled children, as well as the impact of emergencies on facilities specifically for disabled children.
- Provide additional TLS and rehabilitation for schools damaged/without full stock of supplies (DepEd self-learning kit)
- Continue/expand school feeding programs
- Assess and prioritize construction of more resilient school structures
- Centralize forms of school needs and donor availability; support extra days of teacher salaries if needed, and cover transportation where necessary
- Coordinate with Shelter and CCCM clusters to identify solutions for families still living in schools, including identifying shelter solutions or possibility of moving to relocation sites plan immediate distribution of tents to families living in schools to make sure environment is conducive for learning prior to back to school

**Post-Yolanda Cross-Cutting Issues Recommendations (by cluster/sector)**

**All Actors:**

- Coordination needed on all trainings through OCHA and bilaterally, through cluster leads, particularly for consistent DRR messaging moving forward. The DepEd training structure is strong and has ability to reach many barangays, and can be utilized, perhaps, for other barangay-level trainings as well.
- Information on available services needs to utilize TV, radio, and texting (and immediately prioritize the reestablishment of these services).
- All actors ensure services/messaging tailored to children from poor households, children with disabilities, adolescents, and IPs. Additional services may be needed for children with elderly caregivers.
- Establish child-friendly referral systems for child protection; WFCL; sexual violence; UASC; health/physical violence
DRR:

- Include adolescents, younger children, and their families and teachers in DRR trainings and disaster preparedness
- Target clean up to reduce dangers to which children are exposed outside of their homes and on the way or at school via DPWH, DRR/LGUs/school-based structures
- Conduct government agency capacity-building in how to effectively distribute aid; involve children and caregivers for stronger DRR
- DepEd, DSWD, LGU, BCPCs, if functional, and DRRMC coordination for preparedness and response planning for consistent messaging, to avoid duplication and increase effectiveness

Shelter/ERD:

- Contribute to back to school campaign and ensure OOSC are not employed through activities
- Coordinate with CPWG to reach OOSC with alternative education and safe livelihoods
- Inclusive messaging and training on risks associated with child labor; ERD/shelter-related safe livelihoods (inclusive of education and PSS information)

Health:

- Provision of free access to health services to respond to physical dangers post-disaster
- Implementation of advanced PSS
- Early pregnancy awareness-raising on prevention; targeted access to services for adolescents
- Health sector response to sexual violence
- Ensure access to health services for CWD