

CHILD SAFEGUARDING POLICY IN LEMBAGA PENYELENGGARA KESEJAHTERAAN SOSIAL (LPKS)

Bambang Tri Hartono

Sentra Gau Mabaji Gowa, Sulawesi Selatan, Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: bambang.hartono@kemsos.go.id

Article Info

Article History:

Received March 10, 2024

Revised March 16, 2024

Accepted March 23, 2024

Keywords:

Child Protection

Safeguarding Policy

Social Rehabilitation

ABSTRAK

Lembaga Penyelenggara Kesejahteraan Sosial (LPKS) merupakan lembaga yang menyelenggarakan program rehabilitasi sosial bagi anak yang berhadapan dengan hukum. LPKS menerapkan pendekatan pekerjaan sosial dan hak anak untuk mencapai keberfungsian sosial anak, tumbuh dan berkembang dalam lingkungan yang aman sambil mengikuti program rehabilitasi sosial. LPKS memilih Child Safeguarding Policy (CSP) untuk menjunjung tinggi lingkungan yang aman. CSP merupakan suatu sistem atau kumpulan kegiatan, prosedur, dokumen, dan respon dalam mengatasi permasalahan perlindungan anak dalam konteks di dalam lembaga. Ini mencakup berbagai kegiatan mulai dari pencegahan hingga respons terhadap masalah kekerasan terhadap anak. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menguraikan proses Lembaga Penyelenggara Kesejahteraan Sosial dalam menerapkan Kebijakan Perlindungan Anak. Artikel ini merupakan artikel kualitatif yang berlandaskan kerangka konstruktivisme dan interpretivisme, dengan metode etnografi. Pemilihannya didasarkan pada manfaat pengumpulan informasi melalui keterlibatan dalam pelaksanaan, observasi partisipatif, catatan lapangan dan dokumen laporan. Proses LPKS dalam menerapkan Kebijakan Perlindungan Anak menyiratkan (1) peran pemimpin dalam menunjukkan komitmen lembaga dalam melindungi anak dari risiko pelecehan, (2) Kebijakan Perlindungan Anak harus dilakukan secara integral melalui kesadaran, pencegahan, pelaporan dan respons terhadap kekerasan pada anak. isu-isu tersebut, (3) Kebijakan Perlindungan Anak telah mendorong pekerja untuk memiliki kesadaran dalam memperlakukan anak.

ABSTRACT

The Social Welfare Provider Institution (LPKS) is an institution that organizes social rehabilitation programs for children in conflict with the law. LPKS applies a social work and child rights approach to achieve children's social functioning, growth, and development in a safe environment while participating in social rehabilitation programs. LPKS chose the Child Safeguarding Policy (CSP) to uphold a safe environment. CSP is a system or collection of activities, procedures, documents, and responses in addressing child protection issues in the context of the institution. It covers a range of activities from prevention to response to child abuse issues. This article aims to describe the process of the Social Welfare Institution in implementing the Child Protection Policy. This article is a qualitative article based on the framework of constructivism and interpretivism, using ethnographic methods. Its selection is based on the benefits of collecting information through involvement in implementation, participatory observation, field notes, and report documents. The process of LPKS in implementing the Child Protection Policy implies (1) the role of leaders in demonstrating the commitment of the institution to protecting children from the risk of abuse, (2) the Child Protection Policy must be carried out integrally through awareness, prevention, reporting, and response to child abuse issues, (3) the Protection Policy must be carried out in an integrated manner.

Copyright © 2024, The Author(s).
This is an open-access article
under the CC-BY-SA license



How to cite: Hartono, B. T. (2024). CHILD SAFEGUARDING POLICY IN LEMBAGA PENYELENGGARA KESEJAHTERAAN SOSIAL (LPKS). *Devote : Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Global*, 3(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.55681/devote.v3i1.2504>

PENDAHULUAN

From media coverage both print and electronic, portraits of child abuse are often found every day. The violence is varied, from physical, psychological, and sexual violence, and exploitation, to mistreatment. The incident of violence against children also takes place in various settings, schools (Patty 2020), social welfare agencies (Sofian, 2018), police detainment (Davies and Robson, 2016), and home or family (Praditama, Nurhadi, and Budiarti, 2016). For instance, 20 children in Gowa, South Sulawesi, reported their carer for abusive behavior (Tempo, 2011), dozens of children in the orphanage in West Java were presumed

neglected (Teja, 2014), a toddler passed away with injury while in orphanage care (Triyani, 2017), and child victim of online prostitution was raped by safety house's workers (Daton, 2020). Of particular incident in institution concern is what Sofian (2018) stated, the absence of strategy in creating a safe environment for children has led to violence against children. He argued that a national strategy should be delivered to assert a Child Safeguarding Policy (CSP) to any organization that works with children. This has been supported by Handayani (cited in Farida, 2018) who described that although the government has passed dozens of regulations on child protection, the system of child protection in Indonesia is still not working properly. She promoted stakeholders, community, and government institutions to develop and implement child safeguarding policy.

However, CSP is still unaccustomed for Indonesian institution that works with children. This is depicted by fewer institutions applying this policy in their service and has related to the process of its legalization. According to the Ministry of Social Affairs, there are 35 Social Protection Houses (Rumah Perlindungan Sosial /RPS) to support children of victims and witnesses and 98 Social Welfare Service Institutions (Lembaga Penyelenggara Kesejahteraan Sosial /LPKS) across Indonesia that providing social rehabilitation program for children in conflict with law (Permensos No.107, 2019). There are also 4.864 Child Social Welfare Agency (Lembaga Kesejahteraan Sosial Anak/LKSA) in Indonesia that provide social service provision for 106.406 children (OHH Ditjen Rehsos, 2020). Unfortunately, not all these agencies are familiar with the child safeguarding policy. It had been pointed out by BRSAMPK Toddopuli's verification process on 33 child social welfare agencies in South Sulawesi for not knowing about the child safeguarding policy (BRSAMPK Toddopuli, 2021).

To date, there is still less information on organisations that applying CSP. Several institutions that apply CSP in their service provision are obtained from an electronic source, for instance, several schools in Jakarta and Bali (JIS, nd, BIS, 2016), the Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA, 2019), the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection, Yayasan Sayangi Tunas Cilik, Unicef and Save the Children. In contrary, the notion of child safeguarding policy has been voiced in the past decade (Ecpat Indonesia, 2021, Sofian, 2018).

In the context of the legalisation process, The Child Protection Act 23 of 2002 and its emendation Number 35 of 2014, did not embracing the obligation for the agencies to develop their child protection policy (Sofian, 2018). In fact, this would be useful as a mechanism in protecting children while abiding in agency's care. This policy was later pinned in 2020 through the Minister of Social Affairs (MoSA) Ordinance Number 1 of 2020, concerning the Implementation Regulation of the Government Regulation Number 44 of 2017. Which child safeguarding policy also known as child protection policy is listed as an integral part attachment of the MoSa Ordinance Number 1/2020. The implication of this ordinance as mentioned in Article 6 is an obligation for childcare agencies to have a child protection policy. The drawback was this limited to childcare agencies. With this limited scope, child safeguarding policy is not yet widely known amongst agencies that work with children.

This paper draws from LPKS's experience in South Sulawesi in implementing child safeguarding policy. Approval was obtained from LPKS's Administrator. Accordingly, 20 children who were in rehabilitation program and 30 workers consisting of social workers, caregivers, administration workers, and security participated in providing feedback in the process of implementation. The selection of LPKS was based on its role as it was mentioned in MoSA Ordinance Number 107 of 2019, in providing social rehabilitation provision for children in conflict of law.

Implementation of the child safeguarding policy at LPKS was initially started when a workshop for law enforcers was conducted by the Yayasan Sayangi Tunas Cilik in 2019. Numerous cases of child abuse who are treated in social welfare agencies and school were presented during the workshop. The workshop yielded reflections, stating that the risk of child abuse might occur in any place and setting, included children in conflict with the law. Although children were perpetrators, their status as children should be seen as victims of the social environment.

It is noted that children, who are participating in social rehabilitation programs in LPKS are mostly children who come into the justice system or known as children in conflict with law. These children have particular characteristics such as (1) experiencing multiple abuses, (2) having mental health, emotional and behaviour issues, (3) lack of care from a family that resulting in inadequate life skills, poor education, and low understanding of social norms (BRSAMPK Toddopuli 2019).

Children who get involved in the criminal or juvenile justice system are prone to experiencing multiple abuse. Research provides evidence that abuse against children in conflict with the law occurred

while they were placed in detention, in police confinement, and others from their homes and environment (Davies and Robson, 2016). A similar study on children who were placed in detention centres had experiences of violence in the form of physical, sexual, psychological, and exploitation. The perpetrator was their peer and mostly senior inmates (Sutinah, Suyanto, and Aziz, 2020). Dewi (cited in BRSAMPK Toddopuli, 2020) also explained further in the children's psychological reports that some children who are participating in rehabilitation programs, have been experiencing and exposed to cruelty, abuse, and violence since they were young. In addition, she pointed out that the failed role of family in protecting and providing care has consequences on children's social and psychological development.

Violence and abuse experiences admittedly have an impact on children's psychological development Cannon and Andrew (2016) pointed out that multiple traumatic experiences would build an adverse childhood experience, which implies to negative impact on individual psychological development in adulthood. Creating a vulnerable individual with lower health status that manifested in mental health issues such as depression, suicide, and substance abuse. Another example was presented by Sinanan (2015) who described sexual abuse experience that led to serious problems. Children with sexual abuse experience have psychologically negative coping to escape from abuse experience through avoidance, memory repression, addiction, and cognitive reappraisal. Moreover, it can cause Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (Briere 2012). Symptoms of this can include withdrawn behavior from social environment, having re-enactment of the event, and developing an avoidance behavior to any circumstances that could remind the survivor of one of the events.

Admittedly, violence against children has an immense impact on well-being if left untreated (CDC, 2021). Aulia's field note (cited in BRSAMPK Toddopuli, 2020) provided an example of a child who had experienced of sexually abused, and has growth with sexual addiction. This experience developed to delinquency as the boy got involved in stealing and prostitution to fulfilling sexual needs. UNICEF (2020) states that violence and abuse experience has long-term behavioural impacts on children's behavioral problems including substance abuse, delinquency, and anti-social and risky sexual behavior.

Dewi (2019 cited in BRSAMPK 2019) explains in her report that the absence of parents in nurturing children has left children without the opportunity to learn and understand their feelings, emotions, and behavior. From this point, LPKS then has been focusing on teaching children life skills including interpersonal skills, providing psychosocial counseling support, and encouraging pro-social behavior. Expected outcomes are re-acquiring social functioning to its optimum level and preparing children to return to their family or community. In supporting this, LPKS needs to develop well environment that is responsive in addressing the risk of violence while children reside in institutions.

METODE PELAKSANAAN

This article aims to describe the implementation process of the Child Safeguarding Policy in LPKS. Describing step by step of implementation and presenting the organisation's learning. In addition, it showed the shifting perspective of social rehabilitation officers toward children. This study is based on the piloting project of the Child Safeguarding Policy in social rehabilitation programs for children in conflict with the law. Using constructivism and interpretivism frameworks to describe the implementation, this study uses a qualitative approach (Royse 2011) to explore and understand supports and challenges of implementation. To achieve this, ethnography was applied method in collecting the data. Ethnography provides advantages for researchers to collect empirical insights from object studying that develop an understanding of particular issues within the context of child abuse risk in residential settings (Reeves, Kuper, and Hodges, 2008). To support the richness of understanding, the writer conducts a literature study and refers to reputable journals, reports, and published data from national and international organisations that concerns on children's protection and social rehabilitation for children in conflict with the law.

Discussion of the implementation of CSP in LPKS is started by presenting the definition and characteristics of child abuse, the definition and scope of the Child Safeguarding Policy, the role of LPKS, the process of implementation, and closed by our reflection on this implementation process.

HASIL DAN PEMBAHASAN

Definition of Violence against Children.

Violence against children is a human right and social problem that impacts public health, with consequences that are devastating and costly (CFCA, 2014, WHO, 2014). The term violence is used widely to describe harshness and cruelty against children. It takes many forms including physical, emotional, or

sexual, and happens in any setting – in a child's home, community, school, and online. The term violence is often used interchangeably with abuse. South Dakota Coalition Ending Domestic & Sexual Violence (SDCEDS, 2021) describes the term abuse as an individual's behavior or words that are intentionally aimed at hurting another individual. While violence is explained as the appearance of abusive behavior that causing a fear of an individual's life. In the context of children, the term of abuse is often used, as Newberger (1990) stated that;

“The common sense meaning of the term “child abuse” is to refer to a situation where a caregiver, generally a parent, sets out in a systematic way to harm a defenseless child.”

Similarly this, the United Nations of Children Fund (2014) refers to violence against children in the convention of Children right that is;

“All form of physical or mental violence, injury and abuse, neglect or children negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse.”

The act of violence against children can occur in any setting and the perpetrator is not limited to caregivers such as parents. The Save Children (2019) stated in its policy that;

“Child abuse consists of anything, which individuals, institutions or processes do or fail to do which directly or indirectly harms children or damages their prospect of a safe and healthy development into adulthood.”

The Children Protection Act (2014) defines violence against children as any act that results in suffering or suffering physically, mentally, sexually, or psychologically, including neglect and ill-treatment that threatens the integrity of the body and degrades the child's dignity.

Based on the above definition's, violence against children in conflict with the law who are residing in LPKS refers to intentional or unintentional treatment of institution, procedures, services processes, and behaviour of any individual including adults, adolescents, and young people, that result in actual and/ or potential harm, trauma and impairment of child wholeness as a person. This also included violence amongst children or known as bullying.

Although there is debate on defining the type of violence against children, whether it refers to parental behavior or any activity to harm the child, a broad agreement generates several categories of violence namely physical, psychological, sexual, and neglect (WHO, 2006), and exploitation (Ministry of Social Affair (2019). The WHO (2006) defines child physical abuse as;

“Intentional use of physical force against a child that results in – or has a high likelihood of resulting in – harm for the child's health, survival, development or dignity. This includes hitting, beating, kicking, shaking, biting, strangling, scalding, burning, poisoning and suffocating.”

Although the impact of physical violence is deemed to be observable, it does not always leave a mark in a child's body. It occurs when a child is purposely physically injured or creates a risk of harm to child's (Mayo Clinic, 2018) such as excessive discipline or the unintended result of physical punishment. Physical abuse is not merely how badly the child's injured, but rather the act or behavior that harming or causes injury. The YSTC (2019) argues that violence against children can overlap with one another and it can be done in a single or repetitive act.

The second type of violence is psychological violence, which is also known as 'emotional maltreatment', 'psychological maltreatment', and 'psychological abuse' (CFCA, 2014). It refers to act or behavior that resulting in uncomfortable feeling, including degrading and treating children, even raises trauma prolonged against a child. This violence is frequently happened over and over without realization from the perpetrator. The most common psychological behavior is often criticizing, underestimating, snapping, public humiliation, threatening, punishing, and ignoring children (MoSA, 2019). Garbarino et.al (1986 cited in CFCA, 2014) explains that psychological abuse has five main forms: rejecting, isolating, terrorizing, ignoring, and corrupting. The next form is sexual violence as the WHO (2006) defines this as;

“The involvement of a child in sexual activity that he or she does not fully comprehend is unable to give informed consent to, or for which the child is not developmentally prepared, or else that violates the laws or social taboos of society. Children can be sexually abused by both adults and other children who are – by their age or stage of development – in a position of responsibility, trust or power over the victim.”

Child sexual abuse can be differentiated into two types that is contact and non-contact. Contact sexual violence is any sexual activity that directly engage the child well with persuasion, lure, without coercion, coercion, that way unnatural, or activity sexual for commercial purposes or a specific purpose. As an example, touching the genitals, breasts, kissing, and forced oral sex. While non-contact sexual violence is sexual violence done indirectly. For instance, showing pornographic pictures or videos, taking pictures or videos of children in indecency, saying or sending words or terms that contain elements of sex, and shows provocative behavior sexual (YSTC, 2019).

Exploitation is another type of violence that refers to any activities that are intended to make use of a child for other’s advantage (Save the Children, nd). In addition, this constitutes a form of manipulation, misuse, victimization, oppression or ill-treatment, coercion, and violence (Save the Children, nd; UNHCR, 2001) into sexual exploitation and economic exploitation. The Ministry of Social Affair (2019) describes child sexual exploitation as misuse the vulnerability of children for sexual purposed activity, for instance child prostitution, child pornography. According to Save the Children (nd), economic exploitation refers to applying child in activities that benefiting others. The idea is to gain benefit through economic activities that include production, distribution and consumption. An example of this is child domestic work, child soldier, and the use of child in criminal activities.

The last form child abuse is neglection which defined as behaviour that ignoring the need of child and omitting child for doing something that is endanger. CDC (2021) refers child neglect as “the failure to meet a child’s basic physical and emotional needs.” These needs include adequate food, affection, shelter, clothing, education, supervision, education, or dental or medical care (CDC, 2021; CFCA, 2016). Similar with this, the CFCA (2016) highlights that the act of neglect is grounded from the notion “child is in need of protection”. This becomes dilemma when parents are struggling in providing basic needs because they are poor and having mental issues. In the context of organisation that work with children, an example of neglection is not giving healthy food and nutritious, not providing clothes and a decent place to stay, not given the opportunity to play, do not support for education, pay no attention and child’s opinion, and leaving young children without supervision.

Certainly, childhood abuse experience may have lasting effects and significant impact on mental health issues when children growth into adulthood (Thoresen et.al, 2015). Several impact can result in emotional and psychological issues for instance, lower self-esteem, fear, guilt, self-blame, distrust, difficulty in creating relationships, anxiety, depression, learning disorder, developmental delays, post-traumatic stress disorder, self-harming, aggressiveness, behavioural problems, substance abuse, and high-risk sexual behaviour (CDC, 2021; Fortson et.al, 2016; MoSA, 2019; Queensland Government, 2018; Thoresen et.al, 2015).

Child Safeguarding Policy

Globally, numerous terms are used to ensuring child protection within agency context, namely, child safeguarding policy (Save the Children, 2018), child protection policy, safeguarding children and children protection (NSPCC, 2019), safeguarding policy and young people (Plan International, 2019).

According NSPCC (2019), the child safety policy, also known as the child safeguarding policy, is a policy implemented by institutions to ensure the organisation is a safe place for children and to ensure that the institution is committed to protecting child safety. The child safety policy or child safeguarding policy is an internal document an organization of procedures, policies, and guidelines to ensure that the organization is safe for children. This policy should be made especially for organizations that work directly with children (YSTC, 2019).

The statement of policy has setup clear steps for organization in keeping safety for children. It set out several point, namely (1) commitment in protecting children, (2) policy of children protection within agency, (3) procedures in preventing and responding child issues, (4) reporting and documentation of policy implementation (AHRC, 2017; Karen, 2017; YSTC, 2017). This has been described by Powel (2014), pointed out that everyone who are connected to organization should have awareness. Furthermore, everyone is expected to be able in responding appropriately to violence toward children’s issues that occur in the

environment institution. Powel also suggested everyone who are representing organization, behaves appropriately towards the child and never abuse the trust as part of organizations that protect children, (3) Conduct studies and reduce risks to children related to activities or actions which is conducted.

Child safeguarding procedures are detailed guidelines and instructions that support overarching safeguarding policy statement. It explains the steps of organisation will take to keep children and young people safe and what to do when there are concerns about a child's safety or wellbeing. Child safeguarding policy include four main components that are awareness, prevention, reporting, and response (MWECP, 2019). Awareness has an objective to create workers knowledge on violence against children, its impact, prevention, and response. The existence of clear policies or guidelines are significant for workers as guidance to be follow. Even though the awareness effort was indirect resulting in a change in behavior, this is often the foundation to encourage and inspire people to change.

Prevention component has to do with the organisation system in ensuring the system works to all level from management, workers, and children. It should comprise from the first such as recruiting workers, workers's works, violence risk analysis, and ensuring children and family are exposed to information of ethical code and how they will report violations.

The third component is reporting procedures that includes violation reporting manner of child safety policy. This will help to prevent continuation of violence against children. The last component is responding to violence. In this case, the organization ensures the availability of implementation instructions respond to violence that occurs inside and outside the organization. There is also a team or several elements appointed in an organization to respond to the existence offense.

Principles in child safeguarding policy is written in Minister of Social Affairs regulation number 1 of 2020, children who are under an institution that works for children in various programs is maximally protected from various types of child abuse. All parties related to the institution must be fully aware of the problems and risks of violence against the child. This includes workers and anyone who works and is associated with institutions, must apply standards. It is expected to anyone to show the highest behaviour towards children both in personal life nor their professionals, to not abuse trust and mandate given by the institution. In brief, violence against children is unacceptable, workers and anyone who works and is associated with institution is committed to ensuring safety of children.

Lembaga Penyelenggara Kesejahteraan Sosial (LPKS)

Children have dignity as a complete human. When children involved in justice system, children need a special protection in law system as it is mentioned in Children's rights convention. Considering the vulnerability of children, the Indonesian government made ratification of Children's Right Convention to prove its commitment in protecting children as future generation. The Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak (SPPA) or The Child Criminal Justice System Number 11 of 2012 is a series of processes for resolving cases of children in conflict with law through restorative justice. Implemented based on the principle of (1) protection; (2) justice; (3) non-discrimination; (4) the best interests of the child; (5) respect for the child's opinion; (6) the survival and development of children; (7) guidance and mentoring of children; (8) proportional; (9) deprivation of liberty and punishment as a last resort; and (10) avoidance of retaliation.

The SPPA Law 11/2012 categorises children who are involved in justice system into three cohorts, namely children in conflict with law, children who are victim of crime, and children who are witness of crime. Accordingly, children in conflict with the law referred to children who are 12 (twelve) years old, but not yet 18 (eighteen) years old, who are suspected of committing a crime.

Accordingly, there are three institution in supporting social service provision related to children in conflict with law that are Rehabilitation Institute for Children (Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak/LPKA), Children Temporary House (Lembaga Penitipan Anak Sementara/LPAS) (Robson and Davies, 2016), and Social Welfare Service Institution (Lembaga Penyelenggara Kesejahteraan Sosial/LPKS). The Social Ministerial Decree Number 107/2019 pointed out that LPKS has role to provide social provision for children in conflict with law that including temporary shelter, social rehabilitation, carry out reintegration, coordination with law enforcers and organisation partners, case recording and share information with law enforcers, and assigning social workers to assist children.

LPKS uses social work approach in providing social service provision. It has objective to restore child's social function to be able to fulfill their basic needs and rights, carry out their social duties and roles, and overcome problems in their lives (Permensos 16, 2020). Applying strategy of family and community involvement in the process of social rehabilitation, the social rehabilitation program for children in conflict

with law is focusing on child's needs, assessment, and rehabilitation plan (Young, Greer, & Church, 2017). As consequence, risk and protective factors related to children's wellbeing becomes major consideration in defining the plan of intervention. This is in contrary to "justice" model that has highlighting in serving the sentence, accountability, and procedural formality. Therefore, the social rehabilitation service provisions and the model of intervention are comprising activities to support the fulfillment of decent living needs, social care and / or childcare, family support, physical therapy, psychosocial therapy, mental spiritual therapy, vocational training, entrepreneurship development, social assistance, and accessibility support (MoSA 2020).

Developing Child Safeguarding Policy

The notion of Child Safeguarding Policy for LPKS was introduced in March 2019, before the MoSA ordinance 1/ 2020 legalised. This was when Yayasan Sayangi Tunas Cilik (YSTC), the counterpart of Save the Children, conducted capacity building for Law Enforcers who work with children in conflict with law.

Invitation was sent to LPKS since the institution has role as referral agency for children in conflict with law. Two participants who were social worker and section chief attending the two days' workshop. The workshop consisted several subject learnings, namely: children's rights, introduction to child abuse, children in conflict with law, law enforcement officers' role in intervening children in conflict with law, and child safeguarding policy. At the end of workshop, each workshop's participant was asked to present their following up action related to child safeguarding policy. Participants from LPKS stated that this policy would transform social rehabilitation service provision since it showed agency commitment in providing safety environment through workers's behaviour change:

"Children in conflict with law is a perpetrator of crime, but at the same time are seen as a victim of social environment. It is quite difficult to accepting this. Particularly for someone who has not participate in any workshop like todays. For us, who have been trained to work with these children, we have built an awareness for selfcare and not abusing our power. However, not all colleagues received sufficient capacity building. The risk of abuse is still there." (Social Worker)

A following meeting with LPKS's Administrator was held which resulted in child safeguarding policy try out approval. Of particular concern from Administrator for developing policy is:

"Risk of violence amongst children is often seen. We realise that all these children are came from different family background, unnurtured, and exposed to violence either in family or in community. These experiences shape children's life and behaviour. Sometimes, small dispute can develop into scuffle. There are risks, when workers responding this." (Administrator)

Despite acknowledgement of the risk, prevention has not yet developed. Most efforts are intended to respond and reduce the incident of fight or violence amongst children. The risk of abuse from workers or anyone who get involved in social rehabilitation provision are overlooked. In consequence, expected transformation on this issue is that the agency has particular mechanism in reducing the risk of violence that may appear from workers behaviour interaction with children. This expected transformation is workers has adequate awareness, knowledge and skill in working with children.

Social Rehabilitation Section was appointed to lead policy try out. Hereinafter, a team was resembled to work in arranging preparation and creating plan of action and schedule. The process took place for 15 months from August 2019 to October 2020. It was mainly consisting of preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation stage. This try out process was informed to workers by Administrator's announcement on monthly briefing.

Even though all majority of workers have been working in the agency for more than couple years, they were not used with the child safeguarding policy. Some workers expressed that:

"We have experience in working with children, know that abusing children are wrong and we have to protect them. Although it is kind familiar because it is about protecting children, we are not sure what it looks like." (Caregiver)

Regarding these shared information, initial assessment was conducted to understand workers' knowledge on children right, maltreatment, and protection. Afterwards, followed by analysing agency strength using SWOT assessment which connected to four child safeguarding policy components (YSTC, 2019), namely awareness, prevention, reporting and responding (the findings were presented in table 1).

Table 1. SWOT Assessment Result on LPKS's Child Safeguarding Policy Preparation

Category	Strength	Weakness	Opportunity
Awareness	Agency mission to provide a better social rehabilitation provision. Social rehabilitation service guidance.	Agency does not have particular child protection policy.	Two employees participated in CSP workshop.
Prevention	Code of ethic.	Ethic in working with children not available. Recruitment process has not yet standardised. Worker's capacity building has not yet standardised. Code of ethic for public not available. Complaint procedures has not yet developed. Whistle blower has not yet developed.	Commitment from YSTC in assisting CSP. Agency's mission in improving social rehabilitation service.
Reporting	Administrator and Supervisor commitments.	Reporting procedure has not yet developed. Reporting forms do not available.	Regular meeting and supervision.
Responding	Agency procedures on workers supervision.	Vocal point has not yet appointed. Responding procedures has not yet improved.	Procedures on handling violence amongst children.

The assessment findings indicated that amongst workers who works directly with children, only social workers who receive proper capacity upgrading through workshops. Most these workshops were conducted by other agencies. In the context of children's rights and risk of violence, most workers were not sure in answering the questions. Some argued that they are not confidence in answering because they have not been participating in any training. They were using their common sense and their experience in working with children.

This finding became a basis for agency in preparing several in-house trainings for workers who work directly with clients. These trainings were aimed to improve workers' knowledge and skills and to reduce risk of child abuse. To name were child safeguarding policy, children's right and protection, assisting children with trauma, and emotion stabilisation.

Since the agency did not have child protection policy for children who while residing in agency, workers were up mostly relied on Administrator and Supervisor's direction in concerning child protection issues. This has implication on different perspective on the use of violence in the process of rehabilitation, that certainty influence how workers response in responding children. Workers argued that the agency has to provide guidance in child protection, in preventing bias and preventing the use of violence in rehabilitation program. Workers pointed out that the use of violence can enhance children experience on multiple abuse and children will learn new modelling of violence. In relation to process of rehabilitation, the use of violence may contribute distortion on process psychosocial recovery. One of children expressed that:

“I am glad that the court decided me to undergoing rehabilitation in LPKS. Workers treated me well but sometime fussy in reminding my daily schedules. They have never used any violence on me.”

Similar with this, other children stated that:

“I was scared when they sent me to LPKS. I thought I would experience the same thing, but it was different. Caregiver treated me with respect. When I have dispute, caregiver helps me to understand and talk to my friend. I learned to care and respect others.”

Based on children’s feedbacks and in accordance with psychological assessment recommendation, LPKS is expected to provide good social environment and pro social modelling. It is hoped that children will learn prosocial behaviour from caregiver. Therefore, to preventing the risk of abuse, it was decided that team had to prepare (1) child safeguarding policy draft, (2) agency procedures on child safeguarding that include reporting and responding child incidents, (3) dissemination of child protection information that can be accessed by workers and public, (4) ethical of conduct in working with children, and (5) standard of knowledge and skill for workers that uphold child safeguarding.

Child safeguarding policy was drafted and completed in December 2019. This policy is aimed for workers and counterparts, who would receive information on child safeguarding policy and had to signed statement paper that he or she had already read and received explanation of the policy. This policy comprised principle, child, violence and abuse definition, scope of policy, agency’s perspective toward child abuse, standard of working with child, commitment, vocal point as person handling incident, code of conduct, and worker’s statement. As an addition, standard procedures on reporting and handling incident also finished at this stage.

This completion was continued with emendation of workers’ code of ethic in January 2020. Crucial point in this emendation was adding ethical of conduct in working with child. Furthermore, it was produced ethical code handbook that distributed to workers and everyone who work with LPKS in providing social rehabilitation service for children. The following is a code of conduct that agency employees and partners are not allowed to carry out of these prohibited actions namely:

1. Hitting, kicking, attacking, withholding basic needs (eating, drinking, medicine) or commit other physical violence against children.
2. Acting with the intention of humiliating, demeaning, criticizing or insulting children or engaging in other forms of emotional abuse.
3. Use language, give suggestions or advice that is inappropriate, offensive or abusive.
4. Allowing, or participating in children behaviour which is illegal, unsafe or not healthy, or leads to violence.
5. Doing discrimination, showing unfair or different treatment to certain child compared to other children.
6. Engage in sexual activities or have sexual relations with children below 18 years of age regardless of the age limit of adulthood in accordance with positive or customary law local customs. The wrong assumption about the age of child cannot be used as an excuse.
7. Build relationships with child who can be considered exploiting or committing violence against children.
8. Acting that could lead to violence or might put child on a situation vulnerable to violence.
9. Displaying behaviour that is inappropriate or sexually provocative.
10. Inviting child who is in their professional responsibility to stay at their unattended home, except in emergency circumstances and obtain permission from the competent authority.
11. Sleep in the same bed as child which is in their professional responsibility.
12. Sleep in the same room as child which is in their professional responsibility, except in exceptional circumstances and have obtained permission from the competent authority.
13. Do something personal for child who actually can do by themselves.
14. Spending excess time alone with child at a place far from other children.
15. Placing oneself in a position that is vulnerable to accusations of non-committing acts that unpleasant.
16. Showing inappropriate images, films and websites including pornography and extreme violence

Dissemination of child safeguarding policy try out was conducted in early February 2020, informing to section chief which has role as vocal point and the reporting process follows the staffing rules. The agency decided this to make the process as simple and preventing confusion. Of Anyone in the agency who knowing the allegation of child abuse incident, may report to vocal point with confidentiality by sending private message through “WhatsApp application”, followed by filling reporting form as legal record. Vocal point then would look on the report, notify Administrator and investigating the case by interviewing separately all parties involved. To record this investigation process, vocal point also filled out responding form. The finding then was reported to Administrator. Hereinafter, vocal point meeting involving other supervisors is carried out to plan follow up interventions. Whether workers violate the policy, staffing rules will apply as discipline and administrative penalty. For instance, oral and written reprimand, restriction in working with children, transferred to another post, contract termination, and reporting to law enforcers. To protect informant, whistle blower system is applied. Rationalisation of this is to enforcing child protection and preventing workers misconduct in delivering service as one of the workers stated:

“If I know that one of colleagues did violence toward children, I prefer to keep silent until someone else started to reporting. I fear, people will judge me disloyal and keep distance on me.” (Caregiver)

Similar with this, another worker expressed:

“Difficulty on reporting incident is whether our report is followed up. What if others blame me? If that happened, this as protecting children is wrong.” (Caregiver)

Of workers concern with being whistle blower is the possibility of losing his or her employment and threat of violence for instance blaming, avoiding and bullying. Certainty these are dreading and influence worker’s performance. In the long term, this may prevent agency to achieve its mission in protecting children. The application of whistle blower mechanism was prepared through agency’s website and later completed into barcode banner, for easy access.

In supporting prevention of child abuse, the agency prepared flyer and banner of child’s right, forms of child abuse, and how to care children. The Agency also distributed ethical code handbook and explanation of child safeguarding policy. Implementation try out was started in February and evaluated in October 2020. Each section chief was responsible for monitoring and documenting incident of policy violation.

During try out, several changes on rehabilitation service were also noted. The first change was Administrator’s policy of adding more workers into caregiver position. This decision was based on evaluation recommendation to strengthen child’s supervision and reducing risk of bullying. Caregivers were taken from contractual workers who previously work as vocational instructor. From only two caregivers, it goes to eight caregivers who providing companion, assistance, and coaching of practical and life skills. This decision was valued to be useful as it showed responsiveness on addressing emotional issues, dispute and preventing violence amongst children. The mechanism is set as on duty caregivers to inform child’s status through WhatsApp which can be monitored by off duty caregiver, social workers, medical team, security team, supervisor and even administrator. As reporting, information is also recorded on agency’s web based internal report.

The next change is application of rooster system to replace regular work schedule. The initial work schedule was begun at 0730 a.m. and finished at 04.00 pm. This applied for all workers on workdays. Application of this schedule had a drawback, in which children were less supervised particularly at night and on the weekend. At the time, only six security team members who worked on shift schedule. Addressing this, rooster system was then applied to security team and care giver to enhance supervision. Furthermore, several CCTVs were also placed in and outdoor building. Contrary with regular schedule, rooster system allows 24 hours supervision in seven days basis in which children’s activities are reported to all workers who work directly with children. Positive response was stated as one of workers expressing:

“Before rooster system applied for care giver, it was a burden for us in supervising children on the night and weekend. When it is applied, it helps us to share this responsibility and children are properly observable.” (Security Team)

Administrator stated that:

“Children’s activities and behaviour should be always supervised as it relates to whether their rehabilitation progress is in accordance with plan of intervention. Information of children’s attitude is coming from their caregiver who daily accompanying them, and shared to other team members that would follow up the case.”

Rooster system is part of agency commitment in protecting children from any violence whether it comes from adult or adolescent. Of agency’s concern is their abuse experience that will be subconsciously practiced to their peers. Children are often not willingly to disclose this experience as they are not aware or understand the connection between what has happened to them and their behavioural problem. With limited understanding, children have thought that this is normal response for expressing their feeling as one of workers expressing:

“These children are lack of care from their family and it seems nobody cares of their development. They are lack understanding on social norms and self-regulation. When they are annoyed, they can abruptly punch, hit, and harm others.” (Social Worker)

Regarding this, therefore, the agency has focused on treating child’s psychosocial issues and developing child’s life skills.

The next transformation is recruitment process that involving psychological assessment by independent psychology service bureau. The selection of psychological assessment was based on supervisor’s reports which indicating that some workers had lower performance, less responsibility and commitment to follow agency’s standard. A hesitancy emerged whether workers were suitable with their current assignment as one of the supervisors stated that:

“Our customers are children who needed special protection. However, I am wondering whether our workers are suitable for this job since they have various background and whether they are met agency standard in providing social rehabilitation service. We have never been done any psychological assessment to seek worker’s strength.” (Supervisor)

Psychological assessment plays important role in providing information of workers’ strength. When it combined with monthly supervision report, information then can be used to plan workers’ capacity and competency development. Furthermore, it can be also used to terminate work contract when workers are not compiling with agency’s standard.

Several incidents of violating child safeguarding policy were also recorded during implementation try out. The first violation was mostly related to putting children into vulnerable situation. For instance, for not wearing safety mask in preventing Covid-19. Accordingly, agency has standard in preventing Covid-19 spreading by applying health protocol and examine virus contamination through rapid test. Workers was regularly examined with non-reactive result. This had built confidence for being healthy and started to disregard health protocol. Knowing for this, direct supervisor was notified and workers were verbally reprimanded for violating child safeguarding policy and reminded other workers to follow agency’s policy and protocols.

The second violation was putting oneself in a vulnerable position to being accused of doing something unpleasant. For instance, spending more time with children after hours without following plan of individual rehabilitation and supervisor approval. At LPKS, social workers have role as children’s program supervisor which responsible to assure that child is following their rehabilitation plan. This intervention plan is discussed altogether with child, family, and social worker and shared to other workers. As implication, child activities and behaviour should be recorded and informed to social worker as a basis for social worker in reporting as well as assessing child’s progress. Therefore, any changes or activities that is not in accordance with rehabilitation plan and without social worker’s comprehend is valued as potential risk of harming child’s social rehabilitation.

The last violation reported was permitting unsupervised activity while children participating in program, for instance providing unsupervised mobile phone access to certain child. Providing unsupervised mobile phone access to children has great risk that influence child's rehabilitation program. As stated by the workers, this is due to potential risk of misuse of mobile phone for instance accessing pornography content, contacting crime network, and creating a plot for leaving program. Phone use is allowed when it support child rehabilitation program such as communicate with family or relatives, contacting their *Pembimbing Masyarakat (PK) Balai Masyarakat (Bapas)* or Community Advisor Correctional Centre and online studying and learning. Particularly online studying, child's mobile phone is connected to a personal computer in online learning room that monitored by caregiver.

Apart from monitoring policy violations, the agency was recording workers' responses in handling violence amongst incidents. Several violence amongst children as recorded as threatening and fighting, were well and cautiously addressed by workers. It was noted that the workers observe carefully the condition and situation of the children. Workers informed other team member of the certain children, who seem sad, quiet, restless, tense, angry and other unusual daily attitude or behaviour. One of the workers expressed that:

"We are expected to listening and seriously thinking about children. Although children sometime hiding their problem with us, we know they have some issues with their peer or family as it is showed in their unusual behaviour." (Caregiver)

On duty workers followed up with assessment and suitable intervention for instance separating children into safe place, ventilating emotion to calming the child by practicing emotional stabilization, reconciling disputed children, counselling and therapy. Workers' action is expected following principle-based child protection process 'In the best interest of the child' to guide workers in acting and responding appropriately in supporting or cooperating with all follow-up process in protecting children.

KESIMPULAN DAN SARAN

The child safeguarding policy is internal policy in ensuring that organisation is a safe place for children as it is mentioned in the Social Ministerial Ordinance Number 1/2020. Development of this policy within agency could not be done without proper resources such as trained staff and leader understanding on organisation's mission, weak and strength. Moreover, leader commitment, good will, and open communication is valued as important in protecting children from any violence and abuse.

From the implementation's try out, shows that this policy is not a pile of documents in fulfilling agency administration requirement. This policy has presented organisation, management board, employees' commitment in cutting the cycle of violence, preventing further risk of violence, and treating trauma on children. In addition, this policy is representing agency credibility in providing social service provision, and obligation for everyone that related to agency to prevent, to treat, to report and to respond properly in protecting children from any act of violence.

All the process of try out, it shows that child safeguarding policy component facilitates initiative and support management board in preparing the policy. Although agency succeed in developing this policy, the agency views the process should be continued and improved in addressing new issues of child safety that may emerge.

Although this study has focus on the process of child safeguarding implementation try out and does not cover comprehensively the impact of Child Safeguarding Policy on social rehabilitation program, the available feedback from children and workers points out positive influence on organisation environment. This policy encourages workers to have awareness in treating children.

Overall, it is suggested that further study on the impact of Child Safeguarding Policy implementation will provide further evidence of significant influence of this policy in social rehabilitation program for children in conflict with law.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Sofian, A. (2018). *Child Safeguarding Policy Upaya Penanggulangan Kekerasan Pada Anak*. Diakses <https://business-law.binus.ac.id/2018/03/30/child-safeguarding-policy-upaya-penanggulangan-kekerasan-pada-anak/>.
- Atkinson, P and Hammersley, M., 2007, *Ethnography Principles in practice*. Third edition. New York: Routledge.
- Australian Human Rights Commission ,2017, *National Statement of Principles for Child Safe Organisations* (Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission).
- Bromfield, L. M., 2005, Chronic child maltreatment in an Australian statutory child protection sample (*Unpublished Dissertation*). Deakin University, Geelong.
- Lamont, A., Bromfield, L., Horsfall, B., & Parker, R. (2010). *Issues for the safety and wellbeing of children in families with multiple and complex problems: the co-occurrence of domestic violence, parental substance misuse, and mental health problems* NCPC issues. Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- BRSAMPK Toddopuli. (2019). *Laporan Reviu Kasus Anak BRSAMPK Toddopuli 2019*. Kementerian Sosial RI, Indonesia.
- BRSAMPK Toddopuli. (2020). *Hasil Pemeriksaan Psikologis Klinis Anak 2020*. Kementerian Sosial RI, Indonesia.
- CDC. (2021). *Violence Prevention*. Diakses https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/can/CAN-factsheet_508.pdf.
- CFCA. (2014) *Effects of child abuse and neglect for children and adolescents, CFCA Resource Sheet*. Diakses <https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/effects-child-abuse-and-neglect-children-and-adolescents>.
- Children Protection Act 2014 (INA).
- Child Criminal Justice System Law 2012 (INA).
- Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2019) *Long-Term Consequences of Child Abuse and Neglect*. Diakses https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubPDFs/long_term_consequences.pdf.
- Fortson, B. L., Klevens, J., Merrick, M. T., Gilbert, L. K., & Alexander, S. P. (2016). Preventing child abuse and neglect: A technical package for policy, norm, and programmatic activities.
- Gray, D. E. (2021). *Doing research in the real world*. SAGE Publication.
- Patty, J. M. (2020). Tindak kekerasan terhadap anak di lingkungan satuan pendidikan dan peranan keluarga sebagai upaya non-penal dalam pencegahan. *Jurnal Belo*, 5(2), 115-129.
- Kompas.com. (2017). *Seorang Anak Balita Meninggal Diduga Akibat Kekerasan di Panti Asuhan*, viewed in January 2021. Diakses <https://regional.kompas.com/read/2017/01/28/19513941/seorang.anak.balita.meninggal.diduga.akibat.kekerasan.di.panti.asuhan>.
- Newberger, E. H. (1990). Child Physical Abuse: Definition, Prevalence, and Prevention. *Mark Rosenberg and Mary Ann Fenley, (eds) Violence: A Public Health Approach*.
- MayoClinic. (2018). *Child Abuse*. Diakses <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/child-abuse/symptoms-causes/syc-20370864>.
- Teja, M. (2014). Perlindungan terhadap anak terlantar di panti asuhan. *Info Singkat Kesejahteraan Sosial*, 6(5), 9-12.
- Naidoo, L. (2012). Ethnography: An introduction to definition and method. *An ethnography of global landscapes and corridors*, 10, 39248.
- National Center for Biotechnology Information (2014) *Consequences of child abuse and neglect*. Diakses https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK195987/Consequences_of_Child_Abuse_and_Neglect.
- OHH Ditjen Rehsos. (2020). *Komitmen Kemensos Bantu Anak-anak di Kondisi Covid 19 melalui Progres*, Diakses <https://kemensos.go.id/komitmen-kemensos-bantu-anak-anak-di-kondisi-covid-19-melalui-progres>.
- Plan International Organisation. (2019). *Global Policy on Safeguarding Children and Young People*. Diakses <https://plan-international.org/publications/global-policy-safeguarding-children-and-young-people-2019>.
- Powell, Richard. (2014). *Save the Children Child Safeguarding Policy*. Save the Children.
- Queensland Government. (2018). *What is Child Abuse*. Diakses <https://www.qld.gov.au/community/getting-support-health-social-issue/support-victims-abuse/child-abuse/what-is-child-abuse/child-abuse-effects> .

- Reachout. (2021). *What is Child Abuse*. Diakses <https://au.reachout.com/articles/what-is-child-abuse>.
- Save the Children. (2020). *Child Exploitation*. Diakses <https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/keyword/child-exploitation>.
- Praditama, S. (2016). Kekerasan terhadap anak dalam keluarga dalam perspektif fakta sosial. *SOSIALITAS; Jurnal Ilmiah Pend. Sos Ant*, 5(2).
- Detrick, S., Abel, G., Berger, M., Delon, A., & Meek, R. (2008). *Violence against children in conflict with the law. A Study on indicators and data collection in Belgium, England and Wales, France and the Netherlands*. Defence for Children International.
- Davies, S. G., & Robson, J. (2016). Juvenile (in) justice: children in conflict with the law in Indonesia. *Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law*, 17(1), 119-147.
- Sinanan, A. N. (2015). Trauma and treatment of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Trauma & Treatment*, 4(24), 1-5.
- Spradley, J. P. (2016). *The ethnographic interview*. Waveland Press.
- Suyanto, B., & Prasetyo, R. A. (2020). Acts of Violence and Adaptation Mechanism of Children in Conflict with the Law in Juvenile Detention Center. *Talent Development & Excellence*, 12(1).
- Kurniawan, T., Y. (2011). *Disiksa, 20 Anak Panti Melapor ke Polisi*. Diakses <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/346123/disiksa-20-anak-panti-melapor-ke-polisi>.
- The Social Ministerial Decree 107 of 2019 on LPKS and RPS
- The Social Minister Regulation 16 of 2020 on ATENSI
- The Social Minister Regulation 1 of 2020 on Pengasuhan Anak
- Thoresen, S., Myhre, M., Wentzel-Larsen, T., Aakvaag, H. F., & Hjemdal, O. K. (2015). Violence against children, later victimisation, and mental health: a cross-sectional study of the general Norwegian population. *European journal of psychotraumatology*, 6(1), 26259.
- UNICEF. (2014). *Violence against Children in East Asia and the Pacific: A Regional Review and Synthesis of Findings. Strengthening Child Protection Systems Series: No. 4*. Diakses <https://www.unicef.org/eap/reports/violence-against-children-east-asia-and-pacific>.
- WHO. (2006). *Preventing child maltreatment: A guide to taking action and generating evidence*. Geneva: WHO. Diakses www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/violence/child_maltreatment/en.
- WHO. (2014). *Global Status Report on Violence Prevention 2014*. Diakses <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241564793>.
- Robertson, S. (2002). Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method. *Open University, Berkshire*.
- Cannon, Y., & Hsi, A. (2016). Disrupting the path from childhood trauma to juvenile justice: An upstream health and justice approach. *Fordham Urb. LJ*, 43, 425.
- Yayasan Sayangi Tunas Cilik, 2019, Kebijakan Keselamatan Anak, YSTC: Jakarta
- Young, S., Greer, B., & Church, R. (2017). Juvenile delinquency, welfare, justice and therapeutic interventions: a global perspective. *BJPsych bulletin*, 41(1), 21-29.
- Daton, Z., D. (2020). *Rumah Aman yang tak Aman untuk korban prostitusi online*. Diakses <https://regional.kompas.com/read/2020/09/19/11400061/rumah-aman-yang-tak-aman-untuk-korban-prostitusi-online?page>.