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Starting point: MYWeB (2014 – 2016)

- Comprehensive reviews of existing
  - literature,
  - administrative and survey data and
  - national child and youth policies
  - Delphi survey with interdisciplinary experts
Next ... ECDP (2018-2019)

Based on MYWeB we updated national policy reviews and needs and extended the overall approach by thinking about a linkage of policy and measurement concepts.

Which features should be taken regard of in the EuroCohort survey design in order to capture current important aspects of child and youth well-being, which are not covered well, yet?
Next ... ECDP (2018-2019)

Update current policy needs:

- **Interviews** recorded with key experts (30-68 minutes) (experts from UNICEF, University of York, Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories and EuroChild)

- **Dimensions:**
  - Changes in child and youth policies,
  - Changes in the fields of health, financial security and employment,
  - Main actors and changing roles,
  - Subjective measures,
  - Gaps (data and policy),
  - Special problems and groups, and
  - Further suggestions
Next ... ECDP (2018-2019)

Update current policy needs:

• Interviewees agreed that questions about subjective well-being could successfully contribute to measuring the impact of policies.
• Education – well-being at school
• Relationship with family, peers
• Social media – not only as danger
• Migration
• Poverty and deprivation remained important issues
• Environment, ecology
• Parent support – not only employment
• Participation
Update ‘Structured policy review’: Rapid Evidence Assessment

• We asked partners to identify **3 relevant new policies** for child or youth well-being between 2014-2018 from their countries, and fill out a datasheet on them.

• **36** policies collected from Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Croatia, Spain, Finland, Italy, Greece, UK, Netherlands, Slovakia and Latvia.

• More ‘traditional’ fields appeared in the policies (labour market, health, education) than in the interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy field</th>
<th>Nr. of references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour market policy: parents and youth (parent support, youth unemployment)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policy (mental and physical protection and care, risk behaviour)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (ECEC, formal and informal)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and youth protection intervention and laws combatting violence, sexual abuse, and supporting children and youth under care</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child poverty and segregation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation (including combatting radicalization, children’s rights empowering children themselves)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family policy (services, support, institutions)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration (refugees)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special target groups (mentally/physically disabled children, early school dropouts)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet safety and competencies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rapid Evidence Assessment

• ‘How this policy can profit from data provided by the survey?’

• The following topics were regarded as important most frequently:
  • Subjective and psychological measures (most frequently mentioned)
  • Education not only outcome but school life, satisfaction with, contribution to SWB and PWB
  • Quality family time
  • Housing data, satisfaction with housing
  • Voice of children
  • Employment
  • Social care received
Steps for linking well-being domains and measurement concepts

1, preparing a basic list of measurement instruments that have been tested and adopted successfully in child and youth well-being surveys
2, preparing a basic list of child and youth well-being domains
3, prioritizing list of domains

...
Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informing policy field</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Subdomain</th>
<th>Measurement instrument</th>
<th>Study examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary health care</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health related quality of life</td>
<td>KIDSCREEN (Ravens-Sieberer, 2005)</td>
<td>The Sparcle Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family policy</td>
<td>Social environment</td>
<td>Parent support</td>
<td>Good Childhood index</td>
<td>The Good Childhood Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next ... ECDP (2018-2019)

Prioritizing procedure in 2 steps
Step1 used for calculating weights reflecting the general importance of each sub domain:

• 1) its importance for a general understanding of well-being
• 2) its importance for national policy makers
• 3) its importance for the international policy environment
Prioritizing procedure in 2 steps

Step2 used for cohort sensitive prioritization of each sub domain:

• Rating from 1 (not very important) to 3 (very important) for child cohort and youth cohort

• Expressing need for adding subjective measurements
### Next ... ECDP (2018-2019)

*This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under the Agreement no 777449*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Weighted value birth cohort</th>
<th>Weighted value child cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income, Wealth &amp; Earnings</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Crime</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Environment</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next ... ECDP (2018-2019)

Steps for linking well-being domains and measurement concepts

4, deciding, which domains could be captured best by established measurements and which need new developments/adaptions (e.g. in order to include subjective views)

5, preparing questionnaires for different target groups (children, young people, parents, teacher, ...) and harmonise them in order to enable content linkage

Currently in progress ...
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