Western Cape Government

Community Safety

Youth Safety and Religious Programme Summary (1/5/25 format) Evaluation Report

February 2018

ACRONYMS

CBO:	COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANISATION
CC&DW:	CREATIVE CONSULTING AND DEVELOPMENT WORKS
CPF:	COMMUNITY POLICING FORUM
CSIP:	COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PLAN
DBE:	DEPARTMENT OF BASIC EDUCATION
DCAS:	DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND SPORT
DOCS:	DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SAFETY
DSD:	DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
DCS:	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
FBO:	FAITH-BASED ORGANISATION
FGD:	FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION
MEC:	MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
M&E:	MONITORING AND EVALUATION
MOD:	MASS PARTICIPATION, OPPORTUNITY AND ACCESS, DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH
MOU:	MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
NGO:	NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION
NPO:	NON-PROFIT ORGANISATION
RCT:	RANDOMISED CONTROL TRIAL
SC:	STEERING COMMITTEE
SAPS:	SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SERVICE
TOC:	THEORY OF CHANGE
TOR:	TERMS OF REFERENCE
WCG:	WESTERN CAPE GOVERNMENT
YSRP:	YOUTH SAFETY AND RELIGIOUS PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME

TABLE OF CONTENTS

POLICY SUMMARY

The Western Cape Government Department of Community Safety (WCG DoCS) commissioned an evaluation of the Youth Safety and Religious Partnership Programme (YSRP) in 2017 to assess implementation and outcomes achieved between 2012 and 2017, and to provide recommendations to assist in strengthening the Programme. Key findings include:

- Far more children under 14 years were attending the YSRP than children over the age of 14. This suggests that the Programme was more appealing to younger children. The holiday programmes were not sufficiently effective to reach the target group. The Programme was not appealing enough mainly because youth perceived themselves as too old for the Programme. Other reasons included other responsibilities, the structured and supervised nature of the Programme and lack of targeted marketing to attract the older age group.
- The YSRP was able to run in dangerous communities because FBOs formed partnerships with SAPS, CPFs, and neighbourhood watches; venues were secured; there were consequences for misbehaviour; weapons were confiscated and gangs avoided harming the YSRP.
- WCG DoCS has inadequate administrative systems that require technological upgrade, as well as staff capacity gaps including insufficient Monitors and senior level officials. There were also insufficient finances to implement the YSRP effectively. The R50 per child/youth per day was not enough and this grant should be raised substantially. FBOs also struggled with insufficient staff quantity and experienced insufficient administrative management, primarily as a result of WCG DOCS's own administrative capacity.
- FBOs can be appropriate for implementing the YSRP, but this is on the condition that they partner with other organisations, or specialists who have relevant expertise or capacity, including NGOs/NPOs, SAPS and CPFs, sector experts and local projects. However, FBOs did not appear to offer advantages that were necessarily sufficient to privilege them as implementers over any other organisation.
- The Programme kept approximately 94,324 beneficiaries off the streets over a 6 year period. It provided a good alternative to other activities children/youth may have been otherwise engaged in. This evaluation is unable to conclusively and reliably determine if the Programme was able to keep beneficiaries off the street beyond the Programme period. However, considering evaluation theories of dosage and duration, the Programme is too short, infrequent, and not intensive enough to effect an attitudinal or behavioural change beyond the five-day period.

- Key challenges of the Programme were WCG DoCS's "red tape"; a lack of partnerships with CPFs and in some cases SAPS; Programme sites being too far for some beneficiaries; problematic parents/caregivers; and the threat of violence in the communities.
- The YSRP has the potential to be replicable, but only if specific programme quality factors are addressed. However, at this stage it would not be responsible to begin replicating the Programme elsewhere when there are still unresolved issues of financing, resources, planning, administration and monitoring.
- Many FBOs had a relationship with the children after the YSRP concluded, especially if beneficiaries were part of the church's constituency, or if FBOs had long standing community presence. Relationships were not sustained if beneficiaries lived far from the Programme Manager; if FBOs were too reliant on WCG DoCS to fund their work; or if FBOs did not follow-up with non-church member beneficiaries.
- Other influences to keep children and youth off the street included programmes implemented by NGOs/NPOs/CBOs or government departments, church or faith-related programmes, and community structures. There was also evidence to suggest that there were little or no other influences available in some communities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Western Cape Government Department of Community Safety (WCG DoCS) commissioned an evaluation of the Youth Safety and Religious Partnership Programme (YSRP) in 2017 to assess the implementation of the Programme and the outcomes or results achieved, and to provide recommendations to assist in strengthening the Programme.

Creative Consulting and Development Works (CC&DW) was appointed to undertake this evaluation and used a clarificatory workshop, implementation evaluation, and outcomes evaluation, following a formative and mixed-method approach, which included quantitative and qualitative data. The clarificatory workshop produced two versions of a Theory of Change (ToC): the first depicting the current scope of the YSRP i.e. immediate/short-term results, and the second depicting potential intermediate and long-term effects that the YSRP could have. The implementation and outcomes evaluations used primary and secondary data. The latter was used in a literature review and a document review. Various primary data collection methods were used, with: 1) 30 FBO Programme Manager interviews; 2) 10 beneficiary focus group discussions (FGDs); 3) 1 WCG DoCS staff FGD; 4) 2 key informant FGDs and 1 key informant interview; 5) and 51 beneficiary activity sheets were completed.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Relevance to Intended Audience

Why are the targeted age group (14-21 years) not attending, but rather the younger children?
The targeted age group were not attending primarily because the Programme was not appealing enough to them. They perceived themselves as too mature or too old for the Programme. Other reasons for non-attendance include 1) other responsibilities (e.g. holiday jobs, housework, or caring for family members); 2) the structured and supervised nature of the Programme; and 3) the lack of targeted and purposeful marketing to attract the age group. Younger children were attending because FBOs did not wish to exclude them from their programmes and because they were often left in the care of their older siblings who came to the Programme.

Is the Programme content more appropriate and appealing to children (13 years and younger) or to youth (14-21 years)?

Far more children under the age of 14 years were attending the YSRP than children over the age of 14, suggesting that the Programme was not appealing to the target age group. The content appeal was largely depended on the implementing FBO. Prayer/faith-related activities, dancing, speakers/visitors, sports and games appealed to younger children. Content appealing to youth were sports, dancing, and excursions. However these activities were not appealing enough to draw youth in large numbers. The Programme needs to offer activities not easily accessed elsewhere, or that provide benefits beyond enjoyment, such as life-skills or practical career guidance.

Implementation

Why is this Programme able to run within some very dangerous areas without any "down-time"?
In order to keep their venue and beneficiaries safe, most FBOs formed partnerships with SAPS, CPFs, and neighbourhood watches. These stakeholders ensured visibility and patrolled the venue during the week of implementation. Staff would inform beneficiaries of the consequences of misbehaviour, weapons brought in by beneficiaries would be confiscated and venues were physically secured by gates and fence. Additionally, gangs appeared to respect and support the work of the Programme.

Is there sufficient oversight, coordination and management capacity to implement the YSRP Programme within the whole-of-society approach?

WCG DoCS experienced challenges with its administrative system, including issues with managing application processes, providing late acceptance to the FBOs, and releasing finances late. This may have impeded FBOs' effective implementation. It was recognised that the administrative system needs to be an electronic system. The Department also experienced staff capacity gaps: there was a need for more skilled Monitors, and more senior level officials, as there was an over-reliance on interns. This capacity may be inadequate for implementing the Programme within the whole-of-society approach.

Are there sufficient finances, human resources and administrative management to implement the YSRP?

There were insufficient finances to implement the YSRP effectively. The provision of R50 per child/youth per day was reportedly not enough. FBOs catered for more beneficiaries than initially planned, making finances even more inadequate. It is clear that if a quality Programme is to be implemented the R50 grant would need to be raised substantially. FBOs also struggled with insufficient human resources, primarily staff quantity and quality. FBOs also experienced insufficient administrative management, with the challenges primarily being an issue with WCG DOCS's own administration, which consequently affected FBOs' ability to plan and organise their programmes.

Are the FBOs the most appropriate vehicles to use in implementing this Programme or are there other vehicles that can be used to implement this type of programme?

FBOs offered several advantages, including 1) the ability to reach high numbers of community members; and 2) being trusted by the community; 3) commitment to their community; and 4) the perceived likelihood that they would continue such programmes outside of the YSRP. Conversely, there were some concerns in working with FBOs, including whether FBOs 1) had the best interest of the community; 2) had the relevant knowledge and skills; and 3) were only adequately reaching beneficiaries from their own congregation, rather than other children/youth in the community. FBOs can be appropriate for implementing the YSRP, but this is on condition that they partner with other organisations or specialists with expertise or capacity, including NGOs/NPOs, SAPS and CPFs, sector experts and local projects.

Effectiveness

Have the Programmes been rolled out in an effective manner so as to reach the targeted youth beneficiaries?

Whilst the Programme is reaching children and youth within the target age group, younger children largely outnumber the target age group. The holiday programmes are not being implemented in a way that is effective enough to reach the target group. Potential explanations for this were discussed within the evaluation questions pertaining to the *Relevance to Intended Audience*.

Did the Programme address the problem of youth and children on the streets during school holidays in communities that services were provided in? If yes, was it for the duration of the Programme only or for a longer specified period?

The Programme kept approximately 94,324 beneficiaries off the streets over a six year period. The Programme provided a good alternative to other activities children/youth may have been engaged in if they were not at the Programme, including 1) harmless, yet unstimulating activities; 2) risky, antisocial or delinquent behaviours; or 3) being on the street without supervision. Beneficiaries also felt physically and emotionally safe at the YSRP. The evaluation is unable to conclusively and reliably determine if the YSRP was able to keep beneficiaries off the streets beyond the Programme period, as there was no comparison with a control group over the long-term. Considering theories of programme dosage and duration, the YSRP is too short, infrequent, and not intensive enough to effect an attitudinal or behavioural change in its beneficiaries beyond the five-day period.

Challenges

What are the key binding constraints/challenges currently experienced in delivering the YSRP?

The YSRP experienced a number of cross-cutting challenges as presented in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Additional challenges were 1) WCG DoCS's "red tape" (WCG DoC's procedures and rules created difficulties for FBOs in applying to be part of the Programme); 2) a lack of partnerships with CPFs and in some cases SAPS; 3) Programme sites being too far for some beneficiaries; 4) problematic parents; and 5) the threat of violence in the targeted communities.

Replicability and Sustainability

Can this Programme be replicated in different areas, or do specific conditions need to be met to deliver this Programme?

The YSRP has the potential to be replicable, but only if specific factors are implemented. The programme must: 1) be entertaining and appropriate for the beneficiaries; 2) utilise high quality implementers; 3) have a good quality venue; 4) make food security a priority; 5) establish key partnerships with relevant organisations; and 6) be purposively adjusted or tailor-made to the respective community or context. Funding could be a key barrier of replicability. At this stage it would not be responsible to begin replicating the Programme

elsewhere when there are still unresolved issues of financing, resources, planning, administration and monitoring. Replication can and should only happen when there is a set of tested processes, procedures, routines and templates.

Do the children still engage with the religious fraternities after the YSRP holiday programme is concluded?

Many, if not most of the FBOs have some form of relationship with the children after the YSRP has concluded. FBOs may have had sustained relationships if 1) the children and their families were part of the church's constituency; or 2) they had a long standing community presence and relationship. However, sustained relationships did not necessarily apply to all beneficiaries. Reasons included that: 1) beneficiaries did not live in the same area as the Programme Manager; 2) some FBOs were potentially too reliant on WCG DoCS to fund their youth work; 3) FBOs would not necessarily follow-up with beneficiaries, specifically those who were not church members; and 4) some beneficiaries had no interest in engaging with FBOs beyond the YSRP.

What other influences keep children and youth off the street?

The primary other influences keeping children and youth off the street were programmes implemented by NGOs/NPOs/CBOs or government departments. Other influences included church or faith-related programmes and community structures. There was also evidence of little or no other influences or options available in some communities. Participants reported this was likely due to the limited availability of facilities and resources for them in their areas. This may have only been the case in some communities, but community members may have also been unaware of other programmes available.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future Programme Design

WCG DoCS needs to **concretise the specific type of prevention approach or combination of approaches it would like to focus on** to ensure that programming is appropriate and intensive enough to achieve outcomes. Should the target be 14 - 21 year olds, programming will need to be more intentionally and intensively designed. Should WCG DoCS prefer to continue with its current model, changing the intended target audience to younger children would be more appropriate.

WCG DoCS should consider **expanding the YSRP target audience to include children below the age of 14 years, or alternatively focus exclusively on children aged 5-12 years old**. Given that multiple studies emphasise the need to intervene early in the life course, intervening with beneficiaries whilst they are still young may lead to better outcomes of the YSRP.

Considering the above, **the content of the holiday programmes would need to be carefully designed to be specific to each age group to be appropriate**. Adolescents and children cannot be expected to be engaged, entertained and benefitted by similar or the same content. WCG DoCS must form partnerships with other government departments like Department of Basic Education (DBE)/Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport (DCAS) as well NGOs/NPOs/CBOs to assist in developing programme content. In order for carefully designed Programme content to be effectively implemented, **WCG DoCS should provide some form of training for FBO Programme Managers on the content taught during holiday programmes**.

WCG DoCS should consider partnering with other organisations in the implementation of the Programme, including NGOs, NPOs, CBOs etc. The FBOs generally did not possess particular capacities that made them notably better implementers than other organisations. The success of the holiday programmes was often dependent on the FBOs' partnership with other organisations. Additionally, **the Department may need to consider prioritising the quality of its implementing partners over quantity, by reducing the number of grants made**. It might be more effective to fund fewer organisations, who show the most potential for implementing the highest quality programmes. WCG DoCS would also have greater capacity to oversee fewer organisations, which may further improve Programme implementation.

Whilst the YSRP emphasises a whole-of-society approach, the Programme lacks involvement of parents or caregivers. This is despite the fact that various studies point to the importance of including caregivers and/or families in violence prevention efforts. As such, **it is recommended that the YSRP model include a parental component, such as trainings/workshops**.

Partnerships

It is imperative that FBOs do not work in isolation for this Programme. The YSRP must **partner with NGOs/NPOs/sector experts and DBE to develop Programme content and potentially implement programmes**. Additionally, **government departments such as DCAS and the City of Cape Town** run free programmes during the school holidays and after school programmes

throughout the year. These departments should be drawn as they have resources available and can lend learnings and expertise. WCG DoCS may also consider making it a mandatory requirement to have **SAPS and CPFs** present at the Programme to enhance safety.

Future Programme Implementation

To improve future Programme implementation, the following recommendations are made:

1. To improve WCG DoCS's internal challenges, **there needs to be: 1) technological updates made to the Department's administrative system; 2) more capacitated administrative or clerical staff to operate the system; 3) more skilled Monitors and their role to be expanded to actively support FBOs; and 4) more senior level staff.**

2. **WCG DoCS should increase the R50** every year to account for inflation. If the above design suggestions are followed then this amount should increase substantially.

3. **More targeted marketing strategies will need to be employed in order to improve the reach of the target age group,** including: 1) marketing the Programme at high schools and other youth programmes; 2) having youth beneficiaries market the Programme; 3) sending the message that the YSRP is for young adults; and 4) marketing to parents.

4. At the end of each holiday period, **FBOs should be given an opportunity to join a workshop or forum to share their implementation experiences.** WCG DoCS should use these to document learnings and best practices and improve the Programme.

Future Outcomes

WCG DoCS should place a **greater emphasis on more distant outcomes beyond what is currently targeted (as per the first version of the ToC) to achieve longer-term and more substantial Programme results (as per the second version of the ToC).** The Programme has a good foundation for immediate safety outcomes, but would require radical changes to its content for longer-term outcomes to be achieved.

Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation

It is recommended that WCG DoCS revise its monitoring tools to: 1) collect more outcome monitoring data; 2) to more accurately capture outcome and output indicators so avoid subjective perspectives; and 3) develop more concrete tools such as checklists. Monitors should also receive more intensive tool training. WCG DoCS should adopt an electronic M&E system. **The Department should commission a control group for future evaluations** to assess whether intermediate or longer-term changes are attributable to the YSRP.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Programme

The Youth Safety and Religious Partnership Programme (YSRP) is a holiday programme that is implemented in the June/July, December/January and Easter school holidays. The Programme, which was first implemented in 2012 and is currently in its sixth year of implementation, is an initiative of and funded by the Western Cape Government (WCG) Department of Community Safety (DoCS). It specifically targets children and youth[1] aged 14-21 years old who live in high priority crime areas within the Western Cape, including areas that form part of the Community Safety Improvement Plan (CSIP).

The Department partners with faith-based organisations (FBOs) in the targeted communities who serve as direct implementers of the Programme. The rationale being that FBOs have a significant presence and footprint in target communities, and are therefore well suited to attract community members to their programmes. With each new holiday period, WCG DoCS advertises and invites FBOs to apply for YSRP funding to run a holiday programme in their respective community. Following an application and vetting process, FBOs whose applications are accepted then receive a grant of R50 per child per day. The programmes however can only receive funding for a maximum of five days. The specific schedule and content of the holiday programme activities is left to the discretion of FBOs. Broadly, WCG DoCS's requirements are that the programmes consist of sporting activities, recreational games and activities, and/or youth development/life skills/career development activities. Some component of the programmes must however include a safety promotion or crime prevention activity (e.g. presentation on drug awareness, gangs etc.). Children and youth must also be provided with at least one meal, and be appropriately supervised by adults.

The primary aim of the YSRP is to keep children and youth in identified high crime areas off the streets during holiday season when they may otherwise not have adult supervision. By having children and youth attend the FBO-run programmes, and kept busy by activities during this time, they are physically prevented from being unsupervised in the community and potentially engaging in high-risk behaviours or being exposed to violence and crime.

1.2 Background to the Evaluation

---

[1] According to South Africa's National Youth Commission Act (1996), a youth is any individual between the ages of 14 and 35, whilst the Children's Act (2005) defines a child as any individual below the age of 18 years. As such, the YSRP targets both children and youths.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The three primary purposes of this evaluation were to:
1. Assess the implementation of the YSRP provided by FBOs in high priority high crime areas, with a focus on the ability of the programme to reach the targeted beneficiaries, and how the roll-out of programmes are functioning;
2. Assess the outcomes or results achieved by the programme, specifically noting good practices, enabling factors and challenges; and
3. Provide recommendations to assist in strengthening the YSRP via the improvement of implementation for future programming, so that outcomes can more effectively be achieved.

Creative Consulting and Development Works (CC&DW) was contracted to undertake an independent evaluation of the YSRP. The evaluation was conducted over a six month time frame, from October 2017 – March 2018. Where possible, the evaluation considered programmatic data since the Programme inception in 2012 until 2017; however monitoring data made available was primarily focused on data from 2016 to 2017 programmes run[2]. This will be discussed in further detail below.

1.2.2. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation responded to key evaluation questions as outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR), with some adjustments made as agreed with WCG DoCS (i.e. evaluation questions which appeared to be asking the same question and/or were reliant on similar qualitative data were combined in order to avoid redundancy). The final list of evaluation questions, depicted in Table 1 below, were answered by a combination of cross-cutting data sources and data collection instruments. The combination of data collection sources and tools aided in methodological and data triangulation, which further allowed for verification of data, and a more textured, comprehensive account of the Programme.

---

[2] The only monitoring tools that were available to the evaluation team were from June/July 2016, December 2016/January 2017, and June/July 2017. These were tools captured by the the current M&E unit which been responsible for YSRP monitoring visits. The tools for monitoring visits conducted by previous units in the Departments were no longer accessible at the time of this evaluation. This is noted in *Evaluation Limitations*.

TABLE 1: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

YSRP EVALUATION QUESTIONS
Relevance to Intended Audience
1.   Why are the targeted age group (14-21 years) not attending, but rather the younger children?
2.   Is the programme content more appropriate and appealing to children (13 years and younger) or to youth (14-21 years)?
Implementation
3.   Why is this programme able to run within some very dangerous areas without any "down-time"?
4.   Is there sufficient oversight, coordination and management capacity to implement the YSRP programme within the whole-of-society approach?
5.   Are there sufficient finances, human resources and administrative management to implement the YSRP?
6.   Are the FBOs the most appropriate vehicles to use in implementing this programme or are there other vehicles that can be used to implement this type of programme?
Effectiveness
7.   Have the Programmes been rolled out in an effective manner so as to reach the targeted youth beneficiaries?
8.   Did the Programme address the problem of youth and children on the streets during school holidays in communities that services were provided in? If yes, was it for the duration of the Programme only or for a longer specified period?
Challenges
9.   What are the key binding constraints/challenges currently experienced in delivering the YSRP?
Replicability and Sustainability
10.   Can this programme be replicated in different areas, or do specific conditions need to be met to deliver this programme?
11.   Do the children still engage with the religious fraternities after the YSRP holiday programme is concluded?
12.   What other influences keep children and youth off the street?

2. METHODOLOGY

In order to assess the implementation and progress of the Programme, a **formative evaluation approach** was employed. The objective of such an evaluation is to find out what is working and what can be improved. The learning that takes place as a result of the evaluation can therefore be used to inform future programming. Additionally, a **mixed-method approach** was utilised. This incorporated both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods that were inclusive and complementary. This approach allowed for data gathering in multiple ways whereby the evaluation team was able to elicit a variety of perspectives on the Programme's achievements, lessons learned, and recommendations.

2.1. Evaluation Design

The evaluation consisted of three key design elements: 1) a clarificatory workshop; 2) implementation evaluation; and 3) an outcomes evaluation, with a synthesis of these three elements to conclude the evaluation process. Table 2 below provides an explanation of how each element was combined to fulfil the purpose of the evaluation.

TABLE 2: EXPLANATION OF THE FOUR KEY EVALUATION ELEMENTS

ELEMENT 1: CLARIFICATORY	ELEMENT 2: IMPLEMENTATION	ELEMENT 3: OUTCOMES	ELEMENT 4: SYNTHESIS
This element involved reviewing the Programme's theory including underlying assumptions as well as intended outcomes and developing a Theory of Change (ToC).	This element provided an assessment of whether the Programme was being implemented with fidelity, quality and at the level of intensity needed to achieve intended outcomes.	During this element, the evaluation team determined whether the Programme has achieved its identified short term outcomes as per its ToC.	A process of consolidation and synthesis was then conducted to identify learnings, gaps, issues for sustainability and recommendations.

The evaluation team conducted a **clarificatory workshop** which was held in the initial stages of the evaluation. This was attended by WCG DoCS staff and steering committee (SC) members who have been involved in the Programme. This workshop assisted the evaluation team in developing a description of the YSRP and provided a further understanding of the Programme. The evaluation team used a participatory approach which included interactive, inclusionary, and learning elements to enhance ownership and buy-in from key stakeholders of the YSRP. The workshop produced two versions of the ToC (see Annexure A). The first version, which was the version followed for this evaluation, depicted what the current scope of the Programme could achieve at this stage. This was limited to immediate/short-term outcomes only in terms of keeping children/youth off the streets. The second version was an extended model depicting intermediate and long-term results that the Programme could have in the future (and how these relate to provincial strategic goals and national outcomes) if programming was more purposefully developed. Overall, the ToC provides an overview of how the YSRP activities work to produce specific outcomes, and the underlying assumptions on which these processes are based.

2.2. Data Collection

The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach using qualitative and quantitative data collected at a primary and secondary level. Further detail of this is provided below.

2.2.1. Primary Data Collection

Quantitative and qualitative primary data were collected using the following key tools:
1. FBO Programme Manager interviews;
2. Beneficiary activity sheet (5-7 beneficiaries under the age of 13).
3. Beneficiary focus group discussions (FGDs) (5-7 beneficiaries over the age of 13 years[3] per FBO for site visit only);
4. WCG DoCS staff FGD; and
5. Key informant FGDs or interviews (3-7 key informants per key informant group).

Please refer to Annexure B for all data collection tools including the interview guides, FGD guides and the activity sheet. These tools were developed in accordance with the

---

[3] Where possible, the fieldwork team attempted to conduct FGDs with children over the age of 13 years, with a range of ages represented. However, this was not always possible at each FBO, as it was dependent on the age of the children who were at the Programme at the time of data collection. Thus the minimum age of children who were included in the FGDs was assessed on a site by site basis.

evaluation questions. Whilst all guides were presented in English, the fieldwork team included data collectors who were fluent in isiXhosa and Afrikaans so that the questions could be directly translated (and further explained) for evaluation participants who were not proficient and/or comfortable responding in English. This approach aided participants' understanding of the questions and allowed them to respond to questions in the language they were most comfortable in allowing for richer data to be collected.

Where data was collected face-to-face, Programme Managers, WCG DoCS staff, key informants, and children over the age of 18 were required to complete an informed consent form. For children under the age of 18, caregiver consent from the Programme Manager and child verbal assent was acquired. All evaluation participants were also provided with a piece of paper with the contact details of a WCG DoCS staff member and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) which have social workers in the areas in which they resided. Please see Annexure C for the consent forms, the verbal assent protocol and the list of contact details.

Primary data collection took place from 20 November to 15 December 2017, with evaluation participants described below.

2.2.1.1 Evaluation Sample

Evaluation participants comprised of four key target groups as detailed in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3: KEY EVALUATION TARGET GROUPS

TARGETED EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS	
PROGRAMME MANAGERS	Individuals from implementing FBOs who received funding from WCG DoCS during the Programme period 2012 -2017 (either at one point/year or at multiple points/ years or continuously each year from 2012). Participants selected were those who directly oversaw or were involved in the implementation of the YSRP holiday programme.

BENEFICIARIES	Children and youth who were enrolled in the December 2017 YSRP holiday programme.
WCG DOCS STAFF	Relevant WCG DoCS staff members who were involved in the implementation of the YSRP namely: ● Acting Head of Safety Partnerships; ● YSRP Project Manager; and ● Two former Programme Monitors.
KEY INFORMANTS	Individuals who played an instrumental role in the YSRP and hold insights of the Programme, including: ● Member of Executive Council (MEC) of Community Safety ● South African Police Service (SAPS) representatives ● Community Policing Forum (CPF) representatives

A key strength of this multi-level data collection approach was that it allowed for numerous key perspectives on the Programme implementation and outcomes to be captured. This allowed for the collection of rich, highly contextualised and triangulated data, which aided a thorough understanding of the Programme.

WCG DoCS staff and key informants were purposively sampled in consultation with WCG DoCS. WCG DoCS staff who had been intimately involved in the programme were selected, whilst SAPS and CPF key informants were selected from a list provided by WCG DoCS indicating SAPS and CPF members who had previously attended a YSRP meeting with WCG DoCS. Moreover, the evaluation team collected data from a purposive sample of beneficiaries and FBO Programme Managers using FBOs as the unit of analysis. Thirty FBOs were sampled and stratified; ten FBOs were selected for site visits including face-to-face data collection (with Programme Managers and beneficiaries), whilst twenty FBOs were selected for telephonic interviews (with Programme Managers only).

Sampling and stratification were initially carried out in accordance with the following criteria: 1) geographical area (highest priority area with representative geographical spread where

possible); 2) repeated funding (FBOs received YSRP funding on at least 2 occasions where possible); and 3) safety concerns (areas known to be particularly unsafe for the fieldwork team were excluded from site visits, but were included for telephonic interviews). Sampling for telephonic interviews went through multiple rounds of adjustments based on feedback and advice from WCG DoCS and based on ability to contact or schedule interviews with participants. Sampling for site visits was also still further adjusted based on the whether FBOs selected for site visits were implementing their holiday programmes during the selected fieldwork dates.

The sample went through multiple revisions in consultation with WCG DoCS to: 1) improve the geographic representation of the province; 2) to ensure the inclusion of more FBOs that have been identified as running effective programmes; 3) to supplement for those FBOs that were not contactable telephonically. Additionally, for the site visits, given that the final list of implementing FBOs was only released in late November 2017, the sample was still further adjusted based on whether FBOs selected for site visits were implementing their holiday programmes during the selected fieldwork dates.

All planned data collection processes were undertaken which included, 20 telephonic interviews with Programme Managers, ten site-visits to collect data from current Programme beneficiaries and Programme Managers, three key informant focus groups/interviews and one WCG DoCS staff focus group. In total, this comprised of the following evaluation participants:

- 30 FBO Programme Managers were interviewed;
- 54 beneficiaries participated in focus groups, with an age range of 10-18 years old, with an average age of 14 years;
- 51 beneficiaries completed the activity sheet, with an age range of 3-12 years old, with an average age of eight years;
- 11 key informants participated in focus groups or were interviewed, six of which were SAPS representatives, four of which were CPF representatives; and
- Four WCG DoCS staff members.

See Table 4 below for the final sample of evaluation participants where FBOs are used as the unit of analysis.

TABLE 4: YSRP DATA COLLECTION NOVEMBER – DECEMBER 2017

	FBO PROGRAMME MANAGERS TELEPHONIC: INTERVIEWS 20 NOVEMBER – 7 DECEMBER 2017	
1	Al-hi-dayah Islamic Educational Movement	Bonteheuwel
2	Helping Hand	Delft
3	Home of Compassion	Delft
4	Khanyisa Community Church	Manenburg
5	Kwakhanya Aftercare Centre	Worcester
6	Lily Ministries Bible Church	Manenburg
7	Living Hope	Masiphumelele
8	Madrasatul Yaqeen	Bonteheuwel
9	Masikule Community Development	Delft
10	Old Rugged Cross Shelter	Beaufort West
11	Open Door Community Foundation	Bishop Lavis
12	PPC Church Ocean View	Ocean View
13	Rynse Kerk	Elsies River
14	Salvation House	Kraaifontein
15	Spiritual Evangelical Gospel of God	Nyanga
16	Sure Foundation Outreach Ministries	Villiersdorp
17	True Vine Family Church	Gugulethu
18	UPSCSA JL Zwane Church Choir	Gugulethu

19	Youth Evangelism Explosion SA	Durbanville
20	Zion Apostolic Church	Mitchells Plain

KEY INFORMANTS AND DOCS STAFF INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS 28 NOVEMBER – 4 DECEMBER 2017		
1	WCG DoCS staff members (Acting Head of Safety Partnerships, YSRP Project Manager, Former Monitors)	
2	Community Policing Forum (CPF) representatives (Bishop Lavis, Khayelitsha)	
3	South African Police Service (SAPS) representatives (Kraaifontein, Phillipi-East, Delft, Harare, Mitchells Plain)	
4	MEC Minister of Community Safety	

FBO PROGRAMME MANAGERS AND BENEFICIARIES SITE VISITS: INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS 11 DECEMBER – 15 DECEMBER 2017		
1	Apostolic Faith Mission	Masiphumelele
2	Apostolic Faith Mission	Stellenbosch
3	Arise and Shine Ministries	Khayelitsha
4	Christen Gemeenskap Kerk	Mitchells Plain
5	Elpida Foundation	Saldanha
6	Free United Methodist Church	Khayelitsha
5	Muslim Youth Forum	Mitchells Plain
	UCSA	Paarl East
	United Pentecostal Soldiers	Kuilsriver
	Yeshua Covenant Church	Kraaifontein

2.2.2. Secondary Data Collection

Secondary data collection included document reviews and a high-level literature review. The data was reviewed to gain a rapid understanding of the Programme and to establish context.

The YSRP document review included assessing:
- Business and operational plans;
- Strategic and policy documents;
- Monitoring reports;
- Monitoring tools (June/July 2016; December/January 2016/2017; June/July 2017);
- Funding recommendations;
- List of FBOs funded since 2012; and
- Academic and grey literature relevant to the YSRP.

The document review process was used to inform the draft ToC for collaboration at the ToC workshop, and to inform sections of the literature review. The literature review (see Annexure D) covered a targeted range of literature relevant to the Programme, and specifically addressed the state of violence in South Africa and the Western Cape; WCG DoCS's response to this in the form of the YSRP; the links between the YSRP and provincial strategy; the current landscape of partnerships in the YSRP; the role of out-of-school programmes and FBOs in the youth and community development contexts; and the importance of monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

2.2.3 Data Collection Training

In preparation for **FBO Programme Manager telephonic interviews,** a CC&DW Evaluator, who has previously participated in numerous data collection trainings, received a refresher course in qualitative data collection, and was also briefed on the YSRP, the purpose and scope of the evaluation and on the data collection tools and questions. This team member has also previously had experience using a similar data collection tool and was thus highly familiar with the content and questions. **Interviews and focus groups with key informants** were conducted by the team's technical expert, with the assistance of a CC&DW Evaluator, who also conducted the WCG DoCS staff focus group. Given the experience and expertise of the technical expert, a short refresher training was conducted that focused primarily on the data collection tool.

In preparation for **site-visit fieldwork**, training of three fieldwork team members was conducted by a two CCC&DW Evaluators. In brief, the training comprised of 1) an introduction and overview of the YSRP holiday programme and the purpose and scope of the evaluation; 2) theoretical and practical understanding of qualitative interviewing; and 3) an overview of logistic arrangements. The team members were also provided with an opportunity to role play each of the data collection tools, and the Evaluators provided feedback to improve their performance and execution of the tools. The full training agenda is attached (Annexure E).

2.2.4. Data Collection Tool Pilot

The first day of site-visit fieldwork served as the pilot and included two sites. The pilot focussed on determining whether the **beneficiary focus group guide** and the **beneficiary activity sheet** were understandable to the participating children and youth. The fieldwork team took notes whilst conducting the first and second site visits and a debrief was subsequently conducted at CC&DW offices. Issues identified during the pilot were discussed and mitigating actions were developed for the remainder of the site-visit fieldwork week.

2.2.5. Data Analysis

The evaluation team analysed both primary and secondary data collected using Microsoft Excel for quantitative data and ATLAS.ti for thematic analysis of the qualitative data. Data in this report has been organised around the key evaluation questions. Furthermore, data triangulation[4] between various sources and kinds of data has been undertaken to enhance the confidence and reliability of the evaluation findings. Triangulated data has been consolidated in the findings presented below, which in addition to answering the evaluation questions, also highlights successes, challenges and lessons learnt, as well as recommendations for Programme improvement.

Quantitative data presented in this report was primarily extracted from monitoring tools made available by WCG DoCS. Only monitoring tools from June/July 2016, December 2016/January 2017, and June/July 2017 were made available by the Department. As agreed with WCG DoCS, only numerical data was extracted from the monitoring tools, as categorical data was deemed to be less reliable given that data captured was based on the subjective perspective of Monitors. Numerical data captured included the number of

---

[4] Triangulation is a process of incorporating several viewpoints (i.e. data is collected from various stakeholders) and methods (i.e. quantitative and qualitative methods) in order to verify data and increase the validity of findings.

beneficiaries per age group and the number of facilitators. Given that most quantitative data was based primarily on two monitoring reports per FBO, the quantitative data presented here is a sample only, and is not wholly representative of the Programme quantitative data, and is primarily intended to show trends across the holiday periods only.

2.2.5. Evaluation Limitations

This evaluation was subject to a number of limitations. These were primarily related to:

1. The small sample size;
2. A rapid data collection tool pilot, with pilot restricted to Afrikaans sites only;
3. Quantitative data from monitoring tools restricted to June/July 2016, December 2016/January 2017, and June/July 2017 only;
4. Findings related to outcomes largely dependent on qualitative evidence;
5. Potential errors made during transcription process;
6. The quality of the beneficiary focus group data was not as high, rich nor as in-depth as other sources of data collected;
7. Interviews/focus groups were not conducted with children/youth who do not attend the YSRP; and
8. Answers to evaluation questions that relied on beneficiaries' responses were subject to inherent biases.

3. FINDINGS

The findings presented below are presented according to the given evaluation questions, which have been categorised into five broad themes, namely 1) relevance to intended audience; 2) implementation; 3) effectiveness; 4) challenges; and 5) replicability and sustainability.

3.1. Relevance to Intended Audience

3.1.1. Why are the targeted age group (14-21 years) not attending, but rather the younger children?

The predominant reason identified for why **the targeted age group were not attending was because the Programme was not appealing enough to youth, mainly because they perceived themselves as too mature or too old for the Programme.** The Programme had a reputation of being for children which potentially made them subject to ridicule if they were to attend. Secondly, **youth may have had other responsibilities** to tend to such as holiday

jobs, housework, or caring for family members. Thirdly, **the structured and supervised nature of the Programme may have also been unappealing**, as during school holidays, youth were more interested in relaxed and leisurely activities. Finally, most **FBOs lacked targeted and purposeful marketing of the Programme**, and rather relied on general, open-ended methods that may not have been intensive enough to attract the notoriously difficult age group.

One of the primary reasons why **younger children were attending the YSRP was that FBOs did not wish to exclude children outside the target age group** from their holiday programmes. **Young children also attended as they were often left in the care of their older siblings** who came to the Programme, and if they were not able to join them, it would be likely that their older sibling could not attend the Programme either.

3.1.2. Is the Programme content more appropriate and appealing to children (13 years and younger) or to youth (14-21 years)?

Far more children under the age of 14 years were attending the YSRP than children over the age of 14, suggesting that the Programme was not appealing to the target age group. It is however acknowledged that attendance may have been impeded by youth's responsibilities such as those mentioned above. Younger children are likely an easier age group to appeal to. However, the inclination towards catering for younger children points to the need for FBOs to have regular partnerships with organisations that have real experience of dealing appropriately with the target group. Without such partnerships, the default mode will be to programme for younger children, as this group is easier to keep busy and entertained, with fewer resources.

The appeal of content to the different age groups is largely dependent on the implementing FBO; programme content differs from organisation to organisation given that WCG DoCS does not prescribe Programme content. Content that appealed to younger children (below the age of 13 years) were (in order of preference) prayer/faith-related activities, dancing, speakers/visitors, sports and games. Content that appealed to youth (above the age of 14 years) were sports, dancing, and excursions or outings. However, despite this activities being on offer, youth were not attending in large numbers. This suggests that these activities were not appealing enough to attract this age group. It is surmised that these activities could be accessed without the need to attend the Programme. As such the Programme would need to offer youth activities that cannot be easily accessed elsewhere, or that provide benefits over and above fun and enjoyment, such as life-skills or practical career guidance.

3.2. Implementation

3.2.1. Why is the Programme able to run within some very dangerous areas without any "down-time"?

o keep their venue and beneficiaries safe, **most FBOs formed partnerships to enhance the safety of the Programme, mainly with SAPS, CPFs, and neighbourhood watches**, who would be visible and patrol the Programme venue. **Other measures taken were that venues were physically secured by gates and fence; Programme staff would inform the beneficiaries of the consequences of their misbehaviour, and weapons brought in by beneficiaries would be confiscated. Additionally, gangs appeared to be respectful and supportive of the work of the Programme.** Whilst there were few reported incidents, it is recommended that WCG DoCS ensure that FBOs develop and implement a safety protocol for their holiday programmes to mitigate potential dangers.

3.2.2. Is there sufficient oversight, coordination, and management capacity to implement the YSRP Programme within the whole-of-society approach?

Taken together, **several internal shortfalls within WCG DoCS indicate that there was not sufficient oversight, coordination and management capacity to implement the YSRP as effectively as it could be within the whole-of-society approach.**

WCG DoCS experienced challenges with its administrative system, including issues with managing application forms and processes, providing late acceptance to the FBOs, and releasing financial tranches late to the FBOs. This may have impeded FBOs from organising their holiday programmes with sufficient notice, time and upfront finances. It was recognised that the administrative system needed to move from paper-based processes to electronic or online systems. **The Department also experienced staff capacity gaps.** It was noted that there was a need for more skilled Monitors, who needed improved capacity in terms of forming relationships with the FBOs, administrative skills and their content knowledge. There was also a need for more senior level officials to take up vacant senior level roles, as there was an over-reliance on interns who, despite being entry-level employees, were working on senior-level tasks.

3.2.3. Are there sufficient finances, human resources and administrative management to implement the YSRP?

There were insufficient finances to implement the YSRP effectively. The provision of R50 per

child/youth per day was reportedly not enough as did not fund entire holiday programmes. This small grant assumed that FBOs were able to run such holiday programmes independently. Notably, the amount of R50 per child/youth per day has remained constant since the initiation of the Programme in 2012. Often FBOs catered for more beneficiaries than initially planned, making finances even more inadequate. It is clear that if a quality Programme is to be implemented and for outcomes to be achieved, the stipend of R50 per child/youth per day would need to be raised substantially.

FBOs also struggled with insufficient human resources, primarily in terms of staff quantity, which resulted in Programme staff struggling to control the number of children/youth and to undertake administrative tasks. Some FBOs recruited volunteers who were not necessarily reliable nor sustainable. Additionally, FBOs did not necessarily have adequate human resource quality - staff members did not have the appropriate knowledge and skills to deliver such a Programme effectively.

FBOs also experienced insufficient administrative management, with the challenges primarily being related to issue with WCG DOCS's own administrative capacity, which consequently affected FBOs ability to plan and organise their holiday programmes.

3.2.4. Are the FBOs the most appropriate vehicles to use in implementing this Programme or are there other vehicles that can be used to implement this type of programme?

FBOs offered several advantages that potentially NGO/NPO/CBO implementers cannot, including 1) the ability to attract and reach high numbers of community members, especially congregation members; and 2) being trusted by parents in the community; 3) the perception of their commitment to their community, rather than incentivised by monetary gains; and 4) FBOs were perceived to continue such programmes outside of the YSRP.

Conversely, participants noted that there were some concerns in working with FBOs, including 1) whether FBOs truly had the best interest of the community; 2) whether FBOs had the relevant knowledge and skills needed to implement such programmes; and 3) whether FBOs were only adequately reaching beneficiaries from their own church/mosque members rather than other children/youth in the community.

Taken together, FBOs can be appropriate for implementing Programmes like the YSRP, but this is on the condition that they partner with other organisations or specialists who have relevant expertise or capacity, including NGOs/NPOs, SAPS and CPFs, sector experts, as well as local projects. It should be cautioned however that the advantages offered by FBOs may

not be sufficient for privileging the religious fraternity over other organisations. **There was little indication to suggest that FBOs would be more effective Programme implementers than other organisations**.

3.3. Effectiveness

3.3.1. Have the Programmes been rolled out in an effective manner so as to reach the targeted youth beneficiaries?

Whilst the Programme is reaching children and youth within the target age group, younger children largely outnumber the targeted youth beneficiaries. As such, the holiday programmes are not being implemented in a way that is effective enough to reach the target group in large numbers. Potential explanations for this were discussed above within the evaluation questions pertaining to the *Relevance to Intended Audience*.

3.3.2. Did the Programme address the problem of youth and children on the streets during school holidays in communities that services were provided in? If yes, was it for the duration of the Programme only or for a longer specified period?

Using Programme attendance as an indicator, quantitative data revealed **the Programme kept approximately 94,324 beneficiaries off the streets over a six year period.**

The Programme provided a good alternative to other activities children/youth may have been engaged in if they were not at the Programme. If children/youth were not at the Programme, they would likely have been 1) occupied by harmless, yet unstimulating activities (e.g. watching television, doing housework, seeing friends); 2) engaging in risky, antisocial or delinquent behaviours (e.g. taking drugs or drinking, and committing crimes/ coming into conflict with the law); or 3) on the street without supervision, which also may have left them vulnerable to potential dangers in their communities. Beneficiaries also felt physically and emotionally safe at the YSRP holiday programmes they attended, and in some instances more safe than they otherwise might have been. The Programme however may only be a good alternative for those who are already inclined to prosocial behaviours, and it may not be a sufficiently good alternative for those who are at-risk or already engaging in risky behaviours.

The evaluation is unable to conclusively and reliably determine if the Programme was able to keep beneficiaries off the streets beyond the Programme period. Owing to the fact that anecdotal data provided by participants in interviews/focus groups was mixed (some

attributed positive behaviour changes in participants to the YSRP, whilst others claimed the Programme only kept children off the street for the Programme period only), it did not provide a sufficient evidence base to answer this question directly.

Considering evaluation theories of programme dosage and duration, the Programme is too short, infrequent, and not intensive enough to effect an attitudinal or behavioural change in its beneficiaries beyond the five-day period. From what the evaluation could gather, it is likely a minority of beneficiaries that attend all five days, attend every year, for multiple years, and have a sustained involvement in similar programmes. As such, the majority of beneficiaries are likely to be receiving a very small dosage of the Programme both in terms of time and length, and therefore it is unlikely that the YSRP would have realised longer-term outcomes. Additionally, perceived changes may not have been a change of the Programme itself, as other extraneous factors (e.g. other programmes, school programmes, peer group, home-life etc.) were not taken into account in this evaluation.

3.4. Challenges

3.4.1. What are the key binding constraints/challenges currently experienced in delivering the YSRP

There are a number of challenges in delivering the YSRP, many of which are cross-cutting in terms of the findings presented in the Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Additionally **a key challenge is the WCG DoCS's "red tape"** (intimately related to the abovementioned theme of inadequate administration). WCG DoC's procedures and rules created difficulties for FBOs in applying to be part of the Programme. It could be argued that FBOs may have found these procedures too onerous because they may not have had experience in following strict processes in implementing other programmes. Additionally, FBO Programme Managers are likely to have little experience in the processes of applying for, being selected, implementing, and being held accountable for a monitored and evaluated Programme. **Other key barriers noted were 1) a lack of partnerships with CPFs and in some cases SAPS; 2) Programme sites being too far for some beneficiaries; and 3) problematic parents/caregivers; 4) the threat of violence in the target communities.**

3.5. Replicability and Sustainability

3.5.1. Can this Programme be replicated in different areas, or do specific conditions need to be met to deliver this Programme?

According to the respondents the programme can be replicable in different areas, but only if specific factors are considered and implemented. The programme must:

1. Be entertaining and appropriate for the beneficiaries;
2. Utilise high quality implementers;
3. Have a good quality venue;
4. Make food security a priority;
5. Establish key partnerships and relationships with relevant organisations that have the necessary skills and resources;
6. Be purposively adjusted or tailor-made to the community or context.

It was noted however that **the funding required to implement the Programme could be a key barrier of the replicability** of the Programme.

At this stage, it would not be responsible to begin replicating the Programme elsewhere when there are still unresolved issues of finances, resources, planning, administration and monitoring. Replication can and should only happen when there is a set of tested processes, procedures, routines and templates. Only once an effective model of implementation is built, reflected on in numerous iterations and subsequently refined, can this Programme be replicated.

3.5.2. Do the children still engage with the religious fraternities after the YSRP holiday programme is concluded?

Many, if not most of the FBOs have some form of relationship with the children after the YSRP has concluded. FBOs may have had sustained relationships if 1) the children and their families were part of the church's constituency; or 2) they had a strong and long standing community presence and relationship with community members.

Sustained relationships did not necessarily apply to every beneficiary that attended the Programme. Reasons cited included: 1) beneficiaries did not live in the same area as the Programme Manager, thus there was limited accessibility to them; 2) some FBOs were potentially too heavily reliant on WCG DoCS to fund their youth work, and as such could not sustainably afford to run other programmes during the year; 3) FBOs would not necessarily follow-up with beneficiaries, and specifically not follow-up with beneficiaries who were not church members or church goers, limiting the sustained engagement to only those children and youth who were church members; and 4) some beneficiaries only had an interest in the holiday programme, and thus would make no further engagements with the FBO outside of the holiday programme.

3.5.3. What other influences keep children and youth off the street?

Numerous other influences to keep children and youth of the street were cited. **Participants primarily noted programmes implemented by NGOs/NPOs/CBOs or government departments.** Programmes included soccer and other sports clubs, dance and drama clubs, after-school programmes, other holiday programmes, youth groups, hiking clubs, rehab programmes, camps, CPF-led programmes, VPUU-led programmes, DCAS-led programmes, and City of Cape Town-led programmes. **Other influences included church or faith-related programmes as well as community structures** (e.g. library, community hall, the sports field, community park)

There was also evidence to suggest that there were little or no other influences or options available, besides the YSRP, to help keep children/youth off the streets. They reported that this was likely due to the limited availability of facilities and resources for the youth and children in their areas. This may have only been the case in some communities, but community members may have also been unaware of other programmes available.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1. Future Programme Design

4.1.1. Concretising the Type of Prevention Approach

According to the public health model of prevention (primary, secondary, tertiary), YSRP target beneficiaries are secondary prevention targets (high-risk of engaging in criminal behaviours) and tertiary prevention targets (have already engaged in risky or criminal behaviours). As such, secondary and tertiary approaches should be employed. Whilst some FBOs may be delivering some content that falls within secondary and tertiary approaches, this may not be the case for all FBOs and some may not be as intensive as required to reduce risks associated with such populations. **WCG DoCS needs to carefully consider the specific approach or combination of approaches it would like to focus on to ensure that programming is appropriate and intensive enough to ensure outcomes are achieved.**

Should the Programme wish to continue targeting this group of individuals (14 - 21 year olds), programming will need to be more intentionally and intensively designed, rather than leaving the design of programmatic content at the discretion of FBOs (who likely may not know the required programming for such individuals). Should the Programme prefer to

continue with its current model, changing the intended target audience to younger children would be a more appropriate response. In essence the programme approach and the target group need to harmonise.

4.1.2. Expanding the Target Audience

WCG DoCS should consider expanding the YSRP target audience to include children below the age of 14 years, or alternatively focusing exclusively on children aged 5-12 years old. Based on anecdotal evidence and evidence-based research and evaluation, young children may also serve as good targets for a programme like the YSRP. **Intervening with beneficiaries whilst they are still young, may lead to better outcomes of the YSRP. Multiple studies emphasise the need to intervene early in the life course[5].** It is widely accepted that behaviour and other personal characteristics such as empathy, self-esteem, self-control, morality, an appropriate sense of right and wrong and interpersonal skills are largely established during early childhood[6]. Additionally, the concept of the first 1000 days (from conception) being a critical window that sets the stage for a person's intellectual development and lifelong health is becoming a cornerstone of social and public health policy. Children and pre-adolescents are still relatively open to take on new interests and habits, and are more persuadable than older teenagers. Moreover numerous cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analyses indicate that early prevention programmes are easier and cheaper, and can have a higher return on investment compared to tertiary responses such as prison or other criminal justice responses[7].

Given that older youths in these communities may already be engaging in risky or delinquent behaviours, this is a much more challenging group to address. Youth at-risk are likely to require a more intensive rehabilitative or treatment approach, as discussed above for tertiary responses, and may be better dealt with in a longer-time scale by dedicated state and non-state social development and public health organisations. Such approaches however may be beyond the capacity of FBOs who do not specialise in youth development or safety promotion programming for individuals who are high-risk or already perpetrators of crime. Additionally, to have an equivalent impact on older children, more resources will be required, such as infrastructure, sport fields, trauma counsellors and other specialists. WCG DoCS should thus caution that targeting effectively at-risk or high-risk groups is highly challenging.

---

[5] E.g. Burton (2008); Fagan & Catalano (2012), Clayton, Ballif-Spanvill, & Hunsaker (2001); Thornton, Craft, Dahlberg, Lynch, & Baer (2000)

[6] Burton (2008)

[7] Welsh & Farrington (2007)

WCG DoCS will need to decide what target group (young children or at-risk youth) the Department should or can provide interventions for, and then tailor the Programme content accordingly. Whilst at-risk youth may be engaging in problematic behaviours that may serve as barriers for community safety, intervening with young children is likely to produce longer-term outcomes and the cost of these interventions are likely to be easier and cheaper to implement. It is recommended that the WCG DoCS investigate where they can work collaboratively with other departments, as the Department alone may not be able to provide a comprehensive and in-depth response, even if the YSRP is focused on a specific group and appropriately tailored. Synergies with other government departments are discussed in the below section under *Partnerships.*

4.1.3. Developing Age-Appropriate Content

If the Programme is to consider the recommendation of including younger children as part of the target group of the Programme, **the content of the holiday programmes would need to be carefully designed to be specific to each age group to be appropriate.** Adolescents and children cannot be expected to be engaged, entertained and benefitted by similar or the same content. There is literature to suggest what kind of crime prevention/safety promotion programming is most effective across different age groups or level of offending. Most of the evidence for effective violence prevention programming focused on programmes for younger children.

The World Health Organisation (WHO)[8] suggests that **young children are appropriately targeted by programmes that develop their life skills**, including cognitive, emotional, interpersonal and social skills to foster self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationships and responsible decision-making. Particularly, evidence suggests that preschool enrichment and social development programmes, which target children in the early stages of life, have the potential to impede aggressive behaviours, improve social skills, enhance educational achievement, and even improve their long-term employment prospects. **For older children, the WHO also suggests that academic enrichment programmes, incentives to complete schooling, and vocational training programmes can have positive effects on behavioural outcomes associated with reducing violent behaviour**, although more research is required. Unlike proposed programmes for younger children (below the age of 12), programmes targeting adolescents largely focus on academic and vocational skills development (e.g. practical career advice), which has been shown to improve employment prospects most significantly in low- and middle-income countries. This is notable given that

---

[8] WHO (2010)

socioeconomic status is a substantial risk factor for violent and criminal behaviour. Mentoring programmes for adolescents have also had encouraging outcomes.

What should be noted for all programmes, is the principle of using active, skills-based components. Effective prevention programs involve interactive instruction and provide active, hands-on experiences that increase the beneficiaries' skills[9]. Despite the differences in types of skills emphasised, there is general agreement that programmes should caution against relying too heavily on knowledge, information, or group discussions as the major change mechanism[10]. In addition to implementing content that is age-appropriate, it is also imperative to note that as a holiday Programme, the YSRP should still include entertaining and enjoyable activities like sports and dancing.

WCG DoCS must investigate and form partnerships with other government departments like Department of Basic Education (DBE)/DCAS as well NGOs/NPOs/CBOs to assist in developing such programme content and to ensure that it is appropriate and appealing for different age groups. The programme content should be informed by WCG DoCS's best practice learnings over the past 6 years of the Programme. Whilst this deviates from WCG DoCS current strategy of being non-prescriptive, a structured programme guide founded on evidence-based research is more likely to produce positive outcomes for children and youth than in its current form.

4.1.4. FBO Capacity Building

If the Department continues to fund FBOs only, in order for the carefully designed Programme content to be effectively implemented, **WCG DoCS should provide some form of training for FBO Programme Managers on the content taught during their holiday programmes.** Their capacity development needs to be focused on child/youth development, safety promotion and crime prevention, delivering appropriate programmes to different age groups and managing finances. This may be an intensive 3-5 day workshop with all selected FBOs who are implementing within a specific Programme period and may be run in partnership with those stakeholders who helped design the Programme content. **By providing specific content and training to the FBOs, the Programme can be monitored more purposefully to see whether the intended content was implemented or not, revealing the fidelity of the Programme.** Additionally, capacity building of FBOs should incorporate lessons on how FBOs can develop and start their own child/youth programmes that run during the course of the year when the YSRP is not being implemented.

---

[9] Nation et al. (2003)

[10] Nation et al. (2003)

4.1.5. Considering All Types of Organisations as Programme Implementers

Whilst the current Programme model only allows for FBOs to serve as implementing agents of the Programme, this evaluation suggests that **WCG DoCS should consider partnering with other organisations in the implementation of the Programme, including NGOs, NPOs, CBOs etc.** Evaluation findings revealed that FBOs offer advantages in that they have substantial reach (most likely among their own constituency) and the community trusts them. This in itself however may not be sufficient in considering FBOs over any other organisation in implementing the Programme. The FBOs generally did not possess particular capacities that made them notably better implementers than other organisations. The success of the holiday programmes was often dependent on the FBO's partnership with other organisations.

As such, WCG DoCS may wish to allow other types of organisations to serve as implementers of the Programme. **FBOs should compete for Programme funding on the same basis as any other applicant organisation. All applicants should provide details of the objectives they expect their holiday programme to achieve, what activities they plan to implement that can reasonably be expected to meet these objectives, the resources they have available (e.g. venue, staff, etc.), as well as the qualifications and/or experience of the proposed facilitators.** Applicants should be able to logically demonstrate how their planned activities will lead to the types of changes WCG DoCS is wanting to see in communities. They should also lay out a clear plan of how they will partner with other organisations and evidence to show that these partners have agreed to work with the organisation. The organisation aso needs to demonstrate a clearly and well-articulated intervention logic, and show that they have the resources to support this. Should WCG DoCS wish to continue with the FBO model, it is essential that partnering with other organisations and specialists be made a mandatory requirement upon application.

4.1.6. Prioritising Quality over Quantity by Reducing the Number of Grants Awarded

The Department may need to consider prioritising the quality of its implementing partners over the quantity, by reducing the number of grants made. Currently, the Department attempts to fund as many FBOs as possible within its given budget in order to ensure as many children in communities are reached by the YSRP. Whilst this may allow for thousands of children to be catered for within each holiday period, this does not ensure that those implementing Programmes will produce the highest quality programmes with the intended effect. **It might be more effective to fund a fewer number of organisations, who show the most potential for implementing the highest quality programmes (e.g. vast experience in**

similar programmes). **The Department would also have greater capacity to oversee, coordinate, support, monitor and give attention to fewer organisations**, which may further improve the implementation of the holiday programmes. Funding must be directed toward where it will most likely be effective. This would require a thorough vetting process of the organisations who can and cannot comply using YSRP's application forms. These forms may need to be revised to ensure that standards of implementation are raised and that certain mandatory requirements are met. As asserted by evaluation theory, better quality programmes are more likely to lead to the achievement of outcomes, such as behaviour change and in the long-term the prevention of crime.

4.1.7. Expanding the Whole-of-Society Approach

The YSRP emphasises implementing the Programme within the whole-of-society approach, in that various stakeholders should be involved in the promotion of safety or prevention of violence. This approach is congruent with that of the social ecological model (SEM) for violence prevention. A key difference between these approaches however, is that the **YSRP lacks involvement of individuals at the family or close relationship level, i.e. parents or caregivers. This is despite the fact that various studies point to the importance of including caregivers and/or families in violence prevention efforts**, especially in interventions targeting young children or infants[11]. As such, **it is recommended that the Programme further expand its model to include a parental component**. This may include parenting education workshops, counselling at the individual or family level, support groups, or multiple-family group meetings during the week of the holiday programme. Affecting change at the family level will more likely allow for change at the individual child/youth level because children and youth are less exposed to risk factors in the home. Including parents in programming helps ensure thats positive developmental and cognitive needs of children/youth could be met both at the Programme and outside of the Programme[12].

4.2. Partnerships

It is imperative that FBOs do not work in isolation for this Programme. **As discussed above in** *Future Programme Design* **there is a need to partner with NGOs/NPOs/sector experts working in the child and youth development sector.** In addition to this, there are several other opportunities for partnerships to improve the strength and sustainability of the Programme. Although there is supposed to be intergovernmental integration and collaboration, there was no evidence of this. Currently the YSRP is an unsustainable collaborative model. Partnerships

---

[11] Burton (2008); Luthar (2003); Thornton et al. (2000)

[12] Burton (2008)

relevant to the proposed holiday programmes should be stipulated in FBOs' applications or proposals for funding, together with proof of any outside parties' acceptance of this role, such a signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the partner organisation or individual.

4.2.1. Government Departments

Several government departments run free programmes during the school holidays and after school programmes during the course of the year. These departments should thus be drawn on because they have both resources available and they can lend learnings and expertise. In addition to partnering with DBE for the purpose of helping with developing appropriate Programme content, DBE may also offer infrastructure and resources such as school facilities for FBOs. This may assist FBOs with securing venues that may be more cost-effective and safer. DCAS offers Mass Participation, Opportunity and Access, Development and Growth (MOD) Centres during school holidays, and the after-school Game Changers programme. Moreover, the City of Cape Town runs a programme called the Youth Development Programme which involves training unemployed youths to mentor children aged 13 years and older through sport. Partnering with such a programmes could be beneficial in ensuring that the children/youth have something to do after school and during the holiday when the YSRP is not being implemented. It could also ensure that there are no redundancies or duplication of efforts, which may be a misuse of resources.

4.2.2. SAPS and CPFs

FBOs were encouraged to collaborate with SAPS and CPFs, however this was not a mandatory requirement outside the application and approval process. Whilst most FBOs reported to have collaborated with SAPS, it was reported that CPFs were not necessarily as involved as they could have been. Given the benefits of partnering with such entities **WCG DoCS may consider making it a mandatory requirement to have SAPS and CPFs present at the Programme, so that their role is not limited to the application process only. This defeats the beneficial role these partners could play during the course of the Programme.** Without WCG DoCS making this partnership mandatory, it was left to the discretion of the FBOs. Furthermore, given WCG DOCS's limited human resource capacity for monitoring, in that they are only able to conduct site visits with approximately 65% of FBOs, **SAPS and CPFs may support WCG DoCS by serving an oversight role on the ground**. Where Monitors are unable to verify the implementation of the Programme, SAPS and CPFs can potentially serve as Monitors themselves, and can confirm to WCG DoCS whether the Programmes are in fact being run, and whether they are being run as intended according to plan and with quality.

4.3. Future Programme Implementation

4.3.1. WCG DoCS Internal Resources and Processes

As the findings revealed, the Department experienced multiple internal challenges related to its administrative systems and staff capacity gaps. As such the following recommendations are made:

1. **Technological updates should be made the WCG DoCS administrative system.** This would be more effective for record keeping and whilst such a system may be costly, it would save time and human resources on unmanageable paperwork and ensure smoother and more seamless administration.
2. **There should be more capacitated administrative or clerical staff to operate this system**, and for managing the record keeping of the Programme; and
3. **There should be more skilled Monitors on the ground, and for the role of the Monitor to be more active than what was envisioned.** The role of monitors is currently passive, and should go beyond documenting the outputs of the holiday programmes. It should additionally entail encouraging, promoting, empowering and coaching FBO Programme Managers and communicating on the nature of the work required. Currently the role of Monitors is falling below its potential, and investment in Monitors in this way would potentially improve the realisation of Programme outcomes.
4. **More senior level staff members** should be recruited to take up senior positions so that there is less reliance on more junior level staff.

4.3.2. Programme Resources

The limited financial resources provided by WCG DoCS to fund the holiday programmes was a key concern. The R50 per child per day was perceived as not enough to run the holiday programmes, and could only really be used towards providing meals. Going forward, at the very least **WCG DoCS should increase this investment every year to account for inflation. If WCG DoCS undertakes the suggestions above in** *Future Programme Design* **this amount would need to increase substantially.** However, as previously discussed, a larger investment to produce quality programming is likely to be more cost effective than the consequences of violence and crime if not addressed adequately. Additionally, it is suggested that a small stipend be provided to Programme implementers. Currently the R50 provides for programming only, and does not provide implementers with an incentive to run a high quality holiday programme, or to continue running the programme during subsequent holiday periods.

4.3.3. Programme Reach

More targeted marketing strategies will need to be developed and used to improve the reach to the target age group. Programme Managers primarily reported marketing methods that were open-ended and general, rather than specifically attempting to reach this age group. It is suggested that Programme Managers do the following to improve marketing of their holiday programmes: 1) directly market the Programme at high schools and other youth programmes to ensure that older children are aware of the Programme; 2) have youths who have attended the Programme themselves market the Programme; 3) send the message that the Programme is for young adults to be more appealing; and 4) potentially market to parents as well so that they can encourage their children to attend. WCG DoCS should also encourage Programme Managers to develop case studies of beneficiaries who had positive Programme experiences. This may be used as part of FBOs marketing strategies to get youth to attend the Programme.

4.3.4. Opportunities for Learning

At the conclusion of each holiday period, **implementing FBOs should be brought together in a workshop or forum so they can share their experiences of implementation.** This would allow implementing FBOs to learn from each other and to improve the implementation of their programmes in the next holiday period. This would also provide WCG DoCS with an opportunity to hear first-hand issues the Programme Managers faced and how they think the Programme itself, or any challenges could be improved. WCG DoCS could potentially get involved in similar forums hosted by other departments, such as those held by DCAS. **WCG DoCS should use these workshops or forums as an opportunity to document their learnings and best practices, which should be used to inform and improve the Programme.**

4.4. Future Outcomes

4.4.1. Focusing on Longer-Term Outcomes

Currently the Programme is designed to be primarily output driven and focussed on achieving immediate/short-term results only. **WCG DoCS should consider placing a greater emphasis on more distant outcomes beyond what is currently targeted (as per the first version of the ToC) in order to achieve longer-term and more substantial Programme results.** The second version of the ToC (as described previously in Evaluation Design) depicts longer-

term outcomes that potentially may be achieved by the Programme; outcomes that may persist outside of the Programme space such as improved life skills, attitudes and intentions towards safety-related behaviours and decision-making regarding high-risk behaviours. Such longer term outcomes are more likely to contribute to realising provincial strategic goal 3 of "increased wellness, safety, and tackled social ills" and national outcome 3 "all people in South Africa are and feel safe" than the short-term outcomes that are currently being achieved. Whilst this will require further financial investment by WCG DoCS, the potential positive impact is likely to outweigh the costs. The Programme has a good foundation for immediate outcomes of safety (beneficiaries are occupied, are provided with supervision and feel safe). However the Programme would require radical changes to its content for longer-term outcomes to be achieved.

There is potential to take the Programme further than the Programme period; **potentially preventing beneficiaries from being exposed to or being perpetrators for the rest of the holiday period or even during the school term.** The benefits are expected to outweigh the potentially high investment. The Programme has a good foundation for immediate outcomes of safety (beneficiaries are occupied, are provided with supervision and feel safe), however the Programme would require radical changes to its content for longer-term outcomes to be achieved.

4.5. Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation

4.4.1. Monitoring Tools

Currently the Programme's monitoring tools collect primarily output data namely. **It is recommended that WCG DoCS collects outcome monitoring data as well, and where it currently collects outcome data, these tools should be revised to more accurately capture certain indicators.** The monitoring tools primarily leave responses to questions open-ended and responses related to outcomes are left to the subjectivity of the Monitors. There was no objective standard by which to conclude a response. It is thus **recommended that more concrete monitoring tools be developed.** For example, these may utilise checklists, where Monitors can mark what is and is not present or appropriate at the Programme which is supplemented by qualitative notes. In this way, different Monitors will have an identical reference point from which they make their decisions about certain indicators. Additionally, Monitors should receive training on the tools to further ensure that reporting is based on an objective standard, that it remains consistent across Monitors and that there are limited capturing gaps within the tool. The tools should also be designed to accurately capture the age group of interest, as this is currently not being captured adequately.

Additionally, as stated previously, **there is a need for WCG DoCS to adopt electronic systems for administration, however this would additionally be highly beneficial for M&E purposes.** It is recommended that the Department move towards a consolidated M&E system that captures all Programme data collected over the years. As the Programme continues to run, so this data will also be captured on the system. This will assist any future evaluations as all data can be found on a single platform and comparisons can be made over the years.

4.6.1. Commissioning a Control Group for Future Evaluations

Intermediate or long-term behaviour changes in beneficiaries could not be conclusively and reliably claimed in this evaluation. Perceived changes may not have been a direct result of the Programme itself, but may have been attributable to other extraneous factors (e.g. other programmes, school programmes, peer group, home-life etc.). **To assess whether intermediate or longer-term changes were attributable to the YSRP or not, it is recommended that the Department commission a control group for future evaluations.** This control group should consist of a sample of beneficiaries who did not attend the Programme. This may be undertaken through a quasi-experiment or through matched controls, and not necessarily an RCT which can be more costly. The current evaluation scope only allowed for a single group design with a small sample size. This is not a strong evaluation design as it does not allow for comparison with those who do not receive intervention, or who may receive another intervention. As such, changes cannot be causally attributed to the intervention group. Future ToRs should budget for and request that potential evaluators would need to source a control group of participants who were not involved in the YSRP. The control group and YSRP group would need to be assessed before the Programme commences and again in the intermediate and long-term to assess whether any changes occurred in the YSRP group that did not occur for the control group. This could also be applicable to other WCG DoCS evaluations.

4.6. Conclusion

This evaluation set out to assess the implementation of the YSRP, assess the outcomes or results achieved by the programme and to provide recommendations to assist in strengthening the YSRP. This evaluation 1) provided numerous recommendations to improve the design, implementation, outcomes, and M&E of the YSRP; 2) revealed that although the Programme has achieved its primary outcome of keeping children off the street, this was primarily for children younger than the target age group; and 3) showed that there are numerous implementation good practices, as well as challenges.

The YSRP is a potentially valuable programme that has not yet come into its full potential. Given its relatively limited resources, the Programme has been able to achieve its immediate/short-term outcomes as depicted in its current ToC (version 1). However, it is currently not in a position to meet more intermediate or longer-term outcomes as depicted in the second version of the ToC. This evaluation provides a good opportunity for the Department to take stock of the Programme after six years of implementation. Consideration should be given to some of the key directions that have been raised in this evaluation, including changes to the Programme design, which will inform ways to achieve more intermediate or longer term outcomes. These decisions should only be made on the basis of strong evidence in favour of effectiveness in these types of programme areas. It is crucial that funding be directed toward programmatic areas where it will likely be most effective.

References

1. Burton, P. (2008). Dealing with school violence in South Africa. *CJCP Issue Paper 4*, 1-16.

2. Clayton, C. J., Ballif-Spanvill, B., & Hunsaker, M. D. (2001). Preventing violence and teaching peace: A review of promising and effective antiviolence, conflict-resolution, and peace programmes for elementary school children. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 10,* 1-35.

3. Fagan, A. A., & Catalano, R. F. (2012). What works in youth violence prevention: A review of the literature. *Research on Social Work Practice, 23*(2), 141-156.

4. Luthar, S. S. (2003). Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood   adversities. New York: NY, Cambridge University Press.

5. Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K.   (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American   Psychologist, 58*(6/7), 449-456.

6. Thornton, T. N., Craft, C. A., Dahlberg, L. L., Lynch, B. S., & Baer, K.   (2000). Best practices of youth violence prevention: A sourcebook for community action. *Centers for Disease Control and   Prevention.* Atlanta: GA.

7. Welsh, B. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). Save children from a life of crime. *Criminology & Public   Policy, 6*(4), 871-879.

8. World Health Organisation (2010). Violence prevention: The evidence.