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Executive Summary

Evaluating the design and initial development of the six projects currently funded by the Community-Based Youth Development Fund (YDF) shows that the projects are on target to meet their objectives and contribute to the goals of the New Zealand Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy (NZYSPS – the goals of the strategy are listed in Appendix 1).

The six projects funded from 2002 to 2005 are working with youth at-risk in communities throughout New Zealand. Two Auckland-based projects are working mainly with young Pacific people, three projects are working mainly with rangatahi, young Māori, and the sixth project is a national initiative to increase acceptance of sexual and gender diversity, and provide support for queer youth.

The evaluation uses a three-stage approach, developed in partnership with the projects. A glossary of evaluation terms used in the report is in appendix 2. The first stage, a design evaluation, examines:

- the project's monitoring reports and documentation; and
- discussions with the project workers and Community Development Group (CDG) Advisors.

These sources confirm that all of the projects are established, have good administrative and management processes in place, and are engaging with the young people, and their whānau/families and communities.

The design evaluation also uses intervention logic models to document each project's initiatives and activities, and demonstrate how they are contributing to the project's objectives and the objectives of the NZYSPS (the logic models for each project are in appendix 3). Evaluation questions have been developed in consultation with each of the projects to guide the next two stages – a process and outcome evaluation (the questions for each project are in appendix 4).

Background and purpose of the community-based YDF

The YDF contributes to the NZYSPS by funding community-based youth development projects, particularly for Māori and Pacific youth. The projects work with young people and their communities to minimise some of the known risks factors for suicidal behaviour, especially social disadvantage and stressful life events.

The YDF was established in 1998 and is administered by the Department of Internal Affairs' (DIA) Community Development Group. Seven projects were funded from 1999 to 2002. Six projects are funded for the three years 2002 to 2005:

1. Ola Mautinoa - a programme mainly for young Pacific people run by Pacific World Incorporated and based in Takanini in South Auckland.

2. Opotiki Youth Development Project - run by Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust in Opotiki. This project focuses on young Māori.

Queer is a reclaimed word that acknowledges both sexual and gender diversity. It is a collective term used to encompass gay, lesbian, bisexual, takataapui, transgender and faʻafafine identities. While this term is used/accepted by many youth, it is acknowledged that it is not the preferred term for everybody' (Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy Newsletter, April 2003, p5).
3. “Out There” - a national youth development project for queer youth run by the New Zealand AIDS Foundation and Rainbow Youth Incorporated.

4. A number of regional youth development projects - run by the Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand and focusing on communities in Lyttelton, on the West Coast and in the South Canterbury area.

5. Tumau Tutoa - a programme for young Pacific people run by the Manukau Youth Centre and based in Manukau, South Auckland.

6. A self-harm prevention project - run by the Rau O Te Huia Trust for young people in the Fordlands community in Rotorua.

The first two projects also received funding in the first round.

The YDF is one of 70 initiatives contributing to the NZYSPS – 'In Our Hands' and 'Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki'. The goals of the strategy are listed in appendix 1. The YDF contributes to the strategy's goals by focusing on:

- developing young people's problem-solving and other interpersonal skills that help provide alternative choices to self-harm and suicide
- developing healthy levels of self esteem and cultural identity
- encouraging young people's participation and leadership in their communities.

**Evaluation approach**

The six projects funded in the second round are being evaluated in three stages using an evaluation framework developed by DIA's Research Services. Research Services is carrying out the first two stages of the evaluation. An external evaluator will be contracted to carry out the third stage. A partnership approach is being used for the evaluation, in that the project workers and CDG's staff, including the Community Advisors, are being consulted and involved in all three stages of the evaluation. A glossary of evaluation terms used in the report is in appendix 2. The main sources and publications referred to in the report are numbered in the text and listed on the last page.

The three stages of the evaluation include:

1. A **design** evaluation, which uses intervention logic models to document the initiatives and activities that each project is undertaking to achieve its objectives (see appendix 3). This stage also assesses each project against the following questions (see section 3 of the report):
   - Are the project worker(s) in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?
   - Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives and activities to deliver its services and programmes?
   - Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?
   - Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?
   - Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?
Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project's ability to deliver its services and programmes?

Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?

2. A **process** evaluation that will document what happened (is happening) during the first 18 months of the project by describing the initiatives and activities being implemented, and the way in which they are being delivered. This stage also will describe how the project involves young people and whether or not the way it is being delivered is culturally appropriate for the young people and their communities.

3. An **outcome** evaluation that will examine the extent to which the projects have achieved, or are on target to achieve, their short-term outcomes. The evaluation is only considering the short-term outcomes, because the projects are generally funded for 3 years and this is not sufficient time to achieve the long-term outcomes. Nevertheless, the evaluation will consider the likely long-term outcomes of the projects, based on the evidence available about the way in which youth development enhances young people’s ability to cope with the factors associated with suicidal behaviour.

To guide the process and outcome evaluations, a series of questions has been developed for each project (see appendix 4). For each question an **indicator** is identified, i.e., the information, or evidence, required to answer the question, along with data sources for this information.

**Results from the design evaluation**

The design evaluation demonstrates that the projects are established and on target to meet their short-term outcomes. Evidence of the progress made by the projects includes:

- Project workers are in place and are beginning to engage with the young people, their whanau/families, and communities, using hui/meetings, wananga/workshops, and other reported initiatives and activities.

- All of the projects have developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver their services and programmes. The project intervention logic models developed and agreed with each project confirm that these initiatives will contribute to the projects’ short and long-term outcomes, as well as the overall project objectives and the goals of NZYSPS.

- Effective links are being established with other support agencies and community organisations.

- The documents submitted by the projects in support of their applications and the monitoring reports show that good administrative, human resource and ethical practices are in place.

- Projects have reported any internal or external issues that have impacted and/or have the potential to impact on the projects’ ability to make progress, and, where applicable, have identified measures to counter these impacts.

- Monitoring processes and an evaluation framework have been agreed with each project.

The projects have submitted their monitoring reports on schedule and have demonstrated commitment to the monitoring and evaluation process.
Research Services is already beginning to assemble information for the process evaluation, which will be completed by the end of March 2004. Research Services also is developing the specification for the outcome evaluation and suitably qualified external evaluators will be invited to tender for this work shortly.

The design evaluation shows that the two projects that received YDF funding in the first round (Pacific World's Ola Matinoa and Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust's Opotiki Youth Development Project) are now well established and working well with the young people, their whānau /families, and their communities.

In contrast, the other four projects have used much of the first year to get established, build relationships with the young people and their communities, and establish credibility with other service providers. The design evaluation indicates that this time has been well spent and all four projects have built a good foundation for their initiatives and activities.

The experience of the YDF-funded projects indicates that the time required to establish a successful youth development project should not be underestimated. This establishment period, however, limits the amount of time that is available for the delivery of the initiatives and activities when project funding is for three years.
1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Youth Development Fund

The Youth Development Fund (YDF) contributes to the New Zealand Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy (NZYSPS\textsuperscript{1}) by funding community-based youth development projects, particularly for Māori and Pacific youth. The projects work with young people to minimise some of the known risk factors for suicidal behaviour, especially social disadvantage and stressful life events.

The YDF was established in 1998 and is administered by the Department of Internal Affairs’ (DIA) Community Development Group (CDG). Seven projects were funded from 1999 to 2002. Six projects are funded for the three years\textsuperscript{1} 2002 to 2005:

1. Ola Mautinoa - a programme mainly for young Pacific people run by Pacific World Incorporated and based in Takanini in South Auckland.

2. Opotiki Youth Development Project - run by Te Ha O Te Whanau Trust in Opotiki. This project focuses on young Māori.

3. “Out There” - a national youth development project for queer youth\textsuperscript{ii} run by the New Zealand AIDS Foundation and Rainbow Youth Incorporated.

4. A number of regional youth development projects - run by the Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand and focusing on communities in Lyttelton, on the West Coast, and in the South Canterbury area.

5. Tumau Tutoa - a programme for young Pacific people run by the Manukau Youth Centre and based in Manukau, South Auckland.

6. A self-harm prevention project - run by the Rau O Te Huia Trust for young people in the Fordlands community in Rotorua.

The first two projects also received funding in the first round.

---

\textsuperscript{1} Three-year funding is subject to the projects meeting their objectives and reporting requirements.

\textsuperscript{ii} ‘Queer is a reclaimed word that acknowledges both sexual and gender diversity. It is a collective term used to encompass gay, lesbian, bisexual, takataapui, transgender and fa'afafine identities. While this term is used/accepted by many youth, it is acknowledged that it is not the preferred term for everybody’ (Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy Newsletter, April 2003, p5).
1.2 YDF's contribution to the NZYSPS

The YDF is one of 70 government initiatives contributing to the NZYSPS. The Strategy was developed in 1998 to respond to the high rate of suicide in New Zealand; New Zealand has a high youth suicide compared with other OECD countries.

The Strategy has two parts: In Our Hands, which is the general population strategy, and Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki, which is the strategy specifically targeting Māori needs and approaches to Māori well-being. The two parts of the strategy are not exclusive and should be read together. The Strategy recognises that suicide is a complex problem and that prevention needs to involve individuals, whānau, families, communities, iwi, hapū, government and non-government agencies, and businesses.

In Our Hands is aimed at the general population but recognises that services must be appropriate and responsive to culture and ethnicity, including the increasing numbers of young Pacific and Asian people. There are five goals in In Our Hands, which are supported by objectives ranging from initiatives to enhance the resilience of young people to those providing support to people affected by suicide.

Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki also has five goals and a range of objectives that reflect Māori culture and concepts of wellness. The goals from both parts of the strategy are listed in appendix 1.

The YDF contributes mainly to goal one (promoting well-being) and goal five (information and research) of In Our Hands, and goal two (strengthening the role of taitamariki in Māori development) and goal three (cultural development) of Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki. The projects currently funded by the YDF also contribute to other goals in both parts of the Strategy, as is illustrated later in this report.

The YDF contributes to the Strategy's goals by focusing on:

- developing young people's problem-solving and other interpersonal skills that help provide alternative choices to self-harm and suicide
- developing healthy levels of self esteem and cultural identity
- encouraging young people's participation and leadership in their communities.

Note: the strategy uses taitamariki for the age group 15-24 years, while some of the projects use rangatahi to refer to Māori youth.
Evaluation of the projects funded in the first round showed that most of their objectives were met and processes that built youth resiliency and reduced risk factors for suicidal behaviour were used.

A three-stage framework is guiding the evaluation of the six YDF projects funded from 2002 to 2005.

A distribution committee made up of staff of government agencies and nominees from the community sector select the projects for YDF funding. Selection is based on a range of criteria, including:

- the project objectives are based on a youth development approach
- the project targets areas with high rates of suicide and self-harm and/or social deprivation
- the project targets areas which are relatively underserviced by other initiatives.

1.3 Evaluating the YDF

DIA's Research Services evaluated the seven projects funded in the first three-year funding round. The evaluation was carried out after the projects had been operating for at least two years. The evaluation found that the projects met most of their objectives and were effective in using processes that built youth resiliency and addressed risk factors. These processes were identified from reviewing international literature and best practice for youth suicide prevention.

Community stakeholders also confirmed that the projects had: increased capacity by training project workers and leaders; collated and disseminated information about youth issues and agencies; and facilitated information and resource-sharing between local agencies working with youth. The evaluation also provided guidance on the factors contributing to successful youth development projects and this information was given to applicants for the second round of funding.

The six projects funded in the second round are being evaluated in three stages using an evaluation framework developed by DIA's Research Services. Research Services also is carrying out the first two stages of the evaluation. An external evaluator will be contracted to carry out the third stage. A partnership approach is being used for the evaluation in that the project workers and CDG's staff, including the Community Advisors, are being consulted and involved in all three stages of the evaluation.

iv From Internal Affairs, Ministry of Youth Development, Pacific Island Affairs and Te Puni Kōkiri.
1.4 Structure of the report

Following the introduction, the report contains four sections that:

- describe the framework for, and approach to, the evaluation
- present the results from the first stage – the design evaluation
- outline the steps for the second and third stages - the process and outcome evaluations
- summarises the results from the design evaluation in concluding comments.

A glossary of evaluation terms used in the report is in appendix 2. The main sources and publications referred to in the report are numbered in the text and listed on the last page.
2. Evaluation Framework and Approach

2.1 Evaluation framework

The evaluation framework for the YDF follows the project lifecycle and consists of three stages: a design, process and outcome evaluation. Duignan categorises this as a purpose-based evaluation, as the different stages signal the purpose of the evaluation.4

The **design evaluation** (also referred to as a formative evaluation) focused on the design and development of each project in order to confirm that the project is on target to meet its objectives and will contribute to the goals of the NZYSPS. The design evaluation was completed during the first year that the projects were funded. The approach used for this stage is described below and the results are presented in section three of this report.

The **process evaluation** will be completed halfway through the project's second year. This stage will document what happened (is happening) during the first 18 months of the project by describing the initiatives and activities being implemented, and the way in which they are being delivered. This stage also will describe how the project involves young people and whether or not the way it is being delivered is culturally appropriate for the young people and their communities.

This stage of the evaluation also will monitor if the projects are still on track to meet their objectives and outcomes. This will be by way of exception reporting, i.e., reporting on any aspects of the projects that are behind schedule and the steps that are being taken to address the issues that are impacting on the ability to deliver initiatives / activities.

Research Services visited each project in November / December 2003 to make sure that the evaluation methods agreed with the projects are being implemented and to collect additional information required for the process evaluation. Research Services will collate the results from the process evaluation and write a summary of the results for CDG.

An **outcome evaluation** will be completed partway through the third year, with reporting at 27 months (to meet the deadline for reporting to the distribution committee in September 2004\(^v\)).

\(^v\) The timing of this stage may change if the distribution committee agrees to extend the funding for the projects to four years.
An independent evaluator will be commissioned to carry out the outcome evaluation

The outcome evaluation will examine the extent to which the projects have achieved, or are on target to achieve, their short-term outcomes. The evaluation is only considering the short-term outcomes because the projects are generally funded for 3 years and this is not sufficient time to achieve the long-term outcomes. Nevertheless, the evaluation will consider the likely long-term outcomes, based on the evidence available about the way in which youth development enhances young people's ability to cope with the factors associated with suicide risk.5

The outcome evaluation will draw together and analyse the data and information collected during the first two stages of the evaluation. An external evaluator will be commissioned to carry out this stage to get independent feedback on the projects' impact on the young people and their communities.

The independent evaluator will submit a final evaluation report to CDG that: summarises the results for each project; provides an overall assessment of the way the projects have contributed to the goals of NZYSPS; and identifies key factors about the implementation of the projects for the distribution committee to consider in its next round of decision-making.

2.2 The design evaluation - approach

The design evaluation included four steps:

1. An intervention logic model was constructed to document the outputs and outcomes that each project aims to achieve and to illustrate how these contribute the project's objectives and the goals of the NZYSPS.

2. A series of evaluation questions was developed to guide the second and third stages of the evaluation. The information required to answer the questions and the sources of this information were also documented.

3. The project workers were consulted to check that the logic models were correct and that they agreed that the evaluation questions were appropriate for their project. Changes agreed with the project workers were made to the logic models and/or questions.

4. Research Services carried out an initial evaluation of the overall progress of each project and the results of this are in section three of this report.

Information to construct the logic models was drawn from each project's application and the progress reports submitted to CDG.
The time taken to set up the projects varied. In consequence, two monitoring reports were available for the design evaluation for four of the projects, and one report was available for the other two projects. Research Services visited each project in May 2003 to consult the project workers about the set up of the projects.

Consultation with the project workers on the logic models and the evaluation questions has continued by correspondence and phone. Comments from the Community Advisors on the projects' progress reports were also used to inform step four of the design evaluation.

**Developing the logic models**

Logic models show what a project or programme is expected to achieve and how it is expected to work by identifying:

| Inputs – the people and resources used by the project to undertake various initiatives and/or activities that result in a number of outputs – the products and services that reach the target audience (e.g. number and frequency of programmes delivered) that lead to short-term outcomes – which are the short-term effects of implementing the project (for the YDF, for the young people and their communities), that contribute to long-term outcomes – which are the long-term changes or impacts of the project on the behaviour of the young people and their communities, that contribute to the objectives of the project – for example, developing young people's participation and leadership in their communities that contribute to the goals and objectives of the NZYSPS |

*In Our Hands / Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki*

Logic models can be built using different approaches. The diagram on the next page illustrates how the logic models have been built for this evaluation, using part of the model developed for the Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust as an example.
Components of a logic model

**EXTERNAL INFLUENCES**

for example, crime, unemployment, peer pressure, low socio-economic status

**INPUTS**

Investments and resources, for example:
- the two project workers
- other agencies providing support
- whānau and community support
- support from the Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust
- YDF funding

**INITIATIVES /ACTIVITIES**

Programmes, events or actions, for example:
- Noho Marae
- Mana Rangatahi classes for students
- Teenage parenting programme
- College kapa haka and cultural wananga
- Health promotion.

**OUTPUTS**

- Number of programmes.
- Number and types of participants.
- Results from evaluations by youth workers.

**SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES**

Short-term effects of the programme, for example:
- Young people participate in positive activities and learning and leadership opportunities.
- Young people learning to mix together, work cooperatively and explore issues.
- Young people begin to develop their cultural awareness, self-esteem and coping strategies.

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

Long-term effects of the programme, for example:
- Young people demonstrate increased self-esteem, resiliency and knowledge of coping strategies.
- Young people have a strong sense of their Māori identity and identify with their culture and heritage in ways that contribute to their total well-being – spiritual, social, mental and physical.

**LINK TO PROJECT AIM**

To provide a range of programmes and activities that promote holistic well-being and development of rangatahi across five key dimensions.

**LINK TO KIA PIKI GOALS / OBJECTIVES** (see Appendix 1, page 48)

Goal 1 – Strengthening whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori: objective 3 - increase awareness and application of a Māori holistic approach to wellness.

Goal 1: objective 6 – improve support for ‘by Māori for Māori’ programmes.

Goal 3 - Cultural development – objective 2 - promote a Māori cultural base, including relevant Māori values and concepts.

**Notes**

1 The components of a logic model are illustrated with an extract from the first part of the model developed for the Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust youth development project. The full model is in appendix 3.

2 These are the influences in the environment in which the project operates that can affect its success, either positively or negatively.

3 The YDF project being delivered by the Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust aims to provide programmes and activities that promote the holistic well-being and development of rangatahi (young Māori) across 5 key dimensions: te taha wairua – spiritual, te taha tinana – physical, te taha hinengaro – mental and emotional, whanaungatanga – kinship and relationships, and te taha taiao – environmental.
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Process evaluation questions document how the project is being implemented and how the outcomes will be achieved.

Indicators - the information and evidence required to answer the evaluation questions - are identified, along with the sources of the information.

Whether or not short-term outcomes are being achieved are evaluated by answering questions about the effects projects are having on the young people, their whānau/families and their communities.

The approach used for this evaluation follows work by the Department of Health and Human Services at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.7,8

The full logic models for each project are shown in diagrams 1a to 1f in appendix 3.

Developing the evaluation questions

To guide the process and outcome evaluations, a series of questions was developed for each project. Tables 1a to 1f in appendix 4 set out the questions for each project.

The questions for the process evaluation aim to document how the project is being implemented and how the outcomes will be achieved. These questions focus on aspects such as:

- Is the project reaching its target audience and in what ways is it beginning to benefit this audience?
- Is the project delivering the programmes and services it said it would?
- Is the project being delivered by the providers in the way that they said they would?
- Is the project establishing and maintaining links with other agencies/ the community/ other key stakeholders?

For each question an indicator is identified, i.e., the information, or evidence, required to answer the question. For example, information on the number and characteristics of young people attending programmes and activities run by the project indicates if the project is reaching its target audience.

The data sources for this information also are identified. Continuing with the example above, the reports submitted to CDG by the Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust and the project's Advisor will provide information about participants in activities and programmes.

The questions to evaluate the short-term outcomes explore what effects the project is having on the young people, their whānau/families and their communities. These questions focus on aspects such as:

- Are the young people able to complete the project's programmes successfully and are they actively involved in the projects?
- Are the young people developing a sense of their cultural identity and self-worth?
The outcome evaluation will be informed by the project workers and Advisors’ reports, and feedback from key stakeholders and the young people.

The project workers are being consulted at each stage of the evaluation and their comments incorporated into the logic models and evaluation questions.

- Are the young people showing greater awareness of healthy lifestyles?
- Are the other support agencies able to provide a more co-ordinated and effective delivery of their services?
- Is the community showing more understanding of the pressures facing young people in the area?

The outcome evaluation will also use the reports and feedback from the project workers and CDG’s Advisors to provide the evidence required to answer these questions. In addition, independent confirmation of the effects of the project will be sought from key stakeholders in the communities and from the other service providers working with the projects. Where possible, feedback will be obtained from the young people about the benefits they are deriving from the project. Any information collected from young people will only be presented as aggregated results and the confidentiality of the young people will be maintained.

Consulting the project workers

The evaluation is being designed in a way that provides "no surprises" for the projects. To achieve this the logic models and evaluation questions were sent to the project workers or the nominated representative for the project, along with a letter explaining the role of the logic model and inviting comments on the model and the evaluation questions. A sample letter is in appendix 5.

The correspondence was copied to the CDG Advisors to keep them informed about the evaluation.

Comments received from the project workers about the content of the logic models and the evaluation questions were incorporated into the final versions shown in appendices 3 and 4.

The project workers will be kept informed of the progress of the evaluation and will be given opportunities to comment on the sections of the evaluation reports that cover their project.

Research Services also visited each project towards the end of 2003 to collect information for the process evaluation and to answer any queries the project workers had about the evaluation.
The design evaluation documents the set up and initial implementation of the projects to confirm that they are on target to meet objectives.

The initial evaluation

The design evaluation looks at the way the projects have been established and are beginning to operate to check that they are on target to meet their objectives.

The aspects of the projects examined at this stage include:

- Are the project worker(s)\(^{vi}\) in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?
- Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives and activities to deliver its services and programmes?
- Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?
- Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?
- Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?
- Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project's ability to deliver its services and programmes?
- Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?

The results for each project are set out in the next section.

---

\(^{vi}\) Projects also refer to “project workers” as health workers, project coordinators, health promoters and youth development officers.
3. Results from the Design Evaluation

3.1 Ola Mautinoa – Pacific World Incorporated, Takanini, South Auckland

Purpose of the project

Ola Mautinoa is a project run by Pacific World Incorporated for Pacific Island youth, and young people of mixed Pacific Island and Māori descent. The project is a primary prevention strategy that uses youth and community development to provide young people at risk with problem solving and coping skills, and with access to support networks for themselves and their families. Pacific World is based in Takanini in South Auckland and employs two project workers who work part-time on the YDF project.

Young people are referred to the programme from schools and other agencies. As part of the programme, they develop Personal Pathway Action Plans to set themselves goals and a timeframe for their involvement with the project. The programme also aims to develop the capacity of the Pacific Island community to support young people at risk. The programme incorporates Pacific values and protocols such as alofa (love), faka'apa'apa (respect) and feagaiga (gender roles), spirituality, and self worth.

Set up of the project

Ola Mautinoa has been operating as a youth and community development project since 1999/2000. The project received YDF funding in the first three-year funding round. A further three years' funding was approved in 2002.

Pacific World Incorporated was established in 2001. Before this date, Papakura District Truancy Services implemented the Ola Mautinoa programme. Establishing Pacific World Incorporated created an agency catering specifically for Pacific youth and filled a significant gap in the social services in the South Auckland area.

Pacific World is now based in Takanini, an area mid-way between Papakura and Manurewa, which was neglected by other service providers.

The application for YDF funding and the 6 and 12-month monitoring reports submitted by Pacific World have been used to identify the components of the project, and these are shown in the intervention logic model in diagram 1a in appendix 3.
The design evaluation assesses the project against a set of questions to confirm that it is on track to meet its objectives.

Ola Mautinoa's two part-time project workers are well established and are engaging with the young people, their families and communities.

Ola Mautinoa is delivering a well-structured programme with a range of initiatives and activities that will contribute to short and long-term outcomes.

Results of the design evaluation

The design evaluation assesses the project in relation to each of the following questions:

*Are the project workers in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?*

Pacific World employs two project workers, both of whom work part-time to deliver the Ola Mautinoa programme. These two project workers worked on this project in its first three years and are now highly visible in the community. Their CDG Advisor reports that they have a clear understanding of the issues facing the Pacific youth with whom they work (June, 2003). These issues include: physical abuse (as victims and perpetrators), family breakdown and dysfunction, low self esteem, contemplating self-harm, truancy and school suspensions, drug and alcohol abuse, criminal activities, cultural and identity issues and peer pressure.

Ola Mautinoa's primary target group is Pacific youth between the ages of 15 and 24 years, but includes youth of any ethnicity who are at risk. The project has set up systems to record the age, ethnicity and progress of the young people in the programme. These data will be reported in the process evaluation.

The project aims to strengthen family units and organises family activities to engage the families of the young people and encourage them to socialise together. Good relationships are being developed with the wider community as well, and the project has established links with community and church groups.

*Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver its services and programmes?*

The logic model for Ola Mautinoa (see diagram 1a, appendix 3) demonstrates that the project is implementing a range of initiatives and activities that will contribute to the desired short and long-term outcomes for the project. Examples of the initiatives and activities include:

- A school-based prevention project which provides mentoring and support for young people at risk, using group sessions or one-on-one meetings, if required. The young people are encouraged to prepare a personal action plan to set themselves goals and monitor their progress towards achieving them, so that they can learn a level of self-management.
The project workers have established links with a wide range of agencies that act as referral agencies and sources of continuing support for the young people when they leave the programme.

An Incentive Activity Programme to reward and reinforce positive behaviours. The programme includes activities such as youth camps, arts projects and a Polynesian festival.

A student diary project that encourages young people to create their own resource containing information such as how to maintain a healthy lifestyle and where to go to get support to help them understand and cope with the challenges they face.

Activities to strengthen Pacific cultural identity and spiritual well-being, including: learning protocols and language, telling stories and histories, and learning about music, art, fashion, and food.

Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?

As this project is in its fifth year of operation, it has established links with a wide range of other agencies and service providers, including: the Child Youth and Family Service, Special Education Services, the Police Youth Aid, youth health services, national and local government agencies, and local schools. Young people are referred to Pacific World by local and central government agencies and schools. The project workers also use their links with these agencies to provide continuing support for the young people. Records are kept of the numbers of young people returning to school, joining training programmes and taking up full-time employment.

Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?

Since its establishment in 2001, Pacific World Incorporated has strengthened the organisation and the delivery of the Ola Mautinoa programme by:

- Appointing a board that includes social workers, educators and business people, and so has the skills to provide good leadership across the range of Pacific World’s responsibilities.

- Completing strategic planning for the next five years and implementing policies and procedures that safeguard all of the stakeholders.

- Improving administrative processes, including introducing new accounting and financial processes and redeveloping employment contracts.
- Providing support, training and supervision for the two part-time project workers to make sure that the practices used when working with young people are safe. The project’s CDG Advisor reports that "the youth facilitators demonstrate a clear understanding of Pacific culture" and empathy with the issues the young people face (June, 2003). The Advisor also recommends that the board should continue to make sure that the two project workers receive training and supervision.

Ola Mautinoa has set up good assessment and monitoring processes for the young people referred to the programme

Ola Mautinoa uses set procedures for assessing and monitoring the progress of the young people that are referred to the project. Records are kept of the numbers and characteristics of young people referred to the project and young people are encouraged to report on and evaluate their experience of participating in the activities.

Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?

The project's 6 and 12-month reports and the Advisor's report do not identify any issues that are impacting on the project's progress. The only risk identified is that, if the programme is promoted too widely, it may attract more referrals than the project workers are able to accommodate in the programme.

As a consequence, the Advisor recommends that the board of Pacific World should take an active role in planning and directing the project to ensure that resources are sufficient to meet the requirements of the project.

Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project's ability to deliver its services and programmes?

No issues have been identified at this stage in the project.

Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?

Pacific World has provided comprehensive 6 and 12-month reports which monitor the progress of the project. It also has met the requirement to submit annual audited accounts. The components of the logic model have been agreed with the project workers and a series of evaluation questions for the process and outcome evaluations also have been agreed (see appendices 3 and 4).

Evaluators' preliminary assessment and recommendations

Pacific World is implementing Ola Mautinoa as a well-structured project with a clear purpose. The Board is putting good governance and management processes in place.
Pacific World's Board needs to support Ola Mautinoa to make sure that the work is not extended beyond the capacity of the two part-time project workers.

Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust's youth development project delivers a range of programmes and activities to promote holistic well-being and the development of rangatahi in the Opotiki area.

The youth development project aims to address issues identified in the research undertaken by the Opotiki Rape Crisis Collective.

The CDG Advisor reports that Pacific World is recognised by the community as a service provider that maintains high standards of professionalism.

The main challenge facing the project is to ensure that the amount of work is not extended beyond the capacity of the two part-time project workers.

We support the Advisor's recommendation that the board of Pacific World should take an active role in planning and directing the project and ensuring that resources are sufficient to meet the requirements of the project. This role should include managing the extent to which the project is promoted.

We also support the Advisor's recommendation that the board of Pacific World makes sure that the two project workers receive the training and supervision they need to fulfil the wide range of tasks they undertake.

3.2 Opotiki Youth Development Project – Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust

Purpose of the project

Based in Opotiki, Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust’s youth development project aims to provide a range of programmes and activities that promote the holistic well-being and development of rangatahi across five key dimensions; spiritual, physical, emotional, relationships, and environmental.

The project delivers programmes and activities to help rangatahi develop problem solving and coping skills, and provide them with information and support in times of crisis. The project also aims to develop peer support, enabling, rangatahi to identify at-risk behaviour among their peers and assist them to access help when required. Most of the project’s programmes are delivered through local schools.

Two project workers are employed to deliver the programmes. The Trust’s administrative staff support the project workers. The Trust works collaboratively with other key players providing youth services in the area.

Set up of the project

In 1998, the Opotiki Rape Crisis Collective was funded by the Community Funding Agency to undertake research into why rangatahi were not achieving their full potential in the areas of education and employment. The report highlighted a rangatahi worldview built on feelings of isolation, lack of motivation and negative self-image.
Rangatahi perceived their community as offering little in the way of opportunities for personal development and participation in community structures. Rangatahi stated that they had few support networks and limited control over decisions and events that affect their lives. The Opotiki Youth Development Project aims to address some of the issues outlined in the Rape Crisis Collective’s report.

In December 1998, Te Aria Toka Family Centre received a YDF grant to undertake the Opotiki Youth Development Project. In 1999, the Centre was renamed and re-established as Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust. The Trust has a manager, three administrative assistants and six community workers. Of these, two workers and one administration assistant are involved full-time in the youth development project.

The project received YDF funding for three years 1998-2001 and was evaluated by DIA’s Research Services. The evaluation report concluded that the project had been successful in meeting all its objectives. It recommended that, if further funding was awarded, the project should aim to further enhance community collaboration. In July 2002, the Opotiki Youth Development Project received approval for a further three years funding.

The application for YDF funding and the 6 and 12-month monitoring reports submitted by Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust have been used to identify the components of the project, and these are shown in the intervention logic model in diagram 1b in appendix 3.

**Results of the design evaluation**

The design evaluation assesses the project in relation to each of the following questions:

*Are the project workers in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?*

This is the project’s fifth year of operation and the two project workers continue to engage effectively with the young people and their communities, as evidenced by the positive feedback provided by the programme participants. Their CDG Advisor reports that the project workers continue to deliver programmes across a variety of issues focusing on the needs of rangatahi in the Opotiki area (April, 2003).
The programmes offered by this project predominantly target Māori youth and are based around tikanga Māori.

The project’s target group is predominantly Māori youth of both genders, between the ages of 15-24, but young people who fall outside of these criteria are not excluded. Self-referrals, and referrals by friends and family, school management and counsellors, CYFS and other social service providers are used to reach the target group.

The project’s 6 and 12-month reports state that various activities and training (e.g. Mana Rangatahi Programme, cultural awareness and team building exercise) were delivered to young people, youth leaders and peer support teams through local schools or school-related activities. The project has also been promoted and advertised on the local youth radio station.

Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver its services and programmes?

The logic model for Te Hä o Te Whanau Trust (see diagram 1b, appendix 3) demonstrates that the project is implementing a range of initiatives and activities what will contribute to the desired short and long-term outcomes. Examples of the initiatives and activities include:

- Establishing a base for rangatahi to meet and interact within a supportive and safe environment and take part in interesting and worthwhile activities, such as administering and renovating the youth centre, and raising funds for the centre.

- Developing a peer support team, by identifying youth leaders through their quality participation across a range of activities.

- Providing support and training for youth leaders by including them in a peer support team, helping with career pathways, providing driver licence training, safe sex education and tuakana/teina relationships and responsibilities.

Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?

Since the project’s establishment in 1998, the project workers have been actively participating in inter-agency networking forums such as Opotiki Safer Community Council, Opotiki Youth Workers Network, The Combined Community Holiday Programme, Youth Advocacy, Restorative Justice Conferencing and Student Support, and Youth Counselling.
Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust is a well-established organisation with good organisational processes and procedures.

The project workers use set procedures to seek regular feedback about their service delivery.

The Trust supports the professional development of the project workers.

The youth development project benefits from the administrative support the Trust provides.

The project's Advisor sought feedback from various people in the Community (e.g. Police, the District Council, and local schools) and reports that they are supportive of the Trust and the work they do in the community (April, 2003). The 6 and 12-month project monitoring reports describe the establishment and collaboration with other community agencies as on-going. For example, various programmes have been regularly delivered through local schools and marae, and the project has been participating in CNI Youthworker Training and in the Opotiki Safer Communities Youth Worker Forum.

**Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?**

Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust has a clear management structure with responsibilities identified for each employee. The Trust’s human resource processes are in place as evidenced in the documentation submitted with the project’s funding application. The processes include a job description for the youth workers, staff appraisal forms, complaints procedure and policy, a draft employment contract, a self-evaluation plan for the project, and an outline of financial systems and controls. Project workers are responsible to the Trust’s manager and their performance is appraised.

During the implementation stages of a project, the Trust’s project management group meets weekly, and thereafter fortnightly to receive regular updates about the project and assure that the project aims/outputs are being met. Each project operating within the Trust submits monthly reports to the manager. To evaluate their programmes, the project workers use set procedures to seek regular feedback about their service delivery from the programme participants. The Trust's administrative staff provide support for the youth development project workers.

The CDG Advisor commented that the Trust encourages on-going training of its employees, and that the project workers attended a number of training sessions and are always looking for opportunities to up-skill themselves (April, 2003).

In support of the project’s continued funding, the Advisor commented positively on the project’s reporting, recording systems and its service delivery. The Advisor also reported that: “Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust has a strong administrative base and can produce information, reports and proposals, as well as resource material, that allow it to maintain and support its effectiveness in service delivery to the community” (June, 2002).
The project identified a number of environmental issues that have the potential to impact on the project’s ability to make progress.

Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?

No issues have been identified at this stage in the project.

Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project’s ability to deliver its services and programmes?

Although no specific circumstances have impacted on the project’s ability to make progress, the project workers are aware of a number of influences that impact on the young people, the community, and potentially the project. These include:

- lack of co-ordination across community service providers
- frequent changes and re-developments in the existing community service providers
- culture of ‘gate keeping’ information between community service providers, possibly due to funding competition which prevents effective networking
- high turnover of youth in the area of peer-support due to young people leaving the area in search of further education and employment
- increasing number of CYFS’ placements in the area, which impacts on the behaviour of local youth
- a recognition that the communities are dynamic and that projects need to be responsive by allowing for flexibility in programme delivery. For example, as a result of increase in the use of drug “P” in Opotiki, health promotion needs to incorporate messages about “P” through existing health promotion programmes.

The project workers also pointed to potentially detrimental effects from negative reporting and media releases pertaining to suicide. To counteract these messages, the project ensures that positive messages are also promoted at appropriate times.

Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?

Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust has provided 6 and 12-month reports which monitor the progress of the project. It also has met the requirement to submit annual audited accounts.
The components of the logic model have been agreed with the project workers and a series of evaluation questions for the process and outcome evaluations also have been agreed (see appendices 3 and 4).

The project also has a system for recording the number and frequency of products and services delivered to the target audiences (outputs), which will provide basis for the process evaluation.

**Evaluators’ preliminary assessment and recommendations**

The Opotiki Youth Development Project has been operating for a period of five years. The project is now delivered by the Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust, which has good organisational processes and systems in place. The organisational support provided by the Trust is an asset to the youth development project. This is especially the case with the administrative support that the Trust provides. This enables the project workers to spend more time engaging with young people and the community.

The project’s logic model, the monitoring and CDG Advisor’s reports, and numerous letters of reference indicate that the project is consistent in its service delivery to the young people. The project is effective due to the commitment of the project workers, who have been employed to work with the project since it began. The project offers regular programmes and activities that are capturing the young people’s interest. The activities include Noho Marae, kapa haka, and cultural wananga. The project’s awareness of community needs is also demonstrated in the monitoring reports, in which the project workers highlight a number of influences impacting on the young people and their community. This provides valuable information about the project’s wider setting and the need for a flexible approach to the project’s activities.

Community collaboration remains the main challenge in this small community. We have no specific recommendations for this project, but we support the project in its effort to be inclusive, transparent, accountable in delivering all its activities and programmes, and to continue establishing and maintaining positive working relationships with other service providers in the Opotiki community.
3.3 “Out There” - A National Queer Youth Development Project

Purpose of the project

"Out There!" is a national initiative created by the New Zealand AIDS Foundation (NZAF) and Rainbow Youth. Rainbow Youth is an organisation that aims to improve the well-being of queer youth in Aotearoa/New Zealand by providing support, contact and education for queer youth.

The initiative aims to increase acceptance of sexual and gender diversity, and increase support for queer youth. The initiative is working with mainstream groups and service providers to enhance their services for queer youth. "Out There!" is playing an important role regarding education, resource development, and consultancy to help schools and other organisations understand and respond to queer youth.

Set up of the project

The AIDS Support Network Trust, a national initiative to prevent the spread of HIV in New Zealand, was established in 1985. A few months later, the Trust was renamed The New Zealand AIDS Foundation. NZAF focuses on preventing HIV infection among high-risk groups.

In 1989, a group of gay and lesbian young people formed the Lesbian and Gay Youth Group to provide support and social events for their peers, under the umbrella of the Isherwood Trust. This Auckland-based group also developed workshops for delivery in secondary schools, in order to make young people aware of the service and to address the homophobia present in many school environments. In 1995 this group incorporated and renamed itself Rainbow Youth Inc.

In June 2002, NZAF and Rainbow Youth received YDF funding to jointly run the "Out There!" project. To clarify and formalise their obligations, roles, and responsibilities, the two groups signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in January 2002; this MoU accompanied their application. Two part-time project workers were employed initially, one based in Auckland and one in Wellington. Subsequently, it was decided that the project would be more effective if delivered by one full-time health promoter working nationally. The current project worker is Wellington-based.

The application for YDF funding and the 6 and 12-month monitoring reports submitted by "Out There!" have been used to identify the components of the project, and these are shown in the intervention logic model in diagram 1c in appendix 3.
Results of the design evaluation

The design evaluation assesses the project’s first twelve months in relation to each of the following questions:

Are the project workers in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?

The scope of this project is broad and its primary aim is facilitating the development of community groups and service providers to enhance their service delivery to queer youth. The project also works with schools. The health promoter working for this project, therefore, delivers programmes to these audiences, rather than to the young people themselves.

The project engages indirectly with the young people and their communities by providing different resources (e.g. posters, resource pack) for young people. The project’s monitoring reports show that the project is on target to start delivering these outputs.

The health promoter’s engagement with community groups and support agencies is discussed further below.

Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver its services and programmes?

The project’s funding application indicates that the rationale for the project and its initiatives are based on a number of New Zealand and international research findings.

The logic model for Out There! (see diagram 1c, appendix 3) demonstrates that the project is implementing a range of initiatives and activities that will contribute to the desired short and long-term outcomes. Examples of the initiatives and activities include:

- Compiling a set of national resources to provide information for queer youth, and increase all young people's awareness and understanding of queer youth and the issues they face.
- A pilot school research project to demonstrate how schools can implement policies and strategies to promote tolerance of gender and sexual identity diversity, for example, through teacher development and student education.
- Developing and trialing a cultural safety workshop to target those working/participating in the health sector.
Effective links are being established with other service providers, professionals, and organisations working with young people.

Feedback from agencies and individuals confirms the effectiveness of the project worker’s engagement with other agencies.

Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?

Establishing effective links with other support agencies, and agencies that work with young people, is at the core of most of this project’s initiatives. Good links and networks are crucial for the delivery of the programme activities. At the start of the project, the project worker met with individuals and organisations that had an interest in the well-being of queer youth. The meetings were held around the country and attendees included school counsellors, public health nurses, teachers, and lecturers from colleges of education and universities, as well as queer people.

The project notes that: “It was important for community consultation to feed into setting the directions for this project and give us an idea of how we could realise the objectives that were set out as part of the contract” (6-month report, December, 2002). The project continued with the networking throughout the first year and links were established with numerous groups and organisations. Examples listed in the project’s 12-month report (March, 2003) include: Blenheim Peer Support Services, Kapiti Youth Health Service, Pride Dunedin Youth Contacts, Toi Te Ora Public Health in Rotorua, Te Wänanga o Aotearoa, and the School of Applied Social Sciences.

The effectiveness of the engagement between the project worker and the target audience is noted in the project Advisor’s 12-month report, which documents positive feedback from a number of agencies and individuals with which the project worker has liaised. For example, one of the referees commented that "the project worker is very professional, is a brilliant networker, and that she has been building all the right relationships in the region". Another referee commented that the project worker “is doing a marvellous job” and the project “couldn’t have anyone better doing the job” (March, 2003).

The project also has a strong commitment to research and is piloting a school project in conjunction with University of Canterbury’s Department of Education.
### A MoU sets out the obligations of the two organisations delivering the Out There! project

The MoU submitted with the funding application outlines the obligations of NZAF and Rainbow Youth in delivering the Out There! project. NZAF and Rainbow Youth have also submitted a job description for the Out There! health promoter’s position, which identifies that the health promoter is responsible to, and supervised by, the Programme Manager, with whom she regularly liaises. The health promoter’s performance is appraised annually. NZAF and Rainbow Youth are committed to providing further professional development for the health promoter, who also receives some administrative support from the NZAF.

### The project worker receives good support from the two organisations

The health promoter provides regular comprehensive reports to the Rainbow Youth Board. The Out There! project also has a Reference or Advisory Group, which provides advice and expertise from professionals working in the area of youth development. The Reference Group meets three times a year.

### A Reference Group provides advice and expertise from youth development professionals

In support of the project’s ethical practices, the project worker runs cultural safety workshops, and seeks feedback from Pacific and Māori teams at NZAF to ensure that these cultures’ alternative constructions of sexuality are appropriately discussed in the workshop (Advisor’s 12-month monitoring report, March, 2003).

### The project ensures that its service delivery is culturally appropriate

Out There! is committed to improving services by regularly seeking written feedback from different audiences, as evidenced by the feedback forms developed for different project activities. In addition to evaluating feedback from participants, the project documents and submits various minutes of meetings, and plans for the workshops and other activities.

### Out There! regularly seeks feedback from its programme participants to evaluate the project’s effectiveness

The project’s strong commitment to continuous improvement is also evidenced by the project’s participation in the Te Wana Quality Programme. This programme is a modular system with a set of standards and a process for measuring participating groups/agencies against those standards. It is a systematic way that a group/agency can look at what it does and how it can make improvements. Te Wana also helps organisations submit their own quality standards for endorsement by the accrediting body, the Quality Improvement Council (Australasia).9

### The project’s commitment to continuous improvement is also demonstrated by its participation in the Te Wana Quality Programme

---

9. DIA, Research Services: February 2004
Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?

Throughout the first twelve months of its operation, the project has gained a better understanding of the environment in which it operates. This resulted in a decision not to proceed with an Internet chat facility targeted at queer youth who are geographically isolated. After identifying potential risks associated with this initiative, the project opted instead to set up a website for the Out There! project.

As noted earlier, the NZAF and Rainbow Youth decided that one full-time person working nationally would be the most effective way to staff the project. Given the project’s achievements in its first year of operation, it appears that this change has been beneficial to the project.

Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project’s ability to deliver its services and programmes?

Although no major external issues have impacted on the project’s ability to make progress, the project worker mentioned that the project encountered resistance in some communities due to people's beliefs about sexuality and gender identity. Despite this challenge, the project is succeeding in delivering its various activities and engaging with a wide cross section of people and groups.

Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?

Out There! has provided 6 and 12-month reports, which monitor the progress of the project. It also has met the requirement to submit annual audited accounts.

The components of the logic model have been agreed with the project worker and a series of evaluation questions for the process and outcome evaluations also have been agreed (see appendices 3 and 4). The project also has a system for recording number and frequency of products and services delivered to the target audiences (outputs), and this information will be used in the process evaluation.
The project has made good progress towards a number of initiatives and taken time to establish a good foundation for the project.

The project is participating in a pilot research project in conjunction with the University of Canterbury.

The project aims to implement strategies in schools to address homophobia and bullying.

Out There! has made good progress with delivering the project's initiatives and is on target to achieve its short-term outcomes.

**Evaluators' preliminary assessment and recommendations**

The first 12 months of the *Out There!* project have been dedicated to setting up this project. The project’s monitoring reports and other supporting documents suggest that the project has been putting a lot of thought into laying good foundations for the project and its delivery. The project has also made good progress towards a number of initiatives, one of which was establishing working relationships with support agencies for queer youth and agencies/organisations/groups that work with young people.

*Out There!* is committed to research, as evidenced by a joint pilot action research project with the University of Canterbury. This is a unique project in this country, and possibly overseas, which aims to implement strategies to address the intersecting issues of homophobia, bullying, and gender in the school context. The strategies include teacher development, workshops with students, queer/straight alliances, queer speakers, pro-diversity policies that promote no tolerance for "queerphobic" comments or actions, and processes for appropriately dealing with students and teachers who breach these policies. *Out There!* is also committed to improving the standards of its service delivery by taking part in the Te Wana Quality programme.

The *Out There!* project addresses the sensitive issues of gender and sexuality. As the first project of this kind in New Zealand, it is encountering some resistance from some parts of New Zealand society. The project worker is responding well to this challenge and, with support from the NZAF and Rainbow Youth, has made good progress with delivering the project's initiatives.

We have **no specific recommendations** for this project, but we support the project’s commitment to research and continuous improvement. The project is benefiting from the time and effort invested in planning and consultation before starting to deliver the initiatives and activities and it appears to be on target to achieve the project's short-term outcomes.
The MHF’s youth development project aims to facilitate more responsive services for youth, and improve the capacity of those working with young people.

The project focuses on young people in the Canterbury Region and on the West Coast of the South Island.

MHF has its origins in a Trust established in 1974.

The MHF receives funding from a combination of donations, grants and contracts for its regional and national work.

In November 2002, the MHF employed a full-time regional project worker to deliver this youth development project.

3.4 Mental Health Foundation - Youth Development Project, Christchurch

Purpose of the project

The Mental Health Foundation’s (MHF) Youth Development Project aims to: provide support for whānau/families of youth at risk; involve young taiohi (people) in the project to facilitate more responsive services for youth; and improve the capacity of those working with young people by supporting youth and whānau workers.

A full-time project worker is employed to deliver programmes and activities to 18 to 24 year-olds in the Canterbury Region and on the West Coast of the South Island. The project's approach is one of community development and mental health promotion, with an emphasis on building strengths, particularly cultural identity. The project focuses on young men, with an emphasis on the roles they take in their whānau, hapū and iwi, how they look after themselves and interact with others, and how they support initiatives within their communities.

Set up of the project

The MHF had its origins in a Trust established in 1974. As a recipient of the funds raised in New Zealand's third Telethon in 1977, the Foundation has distributed funding to many organisations involved in mental health activity. These included the Women's Refuge movement, Rape Crisis, Alzheimer’s support groups and the New Zealand AIDS Foundation. Grants were made for applied behavioural and social research with a community focus, for example, focussing on issues such as loneliness, mental health legislation and television violence.

The MHF is no longer a grant-giving body, rather it receives funding from a combination of donations, grants and contracts for its regional and national work.

In September 2002, the MHF received YDF funding for this youth development project, which encompasses both youth suicide prevention and youth development. In November 2002, the MHF employed a full-time regional youth development project worker.
The MHF began the project by consulting key groups to identify the issues and areas that the youth development project will target.

The initial stages of the project involved the MHF consulting with key groups to identify the issues and areas that the youth development project will target. These include supporting whānau/families to increase the well-being of young people, improving capacity of those working with young people, and ensuring that services are responsive to young people. The young people are encouraged to participate actively in the development, implementation and evaluation of the project.

The project is working initially with young people in Lyttelton and on the West Coast. Opportunities for extending the project in other areas in South Canterbury will be investigated once the project is established in the first two regions.

The application for YDF funding and the 6-month monitoring report submitted by MHF have been used to identify the components of the project, and these are shown in the intervention logic model in diagram 1d in appendix 3.

Results of the design evaluation

The design evaluation assesses the project’s first six months in relation to each of the following questions:

*Are the project workers in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?*

The project worker has begun to engage with young people and their whānau by organising and facilitating a number of wananga for different target groups, as reported in the project’s 6-month monitoring report (April, 2003). The project records show that six wananga organised by the project worker were well attended (about 350 attendants). The majority of wananga participants were Māori men aged between 15 and 26, from the Canterbury, West Coast and Banks Peninsula areas. The participants’ characteristics are consistent with those of the project’s target group. The effectiveness of this engagement is demonstrated by participants’ giving positive evaluations of the wananga (April, 2003).
The project has a set of initiatives and activities for whānau/families, and youth and whānau workers that are contributing to the project’s short and long-term outcomes.

Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver its services and programmes?

The logic model for the MHF project (see appendix 3) demonstrates that the project is implementing a range of initiatives and activities that will contribute to the desired short and long-term outcomes. The initiatives and activities include, for example:

- Providing support for whānau/families of young people most at risk by: facilitating discussions about issues facing whānau in relation to young people’s growth and development; providing on-going support for whānau/families with most need; identifying services that support whānau/families; and, if services do not exist, helping to establish them in these regions.

- Providing support for youth and whānau workers by mentoring workers, sharing information, and organising and running wananga.

- Ensuring youth participation in the project to facilitate more responsive services for youth.

Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?

The project’s 6-month report states that the project worker has been networking with whānau networks, networks of people who work with youth, and a number of other organisations and groups, including Te Puna Wairoa, Te Tohu o Trust, Te Puawai Ora, Te Oho Ake Trust, Pounamu Kahuraki, He Waka Tapu, S.T.O.P. Trust, Hauora Matauroka, Canterbury Youth Collective, and Otautahi Social Services (April, 2003). The project benefits from having a reference group with members from diverse and relevant agencies, which can assist the project worker in liaising with other agencies in the target areas. The MHF’s strong networks in the South Island are also beneficial to the youth development project worker.

Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?

The MHF’s human resource processes are in place, as evidenced in the documentation submitted with the project’s funding application. These processes include the youth development worker’s job description, individual employment agreement, and human resource policy and procedures.
The project’s reference group has representatives from youth and health agencies and supports the project worker with advice, direction and information.

The work carried out in the first 6 months enabled the project worker to understand the environment the project operates in and, as a result, the project is focusing on young Māori men in the Lyttelton and West Coast areas.

The project identified some external issues that are impacting on it and is countering these by changes to its service delivery.

The MHF has a clear project and agency management structure. The youth development project worker reports to, and meets monthly with, the MHF Southern Regional Manager. The project receives administrative support from the MHF.

The worker also receives support from the reference group, the Suicide Prevention Information New Zealand (SPINZ) Community Liaison Worker, and the area’s Mental Health Promoters. The reference group has representatives from youth and health agencies, including the Canterbury Youth Workers Collective, SPINZ, South Canterbury District Health Board, Crown Public Health, and Te Whanau Puawai Ora. The reference group meets bi-monthly with the project worker and provides advice, direction, support and information. The project’s CDG Advisor comments that: “The establishment of the reference group has provided good support for the worker and has allowed ideas to be ‘tested’ before they are launched” (June, 2003).

Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?

During the first six months this project has gained a better understanding of the environment in which it is operating. This caused some shifts in the group the project is targeting, its methods of service delivery, and a minor change in the project’s terminology. The project’s target group is now mostly young Māori men, although young women are not left out. Also, due to the skills of the project worker and gaps identified in youth development, the activities are now based and centred around tikanga, wairua (spirituality), self-esteem, self-confidence and leadership development, with the emphasis being on a strengths and well-being approach.

Initially, the project’s geographical boundaries were broad (Canterbury/West Coast region), with an intent to identify and target sub-regions once the project started. As a result of the initial work, the project highlighted the need for more emphasis on the Banks Peninsula (particularly Lyttelton) and the West Coast areas, and this where the project worker is currently operating.

Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project’s ability to deliver its services and programmes?

In their 6-month monitoring report, a number of different issues have been identified as impacting on the project’s ability to make progress with a number of the activities. In each instance, however, the project identified alternative activities and measure/s to counteract these issues.
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An initial monitoring report has been submitted, and evaluation questions for the outcome and process evaluation have been agreed.

The project has a system for recording the number and frequency of the products and services it delivers.

The project is established and has made progress towards meeting its Year One objectives.

Due to a better understanding of the environment in which the project operates and the recognition of the project worker’s skills, the project has modified its focus and approach.

For example, an issue impacting on the initiative to train young people to become youth consultants and enable them to participate in forums has been the presence of whakamā (shyness) among the young people. Although the presence of adults seemed to alleviate the whakamā, a lack of whānau support for young people was seen as contributing to this problem. In response, the project is using other means to support rangatahi to overcome whakamā by encouraging personal development using activities such as sports, hobbies, and participation in meetings (April, 2003).

**Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?**

The MHF has provided a 6-month monitoring report that charts the progress of the project. The project’s annual monitoring report had not been submitted at the time of writing this report, as the project had not operated for the full twelve months.

The components of the logic model have been agreed with the project team and a series of evaluation questions for the process and outcome evaluations also have been agreed. The project has a system for recording the number and frequency of products and services (outputs) delivered to the target audiences, and this information will be used in the process evaluation.

**Evaluators’ preliminary assessment and recommendations**

During the first six months, the project has made progress towards meeting its Year One objectives. For example, the project’s 6-month report states that: the project identified and assessed gaps in youth development opportunities in the Canterbury and West Coast regions; and identified the most appropriate target groups. The project worker is engaging with the young people and their communities by organising and facilitating a number of wananga; and has developed networks in the Canterbury Region and on the West Coast.

The work carried out in the first six months of the project enabled the project to become more familiar with the target communities, and identify the specific strengths of the project worker, as well as the gaps in youth development. As a result, project activities have been modified to better meet the needs of the target group and utilise the skills of the project worker. This has resulted in an initial focus on young Māori men in the Lyttelton and West Coast areas.
We have no specific recommendations for this project, but support the project continuing to monitor and respond to the impact of external influences on its progress.

3.5 Manukau Youth Centre, Youth Development Project

Purpose of the project

The Tumau Tutoa or Stand Strong youth development project works with young Pacific people in the greater South Auckland area, who are identified as “at risk” (i.e., with a range of negative health and anti-social behaviours). The Manukau Youth Centre (MYC) delivers the programme.

The programme addresses family and peer issues and coordinates support systems for individuals, which involve the MYC, external services/agencies and the Pacific community. Most project participants are referred to the MYC through schools. The programme is delivered in four stages over a 10 to 12-month period, and uses intensive one-on-one mentoring and group activities.

The programme places strong emphasis on establishing relationships with other similar service providers to coordinate support for the young people. A full-time project worker/coordinator delivers the programme, along with a part-time support worker, who works closely with the schools and the project worker when he works with female youth.

Set up of the project

The MYC is based in Manukau City and it operates under the legal entity Manukau Youth Resource Centre (MYRC), which was established in 1994. MYC has been in the business of positive youth development since 1995 and offers a range of health and well-being services to young people aged 12 to 24 years in the South Auckland area. MYC also provides a drop-in facility and enables young people free, weekly access to medical services on site; the Centre for Youth Health provides this service. MYC employs ten staff, including the YDF project worker.

In June 2002, the MYC received funding to run the Life is 4 Living youth development project, later renamed Tumau Tutoa. The project did not start until October 2002, when the MYC appointed a full-time project worker.

The application for YDF funding, the MYC's 6-month monitoring report and the CDG Advisor's report have been used to identify the components of the project, and these are shown in the intervention logic model in diagram 1e in appendix 3.
Results of the design evaluation

The design evaluation assesses the project’s first six months in relation to each of the following questions:

*Are the project workers in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?*

The project workers have delivered a number of activities that make up the Tumau Tutoa programme, including youth resiliency and well-being courses, activities to enhance and reward young people’s self-worth, such as camps, and engaging young people in goal-setting. The project’s CDG Advisor noted that from October 2002 to May 2003, the youth worker worked with 24 young people, of whom the majority were between 16 and 18 years of age and were of Pacific descent (May, 2003). The characteristics of these young people are consistent with the project’s target group.

There is evidence that the full-time project worker’s engagement with the young people, their families and their community has been effective. The project’s 6-month report states that “A major advantage for this programme is having -- -- coordinating the services as he is well known and well respected by many Pacific Island people. He is fluent in Niuean, which has added additional strength to this programme” (MYC manager, May, 2003).

The project’s Advisor also positively commented about the project worker describing him as “very clearly focused on youth and youth needs in the Manukau community and also very passionate and committed to meeting the needs of youth, their families and the communities they live in” (May, 2003).

*Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver its services and programmes?*

*Tumau Tutoa’s* main initiatives are a 10-12 month programme and networking with other support organisations/groups in the area. The logic model for *Tumau Tutoa* (see appendix 3) demonstrates that the project is implementing two main initiatives and a range of activities that are contributing to the desired short and long-term outcomes.
Tumau Tutoa is a four-stage programme that uses a wide range of activities and resources to support, develop and reward the young participants.

The project worker is establishing links with other support agencies and organisations in the area.

As a result of networking “MYC exceeded their initial candidate intake by 3 and was forced to close the programme intake until the next one scheduled for June 2003”.

The project’s administrative, human resource and ethical practices are in place.

Examples of the initiatives and activities include:

- The Tumau Tutoa programme, which is delivered in four stages, beginning with a needs assessment. The programme uses a range of activities and resources, including goal setting, one-on-one mentoring, linking young people to specialist support services, a life-skills backpack, courses for young people (for example, in youth resiliency and well-being), enhancement activities (for example, arts and crafts, and camps) to reward and enhance young people’s self worth, developing future personal action plans, and providing ongoing support as required.

- Developing positive and strong linkages to a network of service providers, Pacific communities and the wider community. Activities include calls to agencies to promote the programme and networking with community providers and services.

*Is the project beginning to establish effective links with other support agencies in the area?*

The project has begun establishing links with other support agencies and the 6-month monitoring report notes that the project worker “commenced networking with local community services, groups and schools”. The Centre for Youth Health, Affirming Women, Strengthening Families, Pacific World Inc, and Counties Manukau Sports are examples of groups with which the project worker liaised. As a result of networking “MYC exceeded their initial candidate intake by 3 and was forced to close the programme intake until the next one scheduled for June 2003” (6-month report, May, 2003).

The MYC manager also commented “the programme appears to be well-received throughout the community and local high schools, despite adverse publicity of the topic of youth suicide” (May, 2003). In addition, the MYC also was involved with the Youth and Youth Workers Capacity Conference (Advisor’s report, May 2003).

*Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?*

The MYC has a clear management structure with responsibilities identified for each employee. The Centre’s human resource processes are in place, as evidenced in the documentation submitted with the project’s funding application.
The CDG Advisor confirms that the project has good organisational practices in place and is operating professionally.

No internal issues have been identified at this stage of the project.

A number of external issues have impacted on the project’s ability to make progress but the project has responded positively to these.

These processes include the youth worker’s position description, staff performance review form, complaints procedure and policy, abuse policy and procedures, draft employment contract, and outline of financial systems and controls. The project worker/coordinator is responsible to the MYC manager, with whom he meets fortnightly.

The MYC manager and project worker submit monthly reports to the Project Management Group. The project worker is also responsible for submitting milestone and quality reports to the Project Management Team. The youth development project worker is supervised and supported by the MYC manager and also receives administrative support from the MYC. The individual employment contract submitted with the funding application states that MYC acknowledges and supports the personal and professional development of its staff.

In support of the project’s professional practices, the Advisor commented: “My observation of the organisation and the youth associated with the project verified the professionalism in terms of staff and youth management skills, financial management, co-ordination and delegation of duties and each member being supportive and caring for the needs of the participants and each other” (May, 2003).

Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?

No issues have been identified at this stage in the project.

Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project’s ability to deliver its services and programmes?

Although the MYC has made good progress towards meeting its objectives, a number of issues that caused delays initially have been reported by the project team. These are:

- Late launch of Tumau Tutoa due to delays in setting up the administration for the programme.
- In January 2003, a letter co-written by the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Youth Affairs was distributed to schools around New Zealand. The letter warned schools about engaging external providers of any programmes relating to youth suicide. The project’s 6-month report comments that the letter was damning and had a potential to “scare-off” anyone considering participating in the MYC Life is 4 Living programme. In response, MYC changed the name of the project to “Tumau Tutoa”, which means “Stand Strong”.
- The MYC engages other service providers to be part of Tumau Tutoa programme and deliver a range of activities. At times, other service providers unexpectedly cannot deliver the programme and inform Tumau Tutoa of this at short notice. Tumau Tutoa then engages an alternative provider, but this can cause some delays in programme delivery.

- Programme candidates making excuses not to attend. The 6-month monitoring report notes that “this had a great impact on the rest of the group as their absence was sorely missed”, in response, “positive group reassurances were required and follow ups undertaken to establish the whereabouts of missing programme candidates. Home visits and regular whānau contact has assured ongoing commitment” (May, 2003).

**Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?**

Tumau Tutoa has only provided a 6-month monitoring report, due to delays in starting the project. It also has met the requirement to submit annual audited accounts. The components of the logic model have been agreed with the project worker and a series of evaluation questions for the process and outcome evaluations also have been agreed (see appendices 3 and 4).

**Evaluators’ preliminary assessment and recommendations**

Tumau Tutoa’s full-time project worker is in place and has begun to engage effectively with the target group through various activities and programmes. The project worker has also begun to establish effective links with other support agencies in South Auckland. The MYC’s presence in this community since 1994 is likely to have helped in this process.

The project has faced a number of challenges in its first six months of operation, but has managed to counter these and moreover, learn from this experience. The MYC Manager commented “Due to ability to improvise and remain flexible, we are able to turn weaknesses into strengths. Situations such as these can provide real life examples to our young people that life often throws you an unexpected curve ball, which can be turned into a positive” (May, 2003).
We commend the project's positive outlook and recommend that the project continues to evaluate and report on the challenges it faces and the lessons learned.

Overall, the CDG Advisor comments that “Manukau Youth Centre was disadvantaged through internal issues, however it has achieved the outcomes required” (May, 2003) and recommends that the MYC board ensures that employees are supported to attend appropriate training and take an active role in planning and directing the project.

3.6 Rau O Te Huia Trust - Youth Development Project, Rotorua

Purpose of the project

The Rau O Te Huia Trust, in conjunction with Fordlands Community Support Team, runs this youth development project, which aims to improve the well-being of youth living in the Fordlands community, a particularly disadvantaged community in Rotorua.

The project targets young people aged 15-24 years. Young people of all ethnic backgrounds are encouraged to participate in the project, but a high proportion is Māori.

The youth development project was established to address some of the issues and trends that are impacting on young people in the Fordlands community, including suicide, drugs and alcohol, low educational attainments, unemployment and inter-generational welfare dependency.

The project aims to provide young people with information and access to services before or at times of crisis. It also aims to develop leadership skills, provide support for the young people, develop consultation processes to involve youth in Fordlands’ community issues, and address youth training and employment needs in the area.

It aims to establish and maintain a youth centre in Fordlands, and be visible in the community, particularly to youth. The project recognises that, in order to achieve these aims, it needs to develop collaborative relationships with schools, community and government organisations.
Set up of the project

The Rau O Te Huia Trust was established in 1993 to provide mental health residential services for Māori. The Trust’s primary business is providing 24-hour residential mental health services for psychiatric patients, with a Māori kaupapa that uses holistic principles to facilitate general well-being. The Rau O Te Huia Trust is based in Rotorua.

In October 2002, the Trust received approval for three years of funding for a youth development project, but the project was not launched until December 2002, when a full-time youth development officer was employed. The delay occurred because the management of the project was transferred from a partnership between the Fordlands Community Association and Fordlands Community Support Team to a partnership between the Fordlands Community Support Team and the Rau O Te Huia Trust. According to the project’s CDG Advisor: “This created an issue with the community of Fordlands whereby it was seen once again as outside organisations ‘developing’ them” (June, 2003).

The situation has since improved, as the project started by researching the community’s needs, and the advisor comments that: “It has taken at least 6 months throughout the research period to facilitate the development of positive relationships between the Rau O Te Huia, the Fordlands Community Association, the people of Fordlands and the Youth Development Worker” (June, 2003). The project also experienced a high turnover of youth development officers, which added to the challenges this project faced in its first year of operation.

The project began by surveying whānau to identify the issues facing the community and their needs. Conducting the research also allowed the project worker to develop relationships with the young people and their whānau in Fordlands. This "needs analysis" is being used to identify and prioritise programmes for young people. The Trust is a kaupapa Māori provider and the design of programmes draws on knowledge of local culture and tikanga. The Trust works collaboratively with other key players providing youth services in the area.

The application for YDF funding and the 4 and 6-month monitoring reports submitted by Rau O Te Huia Trust, as well as the CDG Advisor's report have been used to identify the components of the project. These are shown in the intervention logic model in diagram 1f in appendix 3.
Results of the design evaluation

The design evaluation assesses the project’s first six months in relation to each of the following questions:

Are the project workers in place and are they beginning to engage effectively with the young people the project targets, their families and communities?

The project worker has used a "needs analysis" research project to provide a basis for identifying and prioritising programmes for young people in Fordlands. The research involved talking to young people and their families about a number of sensitive issues such as drugs, alcohol and different forms of abuse in their environment. This interaction has allowed the project worker to establish a very good rapport with the participants.

The research report indicates that this rapport was achieved: “Being able to communicate with the 20 whānau that participated in the survey was the highlight of the five-month project. The youth development officer engaged with the families in a non-threatening manner that was accepted and appreciated from all participants” (June, 2003). This has contributed to a positive relationship building between the Fordlands community and the Trust.

Recent discussions with the project team confirm that the full-time youth development officer (YDO) currently employed to deliver the programmes is beginning to establish a positive working relationship with the Fordlands community (December, 2003).

Has the project developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver its services and programmes?

The logic model for the Rau O Te Huia Trust (see appendix 3) demonstrates that the project is implementing a range of initiatives and activities that are contributing to the desired short and long-term outcomes. The initiatives and activities include, for example:

- Research to establish specific issues in the Fordlands community and prioritise programmes for young people.
- Establishing a youth centre in Fordlands.
- Developing relationships with young people and their whānau through a range of non-threatening activities, including outdoor activities and camping, drug and alcohol programmes, young parent and health programmes, and education and employment programmes.
The project has established effective links with other support agencies in the area

The project’s 6-month report states that the YDO has established working relationships with other community organisations: “Throughout the five months of research by the Youth Development Officer, various community organisations, government organisations, schools and youth services have aided him in his journey. The consistency of networking with these people has contributed to the final needs analysis that has been developed for programme development for the target group - 15 to 24 years in the area of Fordlands” (June, 2003).

More specifically, the project has liaised with a number of groups and organisations including three iwi providers in Fordlands: Te Waiariki Purea Trust, Ngati Pikiao Runanga, and Mana Social Services, and Housing New Zealand, WINZ, Westend Police, Youth Aid Police, Rotorua Community Youth Centre, CYFS, as evidenced in the project’s monitoring report (April, 2003).

Does the project have good administrative, human resource and ethical practices in place?

The Rau O Te Huia Trust has a management structure for the project and responsibilities identified for each project worker. The Trust’s human resource processes are in place as evidenced in the documentation submitted with the project’s funding application. These processes include: the youth development officer’s job description, complaints procedure and policy, draft employment agreement, outline of the project’s self-evaluation plan, and financial management procedures.

The YDO reports weekly to the Advisory Management Team (AMT) and is responsible to the project co-ordinator. Procedures are in place for performance appraisal. The AMT provides support and oversight of the project, oversees and authorises the release of reporting, monitors and evaluates the obligations of the project, and advises the Trustees on the project’s progress. In the initial stages of the project, the AMT met monthly and is now meeting bi-monthly. The YDO is supported by the Trust's administrative staff and AMT.

The Trust encourages the YDO to identify training needs and attend conferences and training

The Trust encourages the YDO to identify training needs. Examples of this support are evident from the 6-month monitoring report, with the YDO attending the SPINZ conference and the Youth Workers Training Conference.
The project has overcome some initial challenges and is on target to start achieving its short-term outcomes.

Are there any aspects of the project that are not working as intended and, if so, are steps in place to counter these?

Although a number of factors might have impacted adversely on the project's progress (for example, high project staff turnover), the Trust has been proactive in minimising these effects (for example, immediately employing another project staff member) and the project has continued to operate. As a result, the project is on target to start working towards achieving its short-term outcomes.

Are there any external circumstances that are impacting on the project's ability to deliver its services and programmes?

The project operates in a challenging environment, and support from the community and a local organisation such as the Fordland's Community Association is crucial to its success.

The environment in which this project operates is challenging. The Trust is based in Rotorua, yet the project operates in the Fordlands community, in Rotorua. From the oral reports by the Rau O Te Huia Trust, the Fordlands community is resistant to “outside” intervention, which causes stagnation in the community and places the youth at high risk. The project co-ordinator commented that the community “has become cynical” of different programmes offered in the past, since the programmes did not meet the young people’s needs and were, therefore, poorly attended” (December, 2003).

It is of crucial importance, therefore, that the project has support from an “inside” organisation, such as Fordlands Community Association. Although these factors have not slowed the project’s progress so far, they have the potential to impact on the project and the YDO, and the Trust needs to remain alert to the challenges of the environment in which they are working.

Has a monitoring and evaluation framework been agreed for the project?

The Trust has submitted its monitoring reports, annual audited accounts, and evaluation questions for the outcome and process evaluation have been agreed.

The Rau O Te Huia Trust has provided 4 and 6-month reports which monitor the progress of the project. The project’s annual monitoring report had not been submitted at the time of writing this report, as the project had not been operating for the full twelve months. The Trust has met the requirement to submit annual audited accounts. The components of the logic model have been agreed with the project workers and a series of evaluation questions for the process and outcome evaluations also have been agreed (see appendices 3 and 4).
The first six months of the project have been dedicated to a research project, which is providing a good foundation for identifying youth development programmes.

The recently employed YDO is known in the Fordlands community and is establishing good working relationships within the community.

The project has made satisfactory progress with implementing its initiatives. Most importantly, by conducting research to identify community requirements, and then developing and implementing programmes based on this analysis, the project is well placed to meet the needs of the young people in the community.

The research has not only provided useful information for the project, but has also helped build relationships between the project and the Fordlands community. We recommend that, to fully utilise the findings from the research, the project uses its monitoring reports to reflect on how the research findings have been/are being addressed by the initiatives that the project implements.

**Evaluators’ preliminary assessment and recommendations**

The design evaluation is based on the Te Rau o Te Huia Trust youth development project’s first six months of operation. During this period the project has completed a research project, which is providing a good foundation for identifying and prioritising a number of youth development programmes.

The project has recently employed a full-time YDO, who is known in the Fordlands community and is establishing good working relationships within the community. The new project worker is currently focusing on implementing various programmes (oral feedback from the project’s coordinator, December, 2003).

The project has made satisfactory progress with implementing its initiatives. Most importantly, by conducting research to identify community requirements, and then developing and implementing programmes based on this analysis, the project is well placed to meet the needs of the young people in the community.

The research has not only provided useful information for the project, but has also helped build relationships between the project and the Fordlands community. We recommend that, to fully utilise the findings from the research, the project uses its monitoring reports to reflect on how the research findings have been/are being addressed by the initiatives that the project implements.
4. **Next Steps**

The next stage of the evaluation will be a **process evaluation**. Research Services will carry out this stage by answering the process evaluation questions that have been agreed with each project and are listed in appendix 4. Information to answer these questions will come from the projects and Advisors' monitoring reports, project documentation, and from discussions with the project workers and a small number of stakeholders. A report on this stage of the evaluation is scheduled for March 2004.

The final stage will be an **outcome evaluation**. External evaluators will be invited to tender for this stage. Research Services will write a project brief for this work and help CDG to manage the project.

The outcome evaluation will be guided by the questions for this stage, which have been agreed with the projects (see appendix 4). Information to answer these questions will come from feedback from a cross section of the projects' stakeholders, as well as analysis of the monitoring reports and project documentation, and discussions with the project workers and Advisors.

The timing of this final stage will depend on how long the project funding continues. The YDF distribution committee will shortly be asked to approve a fourth year of funding for the six projects. If an extension is granted, the outcome evaluation will take place midway through 2005. If an extension is not granted, then the outcome evaluation will be completed midway through 2004, in order to report to the distribution committee by September 2004.
5. Concluding Comments

The six YDF projects being funded for the three years 2002-2005 are located throughout New Zealand; two are in South Auckland, and the others are working with young people in Fordlands (in Rotorua), Opotiki, and the South Canterbury and West Coast regions, and one project is administered nationally. The projects target diverse groups of young people at risk, including Māori and Pacific youth, as well as young people who face challenges of social and gender identity and rural isolation.

The design evaluation demonstrates that the projects are established and on target to meet their short-term outcomes. Evidence of the progress made by the projects includes:

- Project workers are in place and are beginning to engage with the young people, their whānau and communities through hui/meetings, wananga/workshops, and other reported initiatives and activities.
- All of the projects have developed a structured set of initiatives to deliver their services and programmes. The project intervention logic models developed and agreed with each project confirm that these initiatives will contribute to the projects’ short and long-term outcomes, as well as the overall project objectives and the goals of NZYSPS.
- Effective links are being established with other support agencies and community organisations.
- The documents submitted by the projects in support of their applications and monitoring reports show that good administrative, human resource and ethical practices are in place.
- Projects have reported either internal or external issues that have impacted and/or have the potential to impact on the projects’ ability to make progress, and, where applicable, have identified measures to counter these.
- Monitoring processes and an evaluation framework has been agreed with each project.

All the projects have submitted their monitoring reports on schedule and have demonstrated commitment to the monitoring and evaluation process.
Research Services has started the process evaluation and is developing the specification for the outcome evaluation.

The experience of the YDF-funded projects indicates that a significant period of time is required to establish a successful youth development project, and this limits the time for delivery of the programmes in a three-year period.

Research Services is already beginning to assemble information for the process evaluation, which will be completed by the end of March 2004. Research Services also is developing the specification for the outcome evaluation and suitably qualified external evaluators will be invited to tender for this work shortly.

The design evaluation shows that the two projects that received YDF funding in the first round (Pacific World’s Ola Matinoa and Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust’s Opotiki Youth Development Project) are now well established and working well with the young people, their whānau/families, and their communities.

In contrast, the other four projects have used much of the first year to get established, build relationships with the young people and their communities, and establish credibility with other service providers. The design evaluation indicates that this time has been well spent and all four projects have built a good foundation for their initiatives and activities.

The experience of the YDF-funded projects indicates that time required to establish a successful youth development project should not be underestimated. This establishment period, however, limits the amount of time that is available for the delivery of the programmes when project funding is for three years.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Goals from the New Zealand Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy

Goals for In Our Hands

Goal 1: Promoting Well-being

1. Support for families/whānau to increase the well-being of their young people.
2. Support initiatives which promote the mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.
3. Support initiatives to reduce the stigma of mental illness.
4. Encourage the participation of young people in all aspects of community life and in decisions which impact upon them.
5. Promote opportunities to enable young people to develop and affirm their own identity.
6. Support initiatives which address social inequality, discrimination and abuse where they impact on young people.

Goal 2: Early Identification and Help

1. Improve capacity of those who work with young people, to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.
2. Ensure that information is available to those in contact with young people to help them identify and respond to young people who may be at risk of suicide.
3. Support initiatives to reduce young people’s risk-taking behaviour where this has a negative consequence on their or others’ health and well-being.
4. Ensure that primary health, mental health, and drug and alcohol services are responsive to the culture, gender and sexual orientation of young people.
5. Reduce opportunities for self-harm and suicide.
6. Reduce messages in the media that suggest suicide as an acceptable problem-solving option.

Goal 3: Crisis Support and Treatment

1. Ensure that crisis support services are available, accessible and effective for young people who are suicidal or who have attempted suicide.
2. Ensure that all hospitals and emergency health services respond effectively and appropriately to young people who have attempted suicide.
3. Ensure that young people who have attempted suicide have access to follow-up services which are appropriate and effective.
4. Encourage opportunities for families/whānau to be involved in the care and support of their young people.
5. Encourage co-ordination and collaboration between service providers to ensure that young people receive an effective and seamless service.

Goal 4: Support After a Suicide

1. Ensure that responsive and culturally appropriate support and grief counselling are available to those bereaved by suicide.
2. Ensure that those who have a key role following a suicide are informed about appropriate behaviour and approaches that will minimise the likelihood of further suicide.
3. Encourage communities and organisations to become informed about behaviour and approaches that will minimise the likelihood of further suicides.
4. Ensure that the media are aware of the risk in reporting, discussing and depicting suicide, to minimalise normalisation of suicide and imitative suicides.
Goal 5: Information and Research

1. Promote research into the design and evaluation of suicide prevention and intervention initiatives.
2. Promote and prioritise research into suicidal behaviour among young people, including Māori and Pacific peoples, and sexual orientation-focused research and protective factors.
3. Promote the co-ordination, collection and dissemination of research, information and best practice to all involved in suicide prevention.
4. Improve statistical information about the trends and rates of suicide behaviours among young people.

Goals for Kia Piki te Ora o te Taitamariki

Goal 1: Strengthening Whānau, Hapū, Iwi and Māori

1. Highlight the significance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in promoting wellness amongst whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori.
2. Encourage whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori to challenge discriminatory attitudes and practices to those with mental illness.
3. Increase awareness and application of a Māori holistic approach to wellness which includes te taha wairua (spiritual), te taha whānau (social), te taha hinengaro (mental and emotional) and te taha tinana (physical).
4. Develop better support systems for taitamariki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori affected by suicide.
5. Strengthen the role of kaumātua (elders) in the development of taitamariki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori.
6. Improve support for ‘by Māori for Māori’ service providers and programmes.
7. Increase awareness amongst taitamariki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori of the negative effects of alcohol and drug misuse and peer pressure on health and wellness.

Goal 2: Taitamariki (youth) Development

1. Increase taitamariki Māori participation in Māori participation in Māori health, social, educational, political, economic and tribal development.
2. Encourage taitamariki Māori to play a leadership role in the design, promotion and delivery of development programmes and services for taitamariki Māori.
3. Encourage discussion amongst taitamariki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori on issues that impact on taitamariki Māori such as unemployment, racism, abuse neglect, peer pressure, family breakdown, sexuality, relationship difficulties.
4. Encourage the development of education scholarships for taitamariki Māori.

Goal 3: Cultural Development

1. Support wānanga for raising the awareness of traditional beliefs and responses to suicide.
2. Promote a Māori cultural base, including relevant Māori values and concepts, in the promotion of taitamariki health and wellness.
3. Encourage the retention and revival of te reo and tikanga Māori (which includes song, dance, history, traditional art, craft and sport) to foster a strong sense of identity amongst taitamariki.
4. Enhance Māori healing practices as valid methodologies and tools of empowerment in the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of Māori illness, and in strengthening taitamariki Māori.

Goal 4: Mainstream Responsiveness

1. Promote Māori workforce development strategies and training in mainstream services.
2. Develop effective cultural protocols and training programmes in prisons, educational institutions and other settings where Māori are placed.
3. Involve whānau in the case management of Māori within mainstream settings.
4. Ensure that policy and service delivery for mainstream initiatives in relation to youth suicide are developed in partnership with Māori.
Goal 5: Information and Research

1. Encourage the development of ‘by Māori for Māori’ research as a means of improving the definition, data gathering and the information base covering demographic, social and economic aspects of tātai mariki Māori suicide.

2. Promote the evaluation of suicide prevention programmes and services (both ‘for Māori by Māori’ and mainstream) to ensure all approaches are safe and effective for the prevention of tātai mariki suicide.

3. Developing and disseminating information resources for tātai mariki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori on suicide prevention.

4. Improve the accuracy of ethnicity recording for Māori for suicide, and hospital admissions for suicide attempts.

5. Encourage better collaboration and co-ordination amongst those involved in research on Māori suicide.
Appendix 2: Glossary of terms used

Different definitions are used in the literature to describe the different stages and components of evaluations. The definition of terms given here illustrates the way that the terms are used in this report and draws on a number of sources (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>The range of things that are done to implement initiatives. For example, an initiative to increase community awareness about the issues young people face may be achieved through activities such as community workshops, media activities, and published information. Activities result in outputs. For example, the project worker may run three community workshops, and publish 1000 copies of a leaflet, which are distributed through six outlets in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (or formative) evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation to assess if a project is well constructed and on track to meet its outcomes. This evaluation takes place shortly after the project has started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation is the systematic examination and assessment of a project in order to produce information that can be used by those who have an interest in its effectiveness or improvement – in other words, to judge how well the project has done and what it might have done better. [Note: effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which a project achieves its planned results (aim, outcomes and outputs). Evaluations also may look at the efficiency of a project, which is a measure of the extent to which project outcomes are produced at reasonable cost and in reasonable time.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td>Questions about the project and impact of the project that the evaluation is designed to answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>The person carrying out the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal (or aim)</td>
<td>A broad statement about the outcomes that a project wants to achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicators are the information (or measures) used to answer the evaluation questions. This information may come from a variety of data sources, such as the project's records and documentation, or from consulting or surveying organisations and community members with which the project works. Indicators can be qualitative and quantitative and may include targets (for example, if a project aims to network with other organisations, it may set itself the target of establishing and maintaining links with six other organisations providing services for young people).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>The project's main <em>programmes</em> or strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>The main investments and resources the project uses, including people, funding and other organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic model</td>
<td>A model that describes the core components of a project and illustrates the connection between the components and the intended outcomes. It also shows relevant external influences that may impact on the project, either positively or negatively. The model may also show how the project will contribute to government goals and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>The regular collection of information to track the progress of a project against what is (was) planned and intended. Monitoring provides early indications of a lack of progress with any of the project's initiatives and allows corrective measures to be identified and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs analysis</td>
<td>The process of identifying the needs of a particular group for the purpose of planning an effective project. A needs analysis involves seeking input from all relevant groups, as well as gathering information from documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Specific statements about what the project aims to achieve or change in order to make progress towards the aim and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation to look at whether or not a project is achieving (or has achieved) the outcomes it is seeking. Any unintended consequences of the project – both positive and negative – also can be identified. This evaluation takes place at or towards the end of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>The actual changes and effects the project (or programme) achieves for participants and other people who benefit from the project. Most evaluations separate out short and long-term changes/effects. Some also differentiate between immediate changes/effects and divide long-term changes/effects into short-term (or intermediate) and long-term outcomes (also referred to as ultimate impact).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this evaluation outcomes are divided into:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>short-term outcomes</strong>, which include changes in knowledge and skills, and indications that behaviours are beginning to change as a result of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>long-term outcomes</strong>, which include changes in behaviour, values, conditions and status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>These are the direct, or tangible, products and services delivered as a result of implementing activities. For example, the number of workshops / wananga run and the number of young people taking part in each event, or the number of resources published and disseminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>A linked set of initiatives/activities delivered by a project. A programme is usually run in stages and over a period of time. A programme to increase self-esteem among young people delivered in two stages, over a period of 10 months, is an example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>A planned undertaking of a set of initiatives and activities to deliver products and services (outputs) that contribute to the project’s overall goal (aim). A project usually has a timeframe, with a definite beginning and ending, and it cannot be run without resources (inputs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation to describe and document what actually happened (is happening) in the course of a project. This evaluation takes place mid-way in the lifecycle of a project and can be used to improve the project as it progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Any individual or group that may be significantly involved, affected by or have an interest, in the project and its evaluation (for example, young people, whānau / family, the community, funders, other service providers).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources used for definitions:**


Appendix 3: Logic models

Diagram 1a - Pacific World: Programme Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff – 2 youth workers</td>
<td>1. School-Based Prevention Project: i) mentoring and monitoring in weekly meetings with students at schools ii) regular family home visits</td>
<td>1. Number of weekly meetings. 2. Number of students attending meetings. 3. Number of students preparing Pathway Action Plans with clearly agreed outcomes and closure timeframes. 4. Number of family visits.</td>
<td>1. Students identify issues, set goals and plan ways to address them. 2. Students develop their understanding of health and social issues affecting them. 3. High risk students identified by the youth workers and referred to agencies.</td>
<td>1. Well-being of young people improved and likelihood of self-harm decreases. 2. Young people develop self-management and improved coping skills.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 4 &amp; 5  YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1 / 2 – support initiatives which promote the mental health and wellbeing of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups</td>
<td>2. Pacific Island Church/ community development</td>
<td>1. Number of groups establish/maintain relationships with.</td>
<td>1. Community has increased understanding of the issues associated with self harm. 2. Community involved in way services delivered by project.</td>
<td>1. Capacity of community to support young people at risk increased.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 3  YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1 – overall – promoting wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families/ whanau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pacific World – Project Objectives

### Pacific World: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Initiatives/Activities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Short-term outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Long-term-outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Project objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Immediate intervention for high-risk students</td>
<td>1. Number of agencies establish/maintain relationships with.</td>
<td>1. Young people referred to support agencies and social and personal issues addressed.</td>
<td>1. Risk factors reduced and fewer young people require referral to agencies.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 1 and 2 YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 3 / 1 – ensure that crisis support services are available, accessible and effective for young people who are suicidal or who have attempted suicide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) young people referred to support agencies</td>
<td>2. Number of young people referred.</td>
<td>2. Service delivery by agencies for PI youth improved.</td>
<td>2. Service delivery for community and youth at risk improved, for example, ex-clients refer themselves to support agencies when they need help.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 4 &amp; 5 YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1 / 2 – support initiatives which promote the mental health and wellbeing of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) links established with support agencies</td>
<td>3. Number of calls to 0800 number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 0800 crisis number</td>
<td>4. Database set up / maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) crisis intervention service/contacts and database</td>
<td>5. Number of risk management plans created for young people and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) profiling</td>
<td>2. Number of young people returning to school / entering job placements and employment.</td>
<td>2. Students develop their understanding of health and social issues affecting them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) cultural audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of families interacting with youth workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Number of active partnerships with schools and service providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) develop plans with young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) involve young people's families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pacific World: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Incentive Activity Programme, for example: i) youth camps ii) arts projects iii) Polynesian festival iv) Southside &quot;gigs&quot; v) Sports vi) Basketball vii) Family BBQs</td>
<td>1. Number of Activity programmes. 2. Number of young people involved in organising programmes. 3. Number of people attending events. 4. Number of young people engaging with families.</td>
<td>1. Young people gain planning/organisational/leadership skills. 2. Number of families interacting with the youth workers. 3. Links with families re-established/strengthened.</td>
<td>1. Young people's self esteem is increased and they are encouraged to participate in their community. 2. Young people's social skills increased. 3. Family units strengthened/empowered.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 4 YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1/4 – encourage the participation of young people in all aspects of community life and in decisions which impact upon them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Student diary project i) young people create diaries containing contacts, information about health and mental issues and other youth-related resources and update them regularly.</td>
<td>1. Number of young people creating and maintaining diaries. 2. Number of completed objectives that were planned. 3. Number of completed and monitored diary sheets. 4. Number of sessions the youth workers have with young people to update diaries.</td>
<td>1. Young people have culturally appropriate information and resources.</td>
<td>1. Young people's knowledge and social skills increased.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 4 YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1/3 – support initiatives to reduce the stigma of mental illness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pacific World: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives (YSPS Goals / objectives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Cultural identity strengthened through:</td>
<td>1. Number of events.</td>
<td>1. Young people know more about their cultural identity.</td>
<td>1. Cultural and spiritual well-being of young people increased.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 4 YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1 / 5 – promote opportunities to enable young people to develop and affirm their own identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) cultural audit</td>
<td>2. Number of young people increasing knowledge of culture through participating in events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) learning protocols / language</td>
<td>3. Number of families participating actively and providing positive reinforcement of culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) telling stories / histories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) music / art / fashion / food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) role models and cultural supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Training for youth workers in:</td>
<td>1. Number of courses attended by the youth workers.</td>
<td>1. Positive learning outcomes achieved.</td>
<td>1. Improved capacity of youth development workers for PI community.</td>
<td>Pacific World objective: Focus 1 YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 2 / 1 – improve capacity of those who work with young people, to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) adolescent assessment</td>
<td>2. Number of providers delivering training and professional development.</td>
<td>2. Performance of the youth workers developed</td>
<td>2. Increased employment and retention of youth workers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Pacific multi-ethnic protocol training</td>
<td>3. Recognition of Ola Mautinoa as a training and development model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) frustration of working with young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Treaty of Waitangi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) mental health issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) karakia / waiata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pacific World: Programme Logic Model - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives / YSPS Goals / Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | 9. Organisational development for Pacific World  
  i) financial and management training for trust | 1. Courses attended.  
  2. Ola Mautinoa marketing strategy developed. | 1. Management of Pacific World improved.  
  2. Ola Mautinoa develops options for continuing service development beyond YDF funding. | 1. Project infrastructure developed and sustained.  
  2. Ola Mautinoa service provision sustainable. | Pacific World objective:  
Focus 2  
YSPS goals/objectives:  
Goal 2 / 1 – improve capacity of those who work with young people, to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide. |
|        | 10. Young Pacific People Research | 1. Evaluation by DIA.  
  2. Community feedback. | 1. Increased knowledge of effectiveness of suicide prevention strategies for PI youth. | Pacific World objective:  
Focus 6  
YSPS goals/objectives:  
Goal 5 / 1 – promote research into the design and evaluation of suicide prevention and intervention initiatives |

**External Influential Factors**  
Pacific World Board, Funding, Social / Economic Environment / Cultural and Spiritual Identity Issues
Diagram 1b - Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust Logic Model

| Inputs | Initiatives/Activities | Outputs | Short-term outcomes | Long-term-outcomes | Project objectives

- Youth co-ordinator
- Youth worker
- Other community groups
- Agencies providing support services
- Funding
- Support from Te Hä O Te Whanau Trust

1. Provide programmes and activities that promote the holistic well-being and development of rangatahi across 5 key dimensions*.

   - i) Noho Marae
   - ii) Mana Rangatahi classes for students
   - iii) wananga
   - iv) camps
   - v) teenage parenting programme
   - vi) smoking cessation programme
   - vii) after-school and holiday programmes
   - viii) College kapa haka and cultural wananga
   - ix) health promotion.

1. Number and frequency of programmes / activities delivered.
2. Number and characteristics of participants in programmes / activities.
3. Results from programme evaluations.

1. Rangatahi participating in a range of programmes providing positive activities and learning and leadership opportunities.
2. Rangatahi learning to mix together, work cooperatively and explore issues relevant to them in a safe and supportive environment.
3. Rangatahi beginning to develop their cultural awareness, self-esteem and coping strategies.
4. Young parents beginning to improve their parenting skills.

1. Rangatahi demonstrate increased self-esteem, resiliency and knowledge of coping strategies.
2. Rangatahi have a strong sense of Māori identity and identify with their culture and heritage in ways which contribute to their total well-being – spiritual, social, mental and physical.
3. Rangatahi are equipped with the skills and knowledge to be parents.

* the 5 dimensions are: te taha wairua – spiritual; te taha tinana – physical; te taha hinengaro – mental & emotional; whanaungatanga – kinship / relationships; and te taha taiao - environmental

Kia Piki objective
Goal 1/3 – increase awareness and application of a Maori holistic approach to wellness.
Goal 1/7 – improve support for ‘by Māori for Māori’ programmes.
Goal 3/2 – promote a Māori cultural base.

YSPS objective
Goal 1/2 – support initiatives which promote mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.
Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity.

Te Hä O Te Whanau objective
(Aim 1)
To provide a range of programmes and activities that promote holistic well-being and development of rangatahi across five key dimensions.

Kia Piki objective
Goal 1/3 – increase awareness and application of a Maori holistic approach to wellness.
Goal 1/7 – improve support for ‘by Māori for Māori’ programmes.
Goal 3/2 – promote a Māori cultural base.

YSPS objective
Goal 1/2 – support initiatives which promote mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.
Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | 2. Raise awareness about the project's aims and objectives by:                         |         | 1. Community reports increased awareness of project's aims and objectives and needs of rangatahi. | 1. Community aware of, and responsive to, the needs of rangatahi and the challenges they face. | Te Hā O Te Whanau objective (Aim 3) To raise awareness about project aims and objectives.  
|        | i) community youth radio show – Radio Mulcha                                           |         |                                                                                     |                                                        | Kia Piki objective Goal 1/3 – increase awareness and application of a Māori holistic approach to wellness.  
|        | ii) promotion of services on youth radio, including the parenting programmes,           |         |                                                                                     |                                                        | YSPS objective Goal 1/2 – support initiatives which promote the mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.  
|        | Hauora (health) information, and Mahia te Mahi workshops                               |         |                                                                                     |                                                        |                                                                                  |
|        | iii) 0800 Youthline                                                                    |         |                                                                                     |                                                        |                                                                                  |
|        | iv) community events and celebrations                                                  |         |                                                                                     |                                                        |                                                                                  |
|        | v) media releases around traumatic events                                               |         |                                                                                     |                                                        |                                                                                  |
|        | vi) working with other groups providing Youth services                                 |         |                                                                                     |                                                        |                                                                                  |
### Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives Kia Piki and YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.     | Raise rangatahi's awareness of the supporting networks within the community. For example by:  
  i) publishing a directory of support services for all students at Opotiki College and Te Whanau a Apanui Area School  
  ii) disseminating messages using programmes run by the project. | 1. Number of directories published and disseminated. | 1. The directory of services is distributed to all students.  
  2. Students show increased awareness and use of rangatahi-relevant support services. | 1. Information on support services is readily available to young people in Opotiki. | Te Hā O Te Whanau objective (Am 3)  
To raise the awareness of rangatahi of the networks within community that provide support and assistance.  
Kia Piki objective  
Goal 5/3 – developing and disseminating information resources for taitamariki, whanau, hapu, iwi, and Maori on suicide prevention.  
YSPS objective  
Goal 1/3 – support initiatives to reduce stigma of mental illness. |

---

*DIA, Research Services: February 2004*
### Kia Piki and YSPS Goals / Objectives

#### Te Hā O Te Whanau objective
- **Goal 3**: To provide a base for rangatahi to meet and interact within a supportive and safe environment.

#### YSPS objective
- **Goal 1/4**: Encourage the participation of young people in all aspects of community life and in decisions which impact upon them.
### Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kia Piki and YSPS Goals / objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Develop a peer support team, by identifying youth leaders through their quality of participation across a range of activities, for example:</td>
<td>1. Number of youth leaders identified.</td>
<td>1. Peer support available to rangatahi in Opotiki.</td>
<td>1. Greater support and cohesion amongst rangatahi.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau objective (Aim 3) To provide a programme that equips rangatahi with the skills and knowledge to assist others to access help as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of youth leaders completing upskilling and training.</td>
<td>2. Rangatahi providing peer support receive training and opportunities for career and self-development.</td>
<td>2. Rangatahi gain skills and knowledge to provide peer support and help other young people get access to help when they need it.</td>
<td>Kia Piki objective Goal 2/1 – increase taitamariki Māori participation in Māori health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provide support and training for youth leaders, for example, through:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rangatahi become leaders in their communities.</td>
<td>YSPS objective Goal 1/2 – support initiatives which promote the mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need. Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Influential Factors**

- Crime, unemployment, peer pressure, family unit breakdown, low socio-economic status, substance abuse
Diagram 1c – New Zealand AIDS Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Out There!

Inputs

- 1 full-time project worker
- Schools
- Youth community groups
- Mainstream groups and service providers
- Support from NZ AIDS Foundation & Rainbow Youth
- Funding

Initiatives/Activities

1. Compile a set of national resources to:
   i) provide information for queer youth; and
   ii) increase all young people's awareness and understanding of queer youth and the issues they face.
   Resources to include:
   i) Queer Resource Pack for queer youth, their families, and youth, health and welfare services, which provides information about sexual/gender identities, available resources & support organisations for queer youth
   ii) poster for schools that promotes diversity and acceptance of queer identities.

Outputs

1. Number of resource packs produced and distributed.

Short-term outcomes

1. Queer youth become more aware of where to find information about sexual/gender identities and how to get help and support.
2. Information is available for families and whānau of queer youth.
3. People working with youth, health and welfare agencies have access to resources to help them understand the issues facing queer youth and how to provide effective services for these young people.
4. Posters are displayed in schools, universities, youth health services, sports clubs and 'youth zones' and students and young people begin to understand the messages in the posters.

Long-term-outcomes

1. Queer youth and their families/whānau can easily obtain information about sexual/gender identities and know about resources and organisations that can help and support them.
2. People working with youth, health and welfare agencies are educated about queer issues and provide effective services for these young people.
3. School students and young people acknowledge and accept sexual and gender diversity and understand the issues facing queer youth.

Project objectives

YSPS Goals / objectives

Out There! objective:
Compile a set of national resources and increase the visibility of queer youth and their issues.

YSPS goals/objectives:
Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity.
Goal 1/6 – support initiatives which address social inequality, discrimination and abuse where they impact on young people.
Goal 2/3 – ensure that information is available to those in contact with young people to help them identify and respond to young people who may be at risk from suicide.
### New Zealand AIDS Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Out There! - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | 2. Promote Out There! and queer youth issues via the media, including:  
  i) television  
  ii) radio  
  iii) newspapers. | 1. Number of items/articles promoting Out There! and queer youth issues. | 1. Increase in appropriate media coverage of queer youth issues. | 1. Media regularly promotes positive messages about queer youth and the issues facing them. | Out There! objective: Promote Out There! and queer youth issues via the media  
YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 1/6 – support initiatives which address social inequality, discrimination and abuse where they impact on young people. |
|        | 3. Provide opportunities for educators and schools to enhance their services for queer youth by:  
  i) training established and apprenticed youth educators  
  ii) providing resources – see 1 above. | 1. Training delivered for youth educators and health and welfare service providers. | 1. Youth educators have increased understanding of queer youth issues and the role of education in supporting and validating their identities  
  2. Resources acquired and used by youth educators and health and welfare service providers. | 1. Youth educators and services providers learn about queer youth and the issues they face as a standard part of their training.  
  2. More supportive environments are created for young people. | Out There! objective: provide opportunities for youth groups and service providers to enhance their services to queer youth.  
YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 2/1 – improve the capacity of those who work with young people to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.  
Goal 2/4 – ensure that primary health, mental health, and drug and alcohol services are responsive to the culture, gender and sexual orientation of young people. |
### New Zealand AIDS Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Out There! - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
<th>YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Compile a database of stakeholders in the queer youth mental health field and improve linkages between stakeholders.</td>
<td>1. Database of stakeholders created. 2. Stakeholders establish links and identify ways to coordinate services and support for queer youth.</td>
<td>1. Services offered to queer youth are identified. 2. Organisations providing services start to coordinate service provision and support for queer youth.</td>
<td>1. Comprehensive and seamless services provided for queer youth.</td>
<td>Out There! objective: identify stakeholders offering services to queer youth and improve linkages between them. YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 3/5 – encourage coordination and collaboration between service providers to ensure that young people receive an effective and seamless service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Pilot school research project to demonstrate how schools can implement policies and strategies to promote tolerance of gender and sexual identity diversity, for example, through: i) teacher development and ii) student education.</td>
<td>1. Action research project underway in a school. 2. Resource developed for high schools to help them implement policies and strategies that promote tolerance of gender and sexual diversity.</td>
<td>1. Policies and strategies developed and tested. 2. Research-based evidence and resource promoted to other schools.</td>
<td>1. Schools embrace gender and sexual identity and diversity.</td>
<td>Out There! objective: conduct/analyse New Zealand-based research to benefit queer youth. YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 5/1 – promote research into the design and evaluation of suicide prevention and intervention initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Initiative/Activity:
Develop and trial a queer cultural safety workshop to target those working in the health sector.

### Short-term outcomes:
1. People working in the health sector begin to understand cultural safety, including concepts around Māori and Pacific Island sexuality.

### Long-term outcomes:
1. Services and support for queer youth are delivered in ways that are appropriate and culturally safe.

### Outputs:
1. Workshop format developed.
2. Number of workshops delivered.
3. Number of targeted people/groups attending workshops.
4. Evaluations of workshops.

### Project objectives / YSPS Goals / Objectives:
- Goal 2/1 – improve the capacity of those who work with young people to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.
- Goal 2/4 – see previous page for details

### YSPS Goals / Objectives:
Goal 2/1 – improve the capacity of those who work with young people to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.

### Other Initiatives/Activities:
- Develop and trial a queer cultural safety workshop.
- Organise a national hui of queer youth workers.

### Other Short-term outcomes:
1. Queer youth workers have an opportunity to network and make an input to the Out There! project.

### Other Long-term outcomes:
1. National network of queer youth workers established and provides support, training and personal development opportunities for youth workers.

### Other Outputs:
1. Number of youth and other professionals attending the hui.
2. Evaluations from people attending the hui.
3. Project worker reports that hui was successful in allowing issues to be discussed, gaps in resources and barriers to youth accessing mental health services to be identified, and youth workers to input ideas to Out There!
### 8. Increase access by Māori, Pacific Island, and rural queer youth to queer youth groups and mental health services by:

i) contributing content to media such as Marae, Mana News, Tagata Pasifika, Triangle TV and local and community media.

### Project objectives

**Out There! objective:** increased access to queer youth groups and mental health services by Māori, Pacific Island, and rural youth.

**YSPS goals/objectives:**

- **Goal 2/3** – support initiatives to reduce young people’s risk-taking behaviour where this has a negative consequence on their own or others’ health and well-being.
- **Goal 2/4** – see page 2 for details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Number of articles / items published by relevant media.</td>
<td>1. Queer youth who are Māori, Pacific Island or in rural areas become more aware of groups and mental health services available to them.</td>
<td>1. All queer youth, regardless of culture or location know where to go to get help and support when they need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**New Zealand AIDS Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Out There! - continued**

---
### New Zealand AIDS Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Out There! - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Support and encourage the development and continuation of community groups run by queer youth, particularly where these do not exist. This will be achieved by: i) providing resources &amp; training for queer youth so that they can establish &amp; facilitate youth groups ii) liaising with Māori &amp; Pacific peer support organisations &amp; communities to help them develop youth groups for Māori and Pacific Island queer youth.</td>
<td>1. Number of youth groups developed or continuing to operate. 2. Number of queer youth receiving training and getting involved in running youth groups. 3. Leadership and training opportunities provided for queer youth in their communities. 4. Number of Māori and Pacific peer support organisations and communities links are established with. 5. Number of youth groups established (or potential identified) to meet the needs of Māori and Pacific queer youth.</td>
<td>1. Youth groups established to provide a safe and supportive environment for queer youth to meet and interact. 2. Groups established in areas where they did not exist previously, or the potential for groups identified. 3. Young people begin to develop skills that allow them to run youth groups and take a more active role in their communities. 4. Groups established, or the potential for groups identified, to meet the needs of Māori and Pacific queer youth. 5. Communities begin to understand and accept queer youth.</td>
<td>1. Queer youth have the skills to be actively involved in setting up and running youth groups that provide venues where they can meet, interact and develop life skills. 2. Communities accept and support queer youth as part of their local community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Out There! objective:** support and encourage the development of community groups run by queer youth. **YSPS goals/objectives:** Goal 1/4 – encourage the participation of young people in all aspects of community life and in decisions which impact on them.

|        | 10. Development of project worker through attending / presenting at conferences such as: i) Health Teachers Conference ii) SPINZ conference iii) NZ & Australian Adolescent Youth Health Conference. | 1. Project worker attends conferences and reports positive learning experiences. 2. Number of presentations to conferences about Out There! by project worker. | 1. Project worker develops increased knowledge and understanding of issues affecting queer youth, including mental health issues. 2. Project worker promotes the Out There! project to other youth and health workers. | 1. Personal development of the project worker specialising in working with queer youth. |

**Out There! objective:** educate people working on queer youth issues **YSPS goals/objectives:** Goal 2/1 – improve the capacity of those who work with young people to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.

**External Influential Factors**
Lack of understanding of issues facing queer youth, stigma, discrimination, homophobia, lack of support and resources for queer youth, lack of resources for health workers and educators.

---

*DIA, Research Services: February 2004*
Diagram 1d – Mental Health Foundation (MHF) of New Zealand, Regional Youth Development Project - Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time project worker</td>
<td>1. Provide support for whānau / families of young people most at risk (particularly families of youth who have attempted or committed suicide). Project activities include: i) wananga (one in each region) to discuss issues facing whānau in relation to young people’s growth and development ii) ongoing support for whānau / families with most needs iii) identifying services that support whānau / families identified.</td>
<td>1. Two wananga run as planned. 2. Number of whānau /family members attending wananga. 3. Characteristics of whānau / family members attending wananga. 4. Number of whānau /families receiving support. 5. Existing services that support whānau / families identified.</td>
<td>1. Whānau /family members have an opportunity to meet and discuss the issues facing rangatahi. 2. Whānau/ family members begin to understand and know how to respond to impacting on rangatahi. 3. Whānau families begin to feel more confident and develop their self-esteem. 4. Whānau / families with young people at risk learn about, and know how to contact, the support available for them and rangatahi. 5. Potential to establish new services to support whānau / families in these regions assessed.</td>
<td>1. Enhanced whānau / kinship/ family relationships – whakawhānaungatanga. 2. Whānau / families have a good understanding and awareness of issues impacting on rangatahi. 3. The whole whānau / family, including rangatahi, show increased self-esteem and confidence. 4. Whānau / families of youth at risk have access to a range of support services in their regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MHF objective 1
To provide support for whānau/families of young people at risk.

YSPS objective
Goal 1/1 – support for families / whānau to increase the wellbeing of their young people.

Goal 3/4 - encourage opportunities for family/whānau to be involved in the care and support of their young people.
## Mental Health Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Regional Youth Development Project - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
<th>YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide support for youth and whānau workers by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Number of youth / whānau workers supported by mentoring.</td>
<td>1. Workers are more informed about mental health and wellness issues facing rangatahi/young people and their whānau/families.</td>
<td>1. Youth workers are well informed about mental health and wellness issues facing rangatahi/young people and their whānau/families.</td>
<td>MHF objective 2</td>
<td>To improve the capacity of those who work with young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) up-skilling individual workers by mentoring</td>
<td>2. Number of youth / whānau workers attending liaison meetings.</td>
<td>2. Workers are able to network with others in their field, and so begin to feel more confident and less isolated.</td>
<td>2. Youth workers are able to network with each other and are well supported by peers and mentors.</td>
<td>YSPS objective</td>
<td>Goal 2/1 – improve the capacity of those who work with young people to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) arranging liaison meetings</td>
<td>3. Number of youth / whānau workers attending wananga.</td>
<td>3. Workers are more informed about tikanga.</td>
<td>3. Youth workers have a good understanding of tikanga and are able to use this knowledge to improve services delivered to rangatahi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 3/5 – encourage coordination and collaboration between service providers to ensure that young people receive an effective and seamless service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) information sharing – particularly about mental health and cultural identity</td>
<td>4. Number of networks project establishes contact with.</td>
<td>4. Workers identify ways to collaborate and coordinate services.</td>
<td>4. Youth workers are able to collaborate and coordinate services for rangatahi/young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) organising and running wananga – one in each region</td>
<td>5. Gaps in networks identified by project worker.</td>
<td>5. Opportunities to fill gaps in networks are identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) liaising with and identifying gaps and deficiencies in the networks of those who work with young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mental Health Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Regional Youth Development Project - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives YSPS Goals / objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Provide support for hapū/iwi communities by: i) hui with hapū/iwi community members to discuss youth development issues ii) contacting key community stakeholders iii) becoming a member of key community committees in each region.</td>
<td>1. Number of hui with hapū/iwi, community members. 2. Number of stakeholders the project establishes and maintains contact with. 3. Iwi involvement / representation increased on key committees, e.g. suicide postvention teams. 4. Details of committees involved with.</td>
<td>1. Hapū/iwi communities have an opportunity to discuss and begin to understand issues facing rangatahi/young people. 2. Relationships between people in the communities are developed and people begin to work together. 3. Key stakeholders in the communities are actively involved in youth development issues. 4. Iwi become more involved in committees which support rangatahi.</td>
<td>1. Hapū/iwi communities understand and are more responsive to rangatahi/young people. 2. Hapū/iwi communities work together to support rangatahi/young people. 3. Key stakeholders in the communities are actively involved in youth development. 4. The health and well-being of communities is improved.</td>
<td>MHF objective 3 To provide support for hapū/iwi communities. YSPS objective Goal 4/3 – encourage communities and organisations to become informed about behaviour and approaches that will minimise the likelihood of further suicide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mental Health Foundation: Programme Logic Model for Regional Youth Development Project - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Ensure youth participation in the project to facilitate more responsive services for youth. Activities to include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) cultural / well-being wananga (one in each region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) enabling youth, whānau &amp; communities to participate in organising and delivering wananga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) developing youth leaders to contribute to the development of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) liaising with existing youth forums &amp; networks to identify gaps in networks and facilitate actions to fill these gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) identifying issues &amp; deficiencies in youth services &amp; facilitating actions to improve services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of rangatahi / young people attending wananga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Characteristics of rangatahi / young people attending wananga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of rangatahi / young people involved in organising and delivering wananga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of whānau / community members involved in organising and delivering wananga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of youth leaders being trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of youth forums and networks contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of youth services identified and assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rangatahi / young people become more aware of issues relating to their well-being and cultural identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rangatahi / young people get information about where to go for help and support when they need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rangatahi / young people have opportunities to develop organisational and leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rangatahi / young people begin to develop better relationships with whānau / families - whakawhanaungatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rangatahi / young people feel more included and valued by their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opportunities to establish new youth forums / networks are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Way to improve youth services are identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rangatahi / young people have healthy self-esteem and are confident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rangatahi / young people become leaders in their iwi / communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rangatahi / young people have a strong sense of their cultural identity and are strengthened by this knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rangatahi / young people have strong and effective relationships with their whānau / families - whakawhanaungatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rangatahi / young people develop skills that help them contribute to their communities (e.g. through participating in community groups or employment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rangatahi / young people feel more included in, and valued by, their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Opportunities exist throughout the regions for rangatahi / young people to network &amp; meet together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Youth services are readily available and meet the needs of young people in the regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rangatahi / young people start to challenge negative cultural identity and be more involved in their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rangatahi / young people become leaders in their iwi / communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rangatahi / young people have a strong sense of their cultural identity and feel more valued by their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rangatahi / young people have strong and effective relationships with their whānau / families - whakawhanaungatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rangatahi / young people develop skills that help them contribute to their communities (e.g. through participating in community groups or employment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rangatahi / young people feel more included in, and valued by, their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Opportunities exist throughout the regions for rangatahi / young people to network &amp; meet together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Youth services are readily available and meet the needs of young people in the regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YSPS objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1/2 – support initiatives which promote mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1/4 – encourage the participation of young people in all aspects of community life and in decisions which impact upon them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3/5 – encourage coordination and collaboration between service providers to ensure that young people receive an effective and seamless service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influential Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical isolation, social disadvantage, negative childhood experiences, lack of resources and agencies to support young people, social change, competition for jobs and training, underage alcohol consumption, lack of cultural identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram 1e - Tumau Tutoa: Programme Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Staff – 1 full and 1 part-time project worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Families/whanau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specialist health services/support agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives / Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The Tumau Tutoa programme delivery is separated into four stages over a 10 to 12 month period.  
   The activities in the programme include:  
   i) needs assessment  
   ii) one-on-one mentoring  
   iii) linking young people to specialist support services  
   iv) goal setting  
   v) Lifeskills backpack  
   vi) courses for young people, for example, in youth resiliency and well-being  
   vii) enhancement activities (for example, arts and crafts, camps) to reward and enhance young people’s self-worth  
   viii) developing future personal action plans  
   ix) ongoing support as required |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Experienced, qualified and culturally appropriate staff employed to deliver the programme  
   2. Initial, second, and final assessments of young people (anonymous and confidential)  
   3. Number of students recruited and engaged in the Tumau Tutoa programme  
   4. Self-reflection journals (anonymous and confidential)  
   5. Resiliency testing  
   6. Youth self-evaluation  
   7. Whanau evaluation  
   8. Summaries from fortnightly case management meeting to review progress and assess resiliency of young people |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Pacific youth “at risk” are identified and placed in a supportive “net” made of external and internal providers  
   2. Young people attending the programme show increasing signs of resiliency and personal growth and development  
   3. The safety and well-being of young people involved in the programme is protected  
   4. Young people begin to develop a sense of cultural identity, and belief in their self-worth |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Young Pacific people’s individual capability is enhanced and their emotional and mental well-being is protected by:  
   i) learning skills to cope with serious challenges  
   ii) developing a sense of belonging  
   iii) having a sense of cultural identity  
   iv) having self-esteem  
   v) receiving support from whanau/family  
   vi) receiving school and social support |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project objectives YSPS Goals/objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tumau Tutoa objective:  
   build youth resiliency, individual capability and protect emotional well-being  
   YSPS goals/objectives:  
   Goal 1/2 – initiatives that promote mental health and well-being of young people and encourage them to seek help in times of need  
   Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity  
   Goal 2/3 – support initiatives to reduce young people’s risk-taking behaviour where this has a negative consequence on their or others’ health and well-being  
   Goal 3/1 – ensure that crisis support services are available |
External Influential Factors
Crime, Violence, Abuse, Peer Pressure, Low socio-economic status, Loss of cultural identity, Family unit breakdown, Increased gang affiliation, Alcohol and drug abuse, Early sexual activity

Tumau Tutoa: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives / Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives YSPS Goals/objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop positive and strong linkages to a network of service providers, Pacific communities and the wider community. Activities include: i) calls to agencies to promote the programme ii) networking with community providers and services</td>
<td>1. Number of agencies MYC works with and establishes relationships with 2. Number of networking meetings with schools and the Pacific community</td>
<td>1. Strong alliances formed with community providers/services that support Tumau Tutoa 2. Coordinated responses provided for young Pacific peoples “at risk” 3. Tumau Tutoa is recognised by the Pacific communities as a preferred supplier of suicide prevention support</td>
<td>1. Capacity of community to support young people at risk is increased.</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa objective: support systems put in place for those affected by youth suicide YSPS goals/objectives: Goal 3 / 5 – encourage co-ordination and collaboration between service providers to ensure that young people receive and effective and seamless service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram 1f – Rau O Te Huia Trust: Programme Logic Model

**Inputs**
- Staff – Youth Development Officer (YDO), plus administrative support from the Trust
- Community groups
- Schools
- Agencies providing services for young people
- Whānau / families
- Rau O Te Huia Trust – Advisory Management Team
- Funding

**Initiatives/Activities**
1. Develop relationships with young people and their whānau through a range of non-threatening activities:
   - i) outdoor activities and camping
   - ii) drug and alcohol programmes
   - iii) young parent programmes
   - iv) health programmes
   - v) education and employment programmes
   - vi) role models.
   The YDO or other service providers in the area will deliver programmes. Activities will be delivered through wananga, Marae Noho and the Whānau Worker. Young people will be involved in developing the programmes.

**Outputs**
1. Number of programmes delivered – either by YDO or by other service providers.
2. Number of young people participating in programmes and activities.
3. Number of whānau relationships established with.

**Short-term outcomes**
1. Young people participate in programmes and activities and begin to understand ways to live a healthy and rewarding life.
2. Young people begin to engage with their whānau and the community in positive ways.
3. Young people who are parents begin to develop their parenting skills.

**Long-term-outcomes**
1. Young people have self-esteem and resiliency, and can use a range of strategies to cope with challenges they may face.
2. Young people have positive relationships with, and are supported by, their whānau.
3. Young people are able to become good parents.
4. Young people take an active role in their communities.

**Project objectives**

**Kia Piki and YSPS Goals / objectives**
- **Rau O Te Huia Trust objective**
  Develop relationships with the young people and their families through non-threatening activities.
- **Kia Piki objective**
  Goal 1/3 – increase awareness and application of a Māori holistic approach to wellness, which includes te taha wairua (spiritual), te taha whānau (social), te taha hinengaro (mental and emotional) and te taha tinana (physical).
  Goal 1/7 – improve support for “by Māori for Māori” service providers and programmes.
- **YSPS objective**
  Goal 1/2 – support initiatives which promote mental health and well-being of all young people and which encourage them to seek help in times of need.
  Goal 3/4 – encourage opportunities for families / whanau to be involved in the care and support of their young people.
**Rau O Te Huia Trust: Programme Logic Model - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop young people's understanding of their Māori culture through activities such as:</td>
<td>1. Number of activities organised</td>
<td>1. Young people begin to understand and participate in their Māori culture.</td>
<td>1. Young people have a strong sense of their Māori culture and identify with their culture and heritage in ways that contribute to their total well-being – spiritual, social, mental and physical.</td>
<td><strong>Rau O Te Huia Trust objective</strong>&lt;br&gt;Develop relationships with the young people and their families through non-threatening activities. <strong>Kia Piki objective</strong>&lt;br&gt;Goal 3/3 – encourage the retention and revival of te reo and tikanga Māori (which includes song, dance, history, traditional art, craft and sport) to foster a strong sense of identity among tātamānaki. <strong>YSPS objective</strong>&lt;br&gt;Goal 1/5 – promote opportunities for young people to develop and affirm their own identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Fordlands kapa haka group</td>
<td>2. Number of young people participating in activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) wananga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Youth Development Fund Projects 2002-05: Design Evaluation**
3. A base for young people is established by opening a Youth Centre in Fordlands. This will be achieved by:
   i) establishing a Fordlands youth group
   ii) the YDO and selected young people will lobby for the Centre by making a case for it and present a funding bid to stakeholders, including Rotorua DC.

1. Case made for Centre and funding bid prepared.
2. Centre opened.
3. Processes developed for consulting with and involving young people.

1. Centre is established and young people participate in setting it up and running it
2. Young people have a base where they can meet with their peers and discuss and learn about issues affecting their health and well-being.
3. Young people know where to go for help and learn about the services available to support them.
4. Young people start to develop leadership and other social skills.

1. Young people have a safe and supportive environment to meet in and participate in activities of their choosing.
2. Young people are able to make positive choices about their lifestyles.
3. Young people demonstrate leadership, social and administrative skills from helping to run the Centre.
4. The community supports the Centre as a resource for its young people.

Rau O Te Huia Trust: Programme Logic Model - continued

Rau O Te Huia Trust objective
Establish and maintain a Youth Centre in Fordlands.

Kia Piki objective
Goal 1/8 – increase awareness amongst taitamariki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori of the negative effects of alcohol and drug misuse and peer pressure on health and well-being.

Goal 2/2 – encourage taitamariki Māori to play a leadership role in the design, promotion and delivery of development programmes and services for taitamariki Māori.

YSPS objective
Goal 1/4 – encourage the participation of young people in all aspects of community life and in decisions which impact upon them.
### Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Alternative education opportunities are provided. This is achieved by:  
   i) the YDO networking with current alternative education providers  
   ii) the YDO lobbying for a classroom at Sunset Junior High to teach programmes for young people. | 1. Number of education opportunities made available.  
2. Number of young people attending and successfully completing education courses / programmes. | 1. Young people participate in courses and start to gain knowledge and skills that will equip them for further training or employment. | 1. Young people gain knowledge and skills that equip them for further training or employment.  
2. Some young people are able to return to the mainstream education system. |
| 5. The YDO develops the knowledge and skills required for the role by:  
   i) attending training to meet identified needs  
   ii) attending hui and conferences to allow the YDO to network with other youth workers. | 1. Training courses successfully completed by the YDO.  
2. YDO reports back to Trust on benefits from attending hui and conferences. | 1. YDO gains knowledge and skills required for role, including an understanding of the safety issues around suicide prevention work. | 1. YDO and the community benefit from the YDO’s personal and career development as a youth worker. |

### Project objectives

**Kia Piki and YSPS Goals / objectives**

- **Rau O Te Huia Trust objective**
  - Address youth training and employment needs in the Fordlands area.
- **Kia Piki objective**
  - Goal 2/1 – increase taitamariki Māori participation in Māori health, social, educational, political, economic and tribal development.
- **YSPS objective**
  - Goal 2/1 – improve the capacity of those who work with young people to identify and respond effectively to behaviours associated with suicide.
Rau O Te Huia Trust: Programme Logic Model - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Initiatives/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term-outcomes</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Develop collaborative</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1. Services and</td>
<td>1. Service delivery</td>
<td>Kia Piki and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships with</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>support for young</td>
<td>for young people</td>
<td>YSPS Goals /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools, community</td>
<td>of agencies</td>
<td>people become more</td>
<td>is effective and</td>
<td>objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and other</td>
<td>/organisations</td>
<td>more coordinated.</td>
<td>seamless.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisations to</td>
<td>the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide support for</td>
<td>establishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>youth in Fordlands by:</td>
<td>and maintains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) establishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and maintaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with other service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) referring young people/whānau to the appropriate service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Influential Factors
Low socio-economic area, unemployment, crime, domestic and physical violence, substance abuse, truancy, young marriages and pregnancies, solo parents, gang culture, multi-cultural area, educational issues

Rau O Te Huia Trust objective
Develop collaborative relationships with schools, community and other organisations.

Kia Piki objective
Goal 1/4 – develop better support systems for tātamāriki, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori affected by suicide.

YSPS objective
Goal 3/5 – encourage coordination and collaboration between service providers to ensure that young people receive an effective and seamless service.
### Appendix 4: Evaluation Questions

#### Table 1a: Pacific World – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the wider social <strong>context</strong> for this project?</td>
<td>Description of the socio-economic make-up of the community targeted by the project.</td>
<td>Analysis of Statistics NZ data. Information from the project staff about the communities they are working with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the project <strong>reached</strong> its target audience?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the young people attending programmes and activities / receiving services.</td>
<td>Pacific World’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What channels did the project use to <strong>recruit</strong> its target audience?</td>
<td>Methods used to identify and recruit young people.</td>
<td>Pacific World’s youth workers’ journals. Discussion with youth workers. Advisor’s comments – and feedback from selected stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has the project <strong>delivered</strong> the programmes and services planned?</td>
<td>Details of programmes /activities / services delivered, including proposed ones.</td>
<td>Pacific World’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the target audience <strong>received</strong> the programmes and services delivered?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the young people successfully engaging in / completing programmes and activities / and receiving services.</td>
<td>Pacific World’s youth workers’ journals. Progress with plans / diaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the project being implemented with <strong>integrity</strong> and <strong>quality</strong> – are the providers delivering the project in the way that they said they would?</td>
<td>Description of project components and delivery in comparison with proposals in applications / business plans.</td>
<td>Pacific World’s youth workers’ journals. Discussion with youth workers. Advisor’s reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How is the <strong>implementation</strong> of the project benefiting its target audience?</td>
<td>Initial indications of the benefits to the young people participating in the programme.</td>
<td>Pacific World’s youth workers’ journals. Discussion with youth workers. Advisor’s reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (this aspect will be followed up in more detail in the outcome evaluation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1a: Pacific World – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 - Outcome evaluation – short-term outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were the young people involved in the school-based Primary Prevention Project able to develop and work through their plans?</td>
<td>Number of young people attending Primary Prevention Project meetings and completing plans.</td>
<td>Report from Pacific World on number of plans / diaries completed and acted on by young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were “at-risk” students identified by the youth workers, referred to other agencies, and were their issues addressed through appropriate types of support?</td>
<td>Number of young people referred to other agencies. Reports of any young people in the target community &quot;slipping through the net&quot;.</td>
<td>Pacific World's referral documentation. Feedback from referral agencies. Feedback from schools / community / agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Were young people involved in the mentoring and monitoring programme able to develop and work through their plans?</td>
<td>Number of young people involved in mentoring and monitoring programme completing plans.</td>
<td>Report from Pacific World on number of plans / diaries completed and acted on by young people. Statistics on number of young people returning to school, going on employment placements or taking up training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Have the young people been involved in organising the activities?</td>
<td>Number of young people involved in organising events.</td>
<td>Report from Pacific World on number of events successfully organised by young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Have the young people demonstrated increased self-esteem?</td>
<td>Proxy measures – positive feedback from young people, observed behaviour, and positive feedback from parents and families.</td>
<td>Young people's self-evaluation. Photographic records, letters, feedback from school, family, community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Have the young people demonstrated increased understanding of their culture?</td>
<td>Number of young people participating in cultural events.</td>
<td>Student diaries. Assessment of their ability to demonstrate cultural competency (for example, offer a pepeha/mihi, sing pese/waiata, understand ancestral links and traditions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14. Have the young people demonstrated better social skills?                          | Number of young people demonstrating:  
  - increased participation in family activities  
  - positive social activities with peers  
  - taking up learning/employment opportunities  
  - able to enjoy social interaction | Student diaries. Feedback from family, schools, community, referral agencies. |
Table 1a: Pacific World – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Did service delivery by agencies improve?</td>
<td>Number of agencies maintaining links with PW and providing timely, culturally appropriate services for young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth workers' journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific World referral documentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network list and feedback from agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Has the community's understanding of the issues associated with self-harm increased?</td>
<td>Increased awareness and understanding of self-harm issues in the target community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from schools, community groups and referral agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have family relationships improved?</td>
<td>Number of young people with regular family contact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student diaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth workers' journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points to note:

- DIA's Research Services will carry out the process evaluation using information from the six and 12-month reports provided by the Pacific World and the Community Development Group (CDG) Advisor, and from discussions with the youth workers.
- The outcome evaluation also will use information from the six and 12-month reports. In addition, CDG will commission an independent evaluator to seek feedback about the project from the agencies, schools and communities that the project is working with.
- The confidentiality of the young people will be maintained during the evaluation and information about the young people’s progress from the referral documentation, young people’s diaries will be obtained through interviews with the youth workers.
Table 1b: Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the wider social context for this project?</td>
<td>Description of the socio-economic make-up of the community targeted by the project.</td>
<td>Analysis of Statistics NZ data. Information from the youth workers about the communities they are working with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the project reached its target audience?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the rangatahi attending programmes and activities / receiving services.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust reports. Advisors reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What channels did the project use to recruit its target audience and get its messages across?</td>
<td>Success of methods used to identify and recruit rangatahi. Success of methods used to promote messages – e.g. radio shows, media coverage.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust reports. Discussion with youth workers and feedback from community. Feedback about the success of the youth radio programmes and 0800 Youthline. Media coverage of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has the project delivered the programmes and services planned?</td>
<td>Details of programmes /activities / services delivered, including proposed ones.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust reports. Advisors reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the project established and maintained links with other support agencies</td>
<td>Details of organisations and agencies the Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust is working with.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust reports. Discussion with youth workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the target audience received the programmes and services delivered?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the rangatahi successfully engaging in / completing programmes and activities / and receiving services.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust reports and programme recording sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the project being implemented with integrity and quality – are the providers delivering the project in the way that they said they would?</td>
<td>Description of project components and delivery in comparison with proposals in applications / business plans.</td>
<td>Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust reports. Discussion with youth workers. Advisors reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (to be agreed with projects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How is the implementation of the project benefiting its target audience?</td>
<td>Initial indications of the benefits to the rangatahi participating in the programme.</td>
<td>Discussion with youth workers about the ways the programmes are benefiting rangatahi (note: individual young people’s confidentiality will be maintained). Advisors reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (this aspect will be followed up in more detail in the outcome evaluation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 - Outcome evaluation – short-term outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the rangatahi involved in the activities and programmes able to complete them successfully?</td>
<td>Number of rangatahi completing the programmes and evaluating them positively.</td>
<td>Results from evaluations completed by rangatahi and feedback from youth workers, whānau and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the way the programme is delivered protect the safety and well-being of rangatahi?</td>
<td>Evidence that programmes and services are delivered in a culturally appropriate and comprehensive way to address the 5 dimensions of te taha wairua, te taha tinana, te taha hinengaro, te taha whaungatanga, te taha taiao.</td>
<td>Reports from youth workers, whānau and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Have the rangatahi developed a sense of their cultural identity and self-worth?</td>
<td>Rangatahi's evaluations.</td>
<td>Feedback from youth workers, whānau and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are the rangatahi involved in the parenting programmes developing their parenting skills?</td>
<td>Evidence that rangatahi who are parents are improving their parenting skills.</td>
<td>Feedback from whānau and health workers in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are the rangatahi showing greater awareness of health issues and interest in healthier lifestyles?</td>
<td>Response of rangatahi to messages about healthy living and evidence of a positive response to quit smoking programmes.</td>
<td>Feedback from youth workers, whānau and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Was the service delivery by other agencies more co-ordinated and effective?</td>
<td>Number of agencies maintaining links with Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust and evidence of more co-ordinated service provision.</td>
<td>Details of agencies the Trust has established relationships with and feedback from youth workers and agencies on the effectiveness of the working relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are rangatahi getting more support from their whānau?</td>
<td>Evidence that rangatahi are engaging more positively with whānau.</td>
<td>Feedback from youth workers and other agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are rangatahi more aware of the support and services available to them in times of stress?</td>
<td>Schools and support agencies report that rangatahi seek support and help.</td>
<td>Feedback from schools and other agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1b: Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Are rangatahi actively involved in establishing and running their base and beginning to participate in their communities?</td>
<td>Evidence of rangatahi involvement in setting up and running the base and engaging with their communities.</td>
<td>Feedback from youth workers about the way the base operates and feedback from stakeholders about the ways young people are getting involved in the community. Feedback from rangatahi about their experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Are the rangatahi who are part of the peer support team developing their leadership skills and able to offer support to their peers?</td>
<td>Evidence that peer support team are taking the lead in activities, supporting others and developing their own lives (e.g. through getting involved in training or employment).</td>
<td>Feedback from rangatahi in the peer support team about the changes in their lives and the way they provide support, and feedback from youth workers about the way the peer support teams operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Has the Opotiki community’s understanding of the issues and pressures facing young people increased?</td>
<td>Increased awareness and understanding of the issues and pressures among the Opotiki community.</td>
<td>Feedback about the community response from stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points to note:**
- DIA’s Research Services will carry out the process evaluation using information from the six and 12-month reports provided by Te Hā O Te Whanau Trust and the Community Development Group (CDG) Advisor, and from discussions with the youth workers.
- The outcome evaluation also will use information from the six and 12-month reports. In addition, CDG will commission an independent evaluator to seek feedback about the project from whānau and from the agencies, schools and communities that the project is working with.
- The confidentiality of the young people will be maintained during the evaluation.
### Table 1c: New Zealand AIDS Foundation Project, Out There! – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the wider social context for this project?</td>
<td>Description of the background to the project, the issues facing queer youth and the reasons that they are one of the priority groups for suicide prevention work.</td>
<td>Research into sexual minority youth. Information from the community development worker and New Zealand Aids Foundation about the rationale for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have the resources produced by the project reached the target audiences?</td>
<td>Number of schools, universities and other 'youth zones' where posters displayed. Number of Queer Resource Packs produced and distributed to young people, their families and health and welfare service providers.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Discussion with the project worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the project delivered the initiatives and activities planned?</td>
<td>Details of initiatives and activities delivered or scheduled (e.g. posters, resources, database of stakeholders, workshops, national hui, the research project), including proposed ones.</td>
<td>Out There’s reports. Discussion with the project worker. Advisors reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What channels has the project used to promote queer youth issues?</td>
<td>Number of items/articles in the media – TV, radio, newspapers. Number of items/articles in the media targeting Māori and Pacific queer youth. Conference presentations by community development worker.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Discussion with the project worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the project established links with mainstream groups and service providers to help them enhance their services for queer youth?</td>
<td>Numbers of groups and service providers that the project has links with.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Discussion with the project worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the project established links with community groups run by queer youth and identified potential for new groups?</td>
<td>Numbers of queer youth groups that the project has links with. Number of potential new groups that the project has identified.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Discussion with the project worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has the project established links with Māori and Pacific peoples' peer support organisations and communities?</td>
<td>Numbers of Māori and Pacific peoples’ peer support organisations and communities that the project has links with. Number of potential new groups that the project has identified.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Discussion with the project worker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1c: New Zealand AIDS Foundation Project, Out There! – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **8.** Is the project being implemented with **integrity** and **quality** – is the project being delivered in the way that the providers said it would be? | Description of project components and delivery and comparison with proposals in applications / business plans.                                                                 | *Out There’s reports.*  
Discussion with the project worker.  
Advisors reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (to be agreed with projects). |
| **9.** How is the **implementation** of the project benefiting queer youth?  
Note: this is a preliminary assessment – this aspect will be evaluated in more detail during stage 3. | Initial indicators of the ways in which queer youth are benefiting from the project – for example, greater access to resources, youth groups receiving support or new groups being established.  
Initial indicators of the ways in which educators and mainstream groups and service providers are benefiting from the project – for example, these groups agree that there is a need for the project, feedback from workshops shows increasing understanding of issues facing queer youth, schools respond positively to posters, and interest is show in resource packs. | *Discussion with the project worker.*  
Advisors reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders. |
Table 1c: New Zealand AIDS Foundation Project, Out There! – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 - Outcome evaluation – short-term outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are the resources developed for young people, their families and service providers well received and helpful for these groups?</td>
<td>People using the resources find them well presented, and a useful way to get information about sexual/gender identities and how to get help and support.</td>
<td>Feedback from service providers, health and welfare groups, schools and, if possible, young people and their families about the quality and usefulness of the resources. Feedback from the project worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the posters well received and communicating their messages effectively?</td>
<td>Teachers, other educators, youth workers and young people report that the posters are good quality, stimulate debate about the issues facing queer youth and are getting their message across.</td>
<td>Feedback from teachers, other educators, youth workers and, if possible, young people about the impact of the posters. Feedback from the project worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are the initiatives being delivered in ways that protect the safety and well-being of young people?</td>
<td>Evidence that initiatives are being delivered in ways that do not have any unintended or negative consequences for queer youth.</td>
<td>Feedback from the project worker. Feedback from stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is the project building the capacity of youth workers and mainstream health and welfare service providers to enable them to work more effectively with queer youth?</td>
<td>Number of mainstream groups and service providers (for example, university health clinics, and health teachers) that the project is working with and evidence that the personal skills of people working with these organisations is beginning to develop and impact positively on service delivery. People attending the cultural safety workshops indicate greater understanding of issues facing queer youth and how to support them, including increased understanding of the concepts around Māori and Pacific peoples' sexuality. Project worker reports increased understanding of health and welfare issues facing queer youth from attending conferences.</td>
<td>Out There’s reports. Feedback from youth workers, service providers, health and welfare groups about the extent to which personal skills are being developed and how this is affecting service delivery. Feedback from the project worker. Evaluations from workshops. Project worker's reports on conferences attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is the project providing opportunities for youth workers to network and develop their understanding of issues facing queer youth?</td>
<td>People attending national hui report increased networking opportunities and a better understanding of issues facing queer youth. Project worker reports that useful feedback on the Out There! project received. Project attends conferences and reports establishing links with other professionals.</td>
<td>Evaluations form people attending the national hui. Project worker's report on the national hui. Project worker's reports on conferences attended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1c: New Zealand AIDS Foundation Project, Out There! – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Is the project providing opportunities for <strong>queer youth to meet and interact</strong> in youth groups?</td>
<td>Information about queer youth groups shows that existing groups are working well and new groups have been set up or the potential for new groups has been identified. Young people report that youth groups provide a safe and supportive environment for them.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Feedback from the project worker. Feedback from the young people – if possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is the project able to establish links with Māori and Pacific peoples' peer support organisations and communities and help them develop youth groups for queer Māori and Pacific youth?</td>
<td>Evidence that links are being established with Māori and Pacific peoples' peer support organisations and communities and that there is support for establishing youth groups.</td>
<td>Out There's reports. Feedback from the project worker. Feedback from selected Māori and Pacific peoples' groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is the school pilot research project generating information about queer youth contributing to the knowledge and understanding of how to promote tolerance of gender and sexual identity diversity?</td>
<td>Interim results from the research project.</td>
<td>Interim results from the research project and discussions with the researchers and school hosting the pilot project. Feedback from the project worker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points to note:**
- DIA’s Research Services will carry out the process evaluation using information from the six and 12-month reports provided by *Out There!* and the Community Development Group (CDG) Advisor, and from discussions with the project worker.
- The outcome evaluation also will use information from the six and 12-month reports. In addition, CDG will commission an independent evaluator to seek feedback about the project from the agencies, schools and communities that the project is working with.
- The confidentiality of the young people will be maintained during the evaluation. If possible, feedback from young people will be obtained – to be discussed with the community development worker.
### Table 1d: Mental Health Foundation (MHF): Regional Youth Development Project – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the wider social <strong>context</strong> and <strong>need</strong> for this project?</td>
<td>Description of the socio-economic make-up of the community targeted by the project.</td>
<td>Analysis of Statistics NZ data. Information from the project worker and other MHF staff about the communities they are working with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of gaps in youth development opportunities in Canterbury and the West Coast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the project <strong>reached</strong> its target audiences and have they <strong>received</strong> the initiatives and services delivered?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the rangatahi / young people attending wananga. Number of youth leaders being trained. Numbers and characteristics of the whānau / families attending wananga, and receiving support. Number of hui with hapū/iwi/community members.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the project <strong>established contact</strong> with youth /whānau workers and are they receiving support and training?</td>
<td>Number of youth / whānau workers receiving mentoring, attending liaison meetings and wananga.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Is the project establishing contact</strong> with youth forums and networks in the regions?</td>
<td>Number of youth forums / networks contacted.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the project <strong>started identifying</strong> services that are effective in other areas and might be transferred to the regions the project is working in?</td>
<td>Number and type of services identified.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the project started <strong>establishing links</strong> with key community stakeholders?</td>
<td>Number and range of stakeholder links established with.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Is the project worker involved with key community committees</strong> and facilitating greater iwi involvement on key committees?</td>
<td>Details of involvement with committees and actions taken to involve iwi in key committees.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the project being implemented with <strong>integrity</strong> and <strong>quality</strong> – are the</td>
<td>Description of project components and delivery in comparison with proposals in applications / work plans.</td>
<td>Project worker's reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providers delivering the project in the way that they said they would?</td>
<td>Delivery of programmes and services in relation to safety issues around suicide prevention work.</td>
<td>Discussion with Reference Group members (to be agreed with projects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor's reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How is the <strong>implementation</strong> of the project benefiting the young people, their</td>
<td>Initial indications of how the people/groups the project is working with are benefiting.</td>
<td>Discussion with the project worker and other MHF staff about the ways the project is benefiting the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau / families, the communities and youth/whānau workers? (this aspect will be</td>
<td></td>
<td>young people and their families / whānau (note: the confidentiality of individual young people and their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>followed up in more detail in the outcome evaluation).</td>
<td></td>
<td>whānau / families will be maintained).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion with the project worker and other MHF staff about how the project is benefiting the wider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communities, and youth and whānau workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor's reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from the Reference Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1d: Mental Health Foundation (MHF): Regional Youth Development Project – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 - Outcome evaluation – short-term outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are the whānau / families attending wananga and receiving support able to discuss, and begin to understand more about, issues facing rangatahi / young people?</td>
<td>Evidence that wananga provide opportunities for whānau / families to discuss and begin to understand issues facing rangatahi / young people.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports on outcomes of wananga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do the whānau / families of young people at risk know more about the services available to support them and how to contact these services?</td>
<td>Evidence that whānau / families of young people at risk know more about and are better able to contact services to support them.</td>
<td>Project worker’s reports. Feedback from selected service providers in the regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are youth and whānau workers: i) able to network with each other and feeling less isolated ii) beginning to identify ways to collaborate and coordinate services?</td>
<td>Youth and whānau workers attending wananga, receiving mentoring and attending meetings report that they are networking more with peers and are identifying ways to work together and coordinate services.</td>
<td>Feedback from youth / whānau workers. Evaluation forms completed by people attending wananga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are rangatahi / young people participating in the project and able to contribute their views about services for youth?</td>
<td>Evidence that rangatahi / young people are actively involved in the project and are able to put forward their ideas and overcome their ahau whakamā (shyness).</td>
<td>Feedback from project worker, rangatahi / young people and their whānau / families (if possible) about the extent to which rangatahi / young people are involved in the project and how their ideas are being used to improve services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Does the way the programmes are delivered protect the safety and well-being of rangatahi / young people?</td>
<td>Evidence that programmes and services are delivered in a comprehensive and culturally competent way and address the total well-being of the young people - te taha wairua (spiritual), te taha tinana (physical), te taha hinengaro (mental and emotional), and te taha whānau (social).</td>
<td>Reports from project worker, key stakeholders in the communities and Reference Group about the way the initiatives and activities are being developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1d: Mental Health Foundation (MHF): Regional Youth Development Project – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Are the rangatahi / young people developing a sense of their cultural identity and self-worth?</td>
<td>Rangatahi's behaviour and feedback from whānau and key stakeholders in the communities show that rangatahi are: developing a sense of their Māori identity and their understanding of tikanga; developing their relationships with whānau / family - whakawhanaungatanga.</td>
<td>Feedback from project worker, rangatahi and their whānau (if possible) about rangatahi's increased understanding of, and engagement with, cultural programmes and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are the rangatahi / young people showing greater awareness of health issues and interest in healthier lifestyles?</td>
<td>Evidence that rangatahi / young people are showing an understanding of messages about healthy living (it may not be possible during the project to see evidence that the rangatahi / young people are actually making healthy lifestyle choices).</td>
<td>Feedback from project worker and health workers in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Has the project identified gaps in youth forums / networks and been able to take actions to fill these gaps?</td>
<td>Information about existing youth forums / networks and gaps in provision, and details of ways in which gaps might be filled.</td>
<td>Feedback from project worker and Reference Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Has the project identified issues and deficiencies in youth services and been able to facilitate action to improve services?</td>
<td>Information about existing youth services and gaps in provision, and details of ways in which services might be improved.</td>
<td>Feedback from project worker and other service providers in the regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is the project beginning to engage key stakeholders and hapū / iwi / communities in youth development issues and initiatives, and increasing their understanding about the issues facing rangatahi / young people?</td>
<td>Evidence of ways in which hapū / iwi / communities and key stakeholders and getting involved in initiatives to support rangatahi / young people. Evidence of ways in which hapū / iwi / communities and key stakeholders are increasing their understanding of issues facing rangatahi / young people.</td>
<td>Feedback from project worker, community representatives, key stakeholders and Reference Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points to note:**

- DIA's Research Services will carry out the process evaluation using information from the six and 12-month reports provided by the Mental Health Foundation and the Community Development Group (CDG) Advisor, and from discussions with the project worker, other MHF staff and the Reference Group.
- The outcome evaluation also will use information from the six and 12-month reports. In addition, CDG will commission an independent evaluator to seek feedback about the project from the people and groups that the project is working with.
- The confidentiality of the rangatahi / young people and their whānau will be maintained during the evaluation.
### Table 1e: Tumau Tutoa – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the wider social <strong>context</strong> for this project?</td>
<td>Description of the socio-economic make-up of the community targeted by the project</td>
<td>Analysis of Statistics NZ data. Information from the project workers about the communities they are working with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the project <strong>reached</strong> its target audience?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the young people attending programmes and activities / receiving services</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What channels did the project use to <strong>recruit</strong> its target audience?</td>
<td>Methods used to identify and recruit young people</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s records. Discussion with project workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has the project <strong>delivered</strong> the programmes and services planned?</td>
<td>Details of programmes /activities / services delivered, including proposed ones</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s reports. Advisor’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the project <strong>established and maintained links</strong> with other support agencies</td>
<td>Details of organisations and agencies Tumau Tutoa is working with.</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s reports. Discussion with project workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the target audience <strong>received</strong> the programmes and services delivered?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the young people successfully engaging in / completing programmes and activities / and receiving services</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s reports and &quot;HEADS&quot; assessments of young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Is the project being implemented with integrity and quality</strong> – are the providers delivering the project in the way that they said they would?</td>
<td>Description of project components and delivery and comparison with proposals in applications / business plans</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s reports. Discussion with project workers. Advisor’s reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (to be agreed with projects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How is the <strong>implementation</strong> of the project benefiting its target audience?</td>
<td>Initial indications of the benefits to the young people participating in the programme</td>
<td>Discussion with project workers about information from reflective journals (note: individual young people’s confidentiality will be maintained). Advisor’s reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (this aspect will be followed up in more detail in the outcome evaluation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1e: Tumau Tutoa – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 - Outcome evaluation – short-term outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were Pacific young people at risk identified and referred to Tumau Tutoa?</td>
<td>Number of young people referred to Tumau Tutoa. Reports of any young people in the target community “slipping through the net” Reports that Tumau Tutoa is recognised by the Pacific community as a preferred supplier of services</td>
<td>Tumau Tutoa’s referral documentation. Feedback from schools / community / other service delivery agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Were the young people involved in Tumau Tutoa able to complete the programme successfully?</td>
<td>Number of young people completing the programme whose final assessment shows decreased dependency and increased resiliency</td>
<td>Results from &quot;HEADS&quot; assessments of young people, youth self-evaluations and feedback from project workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does the way the programme is delivered protect the safety and well-being of young people?</td>
<td>Evidence that programmes and services are delivered in a comprehensive and culturally competent way.</td>
<td>Quality reports submitted to the Project Management Group. Feedback from stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Have the young people developed a sense of their cultural identity and self-worth?</td>
<td>Self-evaluations and assessments show that the young people are developing a sense of their cultural identity, self-worth and</td>
<td>Young people's self evaluation and assessments Feedback from project workers and family, schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Was the service delivery by other agencies more co-ordinated and effective?</td>
<td>Number of agencies maintaining links with Tumau Tutoa and providing timely and culturally appropriate services for young people</td>
<td>Details of agencies established relationship with and feedback from project workers and agencies on the effectiveness of the working relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are young people getting more support from their families / whānau?</td>
<td>Number of young people with regular family contact</td>
<td>Young people's journals. Feedback from family / whānau evaluations and project workers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1e: Tumau Tutoa – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Has the Pacific community's understanding of the issues and pressures facing young people increased?</td>
<td>Increased awareness and understanding of the issues and pressures among the Pacific community</td>
<td>Feedback about the community response from schools, community groups and referral agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points to note:
- DIA's Research Services will carry out the process evaluation using information from the six and 12-month reports provided by Tumau Tutoa and the Community Development Group (CDG) Advisor, and from discussions with the project workers.
- The outcome evaluation also will use information from the six and 12-month reports. In addition, CDG will commission an independent evaluator to seek feedback about the project from the agencies, schools and communities that the project is working with.
- The confidentiality of the young people will be maintained during the evaluation and information about the young people's progress from their assessments, self-evaluations and the young people's journals will be obtained through interviews with project workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the wider social <strong>context</strong> for this project?</td>
<td>Description of the socio-economic make-up of the community targeted by the project.</td>
<td>Analysis of Statistics NZ data. Information from the YDO and other Trust staff about the communities they are working with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the project <strong>reached</strong> its target audience?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the young people attending programmes and activities / receiving services.</td>
<td>Rau O Te Huia Trust and YDO's reports. Advisor's reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What channels did the project use to <strong>recruit</strong> its target audience?</td>
<td>Success of methods used to identify and recruit young people.</td>
<td>Rau O Te Huia Trust and YDO's reports. Discussion with YDO, other Trust staff and feedback from the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has the project <strong>delivered</strong> the programmes and services planned?</td>
<td>Details of programmes /activities / services delivered, including proposed ones.</td>
<td>Rau O Te Huia Trust and YDO's reports. Advisor's reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the project <strong>established and maintained links</strong> with other support agencies</td>
<td>Details of organisations and agencies the project is working with.</td>
<td>Rau O Te Huia Trust and YDO's reports. Discussion with YDO and other Trust staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the target audience <strong>received</strong> the programmes and services delivered?</td>
<td>Numbers and characteristics of the young people successfully engaging in / completing programmes and activities / receiving services.</td>
<td>Rau O Te Huia Trust and YDO's reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Is the project being implemented with integrity and quality</strong> – are the providers delivering the project in the way that they said they would?</td>
<td>Description of project components and delivery in comparison with proposals in applications / business plans. Delivery of programmes and services in relation to information from SPINZ about safety issues around suicide prevention work.</td>
<td>Rau O Te Huia Trust and YDO's reports. Discussion with YDO and other Trust staff. Advisor's reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (to be agreed with projects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>How is the implementation</strong> of the project benefiting its target audience?</td>
<td>Initial indications of the benefits to the young people participating in the programme.</td>
<td>Discussion with YDO and other Trust staff about the ways the programmes are benefiting young people (note: individual young people’s confidentiality will be maintained). Advisor's reports – and feedback from selected stakeholders (this aspect will be followed up in more detail in the outcome evaluation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1f: Rau O Te Huia Trust – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 - Outcome evaluation – short-term outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the young people involved in the activities and programmes able to complete them successfully?</td>
<td>Number of young people completing the programmes and providing positive feedback about their experiences.</td>
<td>Feedback from YDO, other Trust staff, whānau, schools and other community agencies about young people’s participation in the programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the way the programmes are delivered protect the safety and well-being of young people?</td>
<td>Evidence that programmes and services are delivered in a comprehensive and culturally competent way and address the total well-being of the young people - te taha wairua (spiritual), te taha tinana (physical), te taha hinengaro (mental and emotional), and te taha whānau (social).</td>
<td>Reports from YDO, other Trust staff, whānau and Rau O Te Huia Trust staff, and feedback from stakeholders about the way the programmes are delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the young people developing a sense of their cultural identity and self-worth?</td>
<td>Young people’s behaviour and feedback from whānau and stakeholders show that the young people are: ▪ developing: a sense of their Māori identity and their understanding of Te Reo and tikanga; ▪ learning to mix together and work cooperatively; and ▪ developing a sense of their self-worth.</td>
<td>Feedback from YDO, other Trust staff, whānau and stakeholders about young people’s participation in, and engagement with, cultural programmes and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are the young people involved in the parenting programmes developing their parenting skills?</td>
<td>Evidence that young people who are parents are improving their parenting skills.</td>
<td>Feedback from whānau and health workers in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are the young people showing greater awareness of health issues and interest in healthier lifestyles?</td>
<td>Response of young people to messages about healthy living.</td>
<td>Feedback from YDO, other Trust staff, whānau, schools and health workers in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are young people participating in the alternative education programmes and completing courses / training?</td>
<td>Details of courses completed and evidence about how the young people are benefiting (for example, going on to further training, using skills in the community or looking for work, feeling more confident).</td>
<td>Feedback from YDO, whānau and schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1f: Rau O Te Huia Trust – Evaluation Questions for Stages 2 and 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators (i.e. information to answer the questions)</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Was the service delivery by other agencies more co-ordinated and effective?</td>
<td>Number of agencies maintaining links with the project and evidence of more co-ordinated service provision. Number of young people/whānau successfully referred to support agencies.</td>
<td>Details of agencies the project has established relationships with and feedback from YDO, other Trust staff and agencies on the effectiveness of the working relationships. Feedback from YDO and support agencies about the effectiveness of referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are young people getting more support from their whānau?</td>
<td>Evidence that young people are engaging more positively with whānau.</td>
<td>Feedback from whānau, YDO and other Trust staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are young people more aware of the support and services available to them in times of stress?</td>
<td>Schools and support agencies report that young people are more willing to seek help and support.</td>
<td>Feedback from schools and other agencies. Feedback from whānau and health workers in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Are young people actively involved in setting up and running the youth centre and beginning to participate in their communities?</td>
<td>Evidence of young people's active involvement in setting up and running the youth centre and beginning to engage with their communities.</td>
<td>Feedback from YDO and other Trust staff about the way the centre was set up and is being operated and feedback from stakeholders about the ways young people are getting involved in the community. Feedback from young people attending the centre about their experiences and what they are learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Has the support available to the young people in Fordlands increased as a result of the project?</td>
<td>Evidence that services and support are more accessible to young people.</td>
<td>Discussion with the Trust and other stakeholders about improvements in service availability and delivery, including the benefits of having a trained youth development officer working in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Has the Fordlands community's understanding of the issues and pressures facing young people increased?</td>
<td>Increased awareness and understanding of the issues and pressures among the Fordlands community.</td>
<td>Feedback about the community response from stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points to note:**

- DIA’s Research Services will carry out the process evaluation using information from the six and 12-month reports provided by Rau O Te Huia Trust and the Community Development Group (CDG) Advisor, and from discussions with the YDO and other trust staff.
- The outcome evaluation also will use information from the six and 12-month reports. In addition, CDG will commission an independent evaluator to seek feedback about the project from whānau and from the agencies, schools and communities that the project is working with.
- The confidentiality of the young people will be maintained during the evaluation.
Appendix 5: Letter sent to project workers

Example of the letter sent to each of the YDF projects by Research Services to explain the evaluation process and invite comment on their logic model and evaluation questions

Kia ora

Evaluation of the Youth Development Projects:

I am writing to explain more about the evaluation of the ------ Trust project. The evaluation has three stages. Since Katja came to visit you, we've been working on stage one and I'm keen to get your views on the information we've put together about your project, as well as the questions we aim to answer in the next two stages.

Stage 1 of the evaluation

Stage 1 is using the information from your project proposal and your six and twelve month reports. Thanks for taking the time to complete these reports. These give us a lot of useful information about your project's progress.

Stage 1 involves looking at:

- how your project has been set up;
- whether or not the project's initiatives and activities are on target to meet the intended outcomes; and
- how your project will contribute to the goals and objectives of the government's Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy.

We have shown how everything links together in diagram 1. This diagram is called a logic model. Sorry about the evaluation jargon. I hope this letter helps you understand it.

- Column 1 of the diagram lists the resources (or inputs) your project has available.
- Column 2 lists the main initiatives and activities that your project is carrying out.
- Column 3 shows the direct results of these initiatives and activities (the outputs), for example, the number of young people referred to your programme.
- Columns 4 and 5 show the benefits and changes in the young people's behaviour that the project aims to achieve (the outcomes). These are divided into short and long-term outcomes, as we know that changing behaviours takes time and it may not be possible to see and measure all of these changes in the first few years of the project.
- Column 6 lists your project's objectives and shows how we see your project contributing to the goals and objectives of the Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy. I've attached a copy of the goals from Kia Piki Te Ora O Te Taitamariki and In Our Hands, in case you don't have them.
The logic model shows that your project is on target to meet its outcomes. The model shows the main elements of the project, rather than everything that you are doing. Please let me know if you agree that we have included the main things in the model that your project is doing, or planning to do.

Once we’ve got your feedback, we will write up our first evaluation report on your project. This will include a brief explanation of the project, the logic model and our evaluation of your progress so far. We will send you a copy of this report when it is available.

Stages 2 and 3 of the evaluation

Stages 2 and 3 of the evaluation will help us understand more about how your project is working and what impact it is having. These stages will involve answering a series of questions about the project. Table 1 shows the questions we’ve put together for your project and the data we’ll assemble to answer these.

For stage 2 we’ll be using information from your reports and your Advisor’s reports. We’d like to talk to one or two of the agencies you work with as well, to get some independent feedback. Katja will come to visit you again towards the end of September to discuss how the project’s progressing and explain more about stages 2 and 3 of the evaluation.

Stage 3 will use information from the reports and discussions with you. We also will commission an independent evaluator to interview more of your project’s key stakeholders, again to get independent feedback on the impact your project is having on the young people, their whānau and your community.

I’d appreciate it if you would look at the questions we’ve listed for your project and let me know if you feel these are the appropriate questions to be asking, or if you think we’ve missed anything out.

I know you have a lot of demands on your time, but I’m keen to get your views about the evaluation, and so I hope that you can provide some feedback. If possible, please can you reply by Wednesday 3 September? If you want to, you can write any comments you have on the diagram and table, and then send them back to me. If you’d prefer an electronic copy of the diagram and table, then please email me to let me know.

If any of the information I’ve sent doesn’t make sense, then please call me (04 495 7236) or speak to your Advisor about it. I’m sending him a copy of this letter.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Nāku noa, na

Sue Walker
Manager, Research Services
(email: sue.walker@dia.govt.nz)

Encl. copy of goals and objectives from Kia Piki Te Ora O Te Taitamariki and In Our Hands
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