OLA FOU – PASIFIKA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Fiji and Samoa

Final Project Evaluation Report

Susan Elliott

March 2008

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

This evaluation of the Ola Fou youth worker programme took place over two weeks in late February and March 2008. A participative methodology was used including observation of youth workers in context, a review of literature and programme documentation, focus group discussions in Fiji and Samoa and one-to one interviews with Ola Fou students, leaders and agency managers.

The purpose of the review was

- To enable implementing agencies and NZAID to learn (for future projects and programmes) from the successes and mistakes in designing and implementing Ola Fou.

- To assess what difference the project has made to the Ola Fou participants, the young people they work with and their communities.

- To help NZAID make a decision about possible extension of the project to a second phase

The evaluation found that the programme was highly professional, relevant, taught using a participative methodology and had achieved a great deal in a short timeframe on a minimal budget. It fills a currently unmet need and has resulted in the formation of the nub of a cadre of confident, reflective youth practitioners who have developed a broad skill set and are highly motivated to continue their work. Ola Fou is lead by a group of committed youth workers and educators who show passion and vision for their work. The programme is founded on a nest of overlapping partnerships going back over a number of years providing for the basis of trust and openness to continue negotiation of further programmes. Crucially these involve Maori and New Zealand-based Pacific Islanders.

However, the programme has some limitations and some challenges, which need to be addressed in future programmes. Ola Fou itself has identified the need to broaden the base of agencies from which students are recruited. More investment is required in the set up phase to get the buy in and increase understanding of agencies employing youth workers (on a voluntary or paid basis). Some agencies are suspicious that the programme is mobilising young people in order to draw them away from traditional churches and/or establish a new evangelical church. Increased understanding among agencies should go a considerable way to overcome this suspicion. Agencies also need to be made explicitly aware that the programme is not designed to ensure evangelising activities are more effective; but focused on broad aspects of youth development.

In future, participants should be recruited from a broader range of agencies and greater attention given to gender equality. Gender equality should also be addressed in recruitment and both the content of the course and in the teaching methodology. This can be achieved through an explicit focus on the different issues facing young men and women in the Pacific and through further modelling by leaders and the introduction of gender-based processing groups similar to the language groups already used. Similarly, attention should be given to human rights issues; especially as they relate to legal literacy as the youth workers are often met with ethical issues involving the law.

The programme would benefit from NZQA accreditation as this will increase graduates opportunities in gaining paid employment, although these appear to be limited. In Samoa at least, NZQA recognition will easily lead to recognition of the qualification by the newly formed Samoa Qualification Authority.

Programmes such as Ola Fou, which are based in faith-based agencies, are relatively new for NZAID. During the development and implementation of this programme there have been five programme managers, and mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure NZAID learns from the programme and can feed that learning back into the wider agency.

The programme sits well within NZAID priorities and policies and aligns well with wider Pacific youth development strategies. NZAID supports many of these across the Pacific. As such it is recommended that the programme is funded at for a further three to five years, but that Praxis seeks approval of the course to a Diploma level, with students able to exit if at the Certificate level. This provides some flexibility in programming and requires little extra work during the accreditation process. Whether or not the programme is taught at a Diploma level will also depend on having a critical mass of eligible, committed students who have a reasonable chance of gaining paid employment at the conclusion of the course.

Recommendations

1. **The programme should continue, for another three to five years**. This would allow time for Pacific trainers to build competence in leading the programme and a permanent Pacific base to be established (either in an NGO or an educational institution) and the qualification to be accredited. At the end of this period there should be a further review of the programme which could include tracking of graduates and attention to the longer term impact of the programme.

2. The current selection criteria appear appropriate, however recruitment should not be restricted to participants with high school level education, as the programme is well suited to develop youth work skills among people who are tertiary graduates working in hands on jobs.

3. NZAID *Guidelines for Working with Faith-Based Organisations* should be used to guide programme discussions and contracting with Praxis and with Pacific agencies. NZAID could also draw further on the way in which churches are seen as enhancing community and family as an underpinning strategy in the New Zealand MSD *Pacific Youth Development Strategy* for Auckland.

4. Visits to students between Block courses should be retained in future courses but should be more structured and include meeting with the student, their agency and supervisor; together and separately. Ola Fou leaders need to use this time to engage constructively in dialogue about change with agencies so as to increase their support for the programme, but more importantly to increase their understanding of its approach to youth work.

5. NZAID should recognise that small scale programmes such as Ola Fou have a value wider than the programmatic content. They afford ways the agency can learn about:

- engaging with faith-based organisations in development
- follow developments in the DfID research on religions and development and the MSD approach to churches in the *Pacific Youth Development Strategy* for Auckland and
- Build upon and encourage the involvement of Maori and New Zealand-based Pacific Islanders in development.

6. In future programmes budgetary allowance needs to be made for administration; monitoring and evaluation in line with the usual NZAID Guidelines for funding NGOs.

7. If Ola Fou runs again there needs to be more investment in engaging agencies employing youth workers. An entry, recruitment and ongoing support strategy needs to be developed for each country involved in the programme.

8. In future, the course should include a greater focus on gender equality through

- Inclusion of course content material on the different issues facing young men and women in the Pacific.
- Provision for gender specific processing groups should be made to enable young men and women to discuss issues that affect them separately.
- Further efforts to have equal numbers of men and women teachers in order to model gender equality and positive relationships between men and women as youth workers and leaders.

9. Further courses should include a more formal focus on rights if the programme runs again; especially at the Diploma level. Particular attention should be given to legal rights and literacy.

10. the programme should be consolidated in the existing countries first before it is extended further.

11. Further discussions with the UNITEC Graduate Diploma in not for Profit Management should occur to learn from their experience of developing a pool of Pacific based resource people.

12. Planning to identify vocational pathways for graduates and support services should occur sooner rather than later to help students gain paid employment at the end of their study.

2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation was

- To enable implementing agencies and NZAID to learn (for future projects and programmes) from the successes and mistakes in designing and implementing Ola Fou.

- To assess what difference the project has made to the Ola Fou participants, the young people they work with and their communities.

- To help NZAID make a decision about possible extension of the project to a second phase

2.2 Evaluation Methodology

The review methodology was discussed by NZAID, Praxis and the Director of YfC Fiji ahead of time and some initial scheduling was done. From there much of the methodology was emergent and used a snowball approach to identify stakeholders for interview. Although each stage was planned beforehand, the plans were modified as the review progressed. The review was carried out by a New Zealand based consultant in Fiji, but in Samoa she was joined by a Samoan co-worker as not all of the students were confident to fully express themselves in English. A list of people interviewed or met makes up Appendix 4.

Steps in the evaluation were:

In NZ pre visits to Fiji and Samoa

1. Briefing by NZAID Programme Manager and Praxis staff in Wellington
2. An initial review of available documentation
3. a brief review of literature relating to youth work in the Pacific and New Zealand (See Appendix 6 for list of background materials or papers used)

In Fiji

4. interviews and discussions with primary and secondary stakeholders including
   - the Youth for Christ (YfC) Director/Ola Fou Pacific coordinator in Fiji
   - 6 Ola Fou students and community members in Fiji
   - agency staff and/or leaders in Fiji
   - mentors
5. Visits to youth groups and schools which included observations and focus group discussions. Two settlements were visited (one predominantly Fijian the other mainly Indo-Fijian) and two villages (one peri-urban and the other rural). A visit to a rural bee-keeping project was originally planned, but the youth work who established it during the Ola Fou programme has now left YfC and returned to his own island.

In Samoa

6. Briefing and meeting with co-worker
7. interviews and discussions with Primary and secondary stakeholders including
   - Director of YfC Samoa

- 4 Ola Fou students
- Peace Chapel youth Pastor and Ola Fou leader in Samoa
- Interviews with student mentees and mentors
8. Observation of YfC primary school programme

In NZ post visits
15. Debriefing with NZAID and Praxis

2.3 Limitations of the Review

The review largely confirms the reporting from Praxis, but my interpretations are inevitably influenced by my own experience and opinions. Although I have a broad background knowledge and experience in NGO (non-governmental organisation) relationships and NGOs in the Pacific, I have limited experience of youth work or youth worker development programmes. However, experience my teaching on the UNITEC Graduate Diploma in Not for Profit Management allowed comparison of team teaching practices in a Pacific context.

3. Project Background

Ola Fou was developed as a partnership between a group of NZ and Pacific based organisations that have developed relationships over more than 10 years. The project aims to provide contextualised training and support for youth workers across the Pacific nations.

The team that managed the project has included the (then) leaders of Youth for Christ in Samoa and Fiji (Isaia Lameta and Sereki Korocowiri respectively), the coordinator from Praxis New Zealand (Lloyd Martin), and a board member of Te Ora Hou (Danette Abraham). A wider group of people including NZAID staff, assisted with planning, advice, teaching resources and reporting during the project.

The following goals were established for the project in the original proposal to NZAID:

- o **Promote indigenous approaches to youth development in the Pacific**
- o **Raise the credibility and worth of youth work and youth workers in the Pacific.**
- o **Assist church and community organisations to recruit and up skill youth workers.**
- o **Deliver a recognised qualification for youth workers in NZ and Pacific**

A fifth goal was added after an initial Ola Fou evaluation of where the students 'were at' in their approach to youth work:

- o **Promote participatory and developmental approaches to youth work.**

The course was planned through a series of meetings between the Pacific and NZ based trainers and delivered over a series of block courses following a pilot course held in Fiji. The first four of these were held in each of the four participating nations (Samoa, Fiji, Tonga and the Solomon Islands). (Appendix 6 sets out the programme's timeline). These events were open to all youth leaders, and other practitioners. Recruitment was driven through YfC Fiji. Participants in Samoa and Fiji were invited through the YfC networks. These invitations were mainly given to church and community groups to send their youth leaders. In Tonga and the Solomon Islands, local contact people were approached and asked to contact people in their networks. From these initial workshops, participants for the ongoing project were selected.

The remaining three (residential) block courses were held at youth camps in Fiji over the following twelve months. The aim of this was to offer the course in Pacific cultural context as far as is possible. During the block courses, the students were also hosted by Fijian families in villages and squatter settlements as a break from the camp environment.

A series of smaller scale objectives were established at the beginning of the project.

3.1 Background and project rationale

Ola Fou was developed as a youth worker development programme with a key goal of beginning to change youth work towards being interactive and based on participatory models. I.e. changing how people in church-based organisations interact with young people. The programme hoped to take faith-based youth work out of the church and into the communities where young people lived thereby equipping young people with skills to use in all aspects of their lives.

However in the Pacific, especially in church circles the terms youth worker, youth leader or youth pastor are often used interchangeably. Praxis defined youth work as building relationships with young people and then building connections to and participation in communities to meet needs. A flexible approach was taken to who was defined as youth, reflecting the need for contextualising the programme and taking account of national and cultural differences and approaches. This in turn impacts on the goal of promoting indigenous approaches to youth work in the Pacific as these will differ between each Island state further highlighting the need to ensure ongoing work with sponsoring agencies to ensure relevance in each context. This is discussed further below.

The programme was designed to meet a need for youth work practitioners who are unlikely to enrol in university level programmes; not for those involved in administration or employed by government agencies working with young people e.g. teachers, probation officers etc. None of the participants had any formal youth work training; in fact little appears to exist and currently there is no recognised youth work qualification in Fiji or Samoa. Much of what is available at this Certificate level is currently provided for young people working in peer education programmes such as those promoting HIV/AIDS awareness. The only other certified training available in the Pacific is the tertiary-level Commonwealth Youth Programme Diploma in Youth Development Work offered through USP in Fiji and Samoa and the Solomon Islands College of further Education. NZAID provides $95,000 a year for the global programme. This has a low level of uptake in the Pacific (currently no one is enrolled in Samoa. Consequently the programme is being moved to the National University of Samoa in the hope that there will be a greater uptake).

Selection for the programme was based on
- Attendance at High School up to 4th form
- Being at least 18 years of age
- Having the support of their agency[1]
- Positive participation in Block 1.
- Being a practitioner actively involved in youth work- not as an administrator

These criteria appear appropriate for the nature of the course and the work the trainees are involved in. However recruitment should not be restricted to participants with high school level education, as the programme is well suited to develop youth work skills among people who are tertiary graduates working in hands on jobs in organisations such as Prison Fellowship.

Overall 52 youth workers participated in at least one Block course of the programme; 39 men and 13 women. Seven girls/women completed the course and 14 boys/men. The programme was structured so that all who participated would have gained some transferable skills which were immediately useable.

Recommendation

- _____

[1] Agency support is needed to release students from work to attend the Block course and provide supervision during the various practical exercises.

The current selection criteria appear appropriate, however recruitment should not be restricted to participants with high school level education, as the programme is well suited to develop youth work skills among people who are tertiary graduates working in hands on jobs.

0

4. Review Findings and Analysis

4.1 Ola Fou Context

Demographics

Across the Pacific there is an increasing need for youth workers given the population demographics. In general the population of Pacific Island countries is young, with predictions that the Pacific Island population will double in the next 30 years. However the small size of the population in Micronesian and Polynesian countries, and their historical and current political associations with New Zealand and Australia, makes these states very sensitive to international migration, which has a significant impact on their demographic structure. The fastest growing countries have the lowest median age and the broadest population base with increasing urbanisation and decreasing opportunities for youth employment in the formal sector despite gains in education enrolments (Haberkorn: 2004).

Pacific Youth work

Youth work in the Pacific has a low status (which reflects the lack of funding) and therefore there is a high attrition rate amongst workers. Most reportedly only stay for two- three years before moving on. There is no formal qualification for youth workers in the Pacific apart from the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) Diploma[2], which is aimed more at a policy level, and appears to have low take up in Fiji and Samoa.[3] Additionally, there is no formal youth work network in either Fiji or Samoa although there are informal links between youth workers who all seem to know each other. A formal network does exist in Tonga and Ola Fou could well build its current informal connections with it in future. In Fiji the *Young Persons Concerns Network* which is involved in a number of advocacy campaigns around issues such as youth suicide, is largely driven by a pro-democracy agenda and many prominent members are USP graduates; i.e. the network is not as focused on community development type initiatives such as those involved in Ola Fou.

Meeting NZAID and Regional Priorities

The TOR specifically ask for comment on the level of alignment that exists between the goals and outcomes of this project and the objectives of NZAID's Pacific Leadership Development Strategy. Ola Fou aimed to develop a cadre of youth workers across the Pacific, rather than leaders. However the course content had a component of teaching on leadership skills and styles thereby increasing awareness of leadership roles and responsibilities in line with the strategy. The graduates appear to now be viewed as leaders in their organisations- but at a junior level with limited opportunities to influence

-

[2] In Fiji and Samoa, the CYP Diploma is delivered through USP, but has a low level of uptake. In the Solomon Islands it is more active and implemented by the Solomon Islands College of Higher Education**.**

[3] The Division for Youth indicated that there were currently no enrolments in the programme based at USP in Samoa and the programme is likely to move to the National university of Samoa in an attempt to attract students.

organisational culture or structures. Nevertheless the programme fulfils other aims of the NZAID Pacific Leadership Strategy particularly through the provision of increasing access to high quality initiatives by those who model sound leadership qualities and values. This is reinforced through the focus on young people in civil society and community based organisations, through a programme lead by acknowledged change agents.

The programme is also in line with the NZAID *Pacific Strategy 2007-2015* focus on Improving Education and Health, Outcome 2 increased Opportunities and choices through skills development.

Ola Fou also supports the priorities of a number of other Pacific regional strategies: the Secretariat of the Pacific community (SPC) *Pacific Youth Strategy 2010; youth empowerment for a secure, prosperous and sustainable future*, particularly the Youth-Led Pacifica Strategy which focuses on capacity building of young people and their organisations and the *Pacific Plan* strategic objective for the enhanced involvement of youth. It is also inline with the overarching thrust of the *The Commonwealth Plan of Action for Youth Empowerment 2007-2015* particularly the aim of professionalising the youth work sector through investment in education and training. These initiatives aim, in different ways at professionalising youth work. Ola Fou contributes to this through discussions of the development of codes of ethics and seeking to have the training accredited at the same time allowing for a diversity of approaches depending on context.

Ola Fou is also in line with Goal 3 of the UNESCO *Education for All* strategy which has had prominence across the Pacific. Goal 3; ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programmes.

Faith-based Organisations and Development

This programme appears to be one of the first examples of NZAID engaging with faith-based agencies in development- outside the NZ international NGO sector. This sort of engagement is increasing with other donor agencies also[4], and provides the basis for learning for all involved and therefore needs to be approached openly. NZAID has a set of *Guidelines for Working with Faith-Based Organisations* which were developed with the NZ NGO sector in 1997. Although discussions took place with Praxis about NZAID's focus, NZAID staff were not aware of the Guidelines (possibly because they have only recently been incorporated in the *NZAID Tools*) and therefore they were not used to guide programme development. In future, the Guidelines should be used to guide programme discussions with Praxis and with Pacific agencies. NZAID could also draw further on the way in which churches are seen as enhancing community and family as an underpinning strategy in the New Zealand MSD *Pacific Youth Development Strategy* for Auckland.

- _____

[4] See for example the DfID research programme on Religions and Development at http://www.research4development.info/projectsAndProgrammesResults2.asp?search=simple%20List&SearchType=0&Topic=Religion%20and%20Development&SubTopicID=41&TopicID=8&Projects=undefined&Outputs=Yes

The way the Ola Fou Pacific leaders describe the programme is to move the programme away from a doctrinal position and into work with communities whilst acknowledging spirituality. They see the work built around the example of the life of Jesus; which is similar to the position of a number of NZ international development NGOs and the programme could well benefit from further discussion on these themes within the NGO sector.

The Ola Fou students commented that the church still has an important role in the lives of young people in the Pacific and most young people still have some link to a church and most youth work is linked to a church. Having said this, the students have developed a sound critique of current church approaches which they find anachronistic and increasingly frustrating.

Recommendation

NZAID *Guidelines for Working with Faith-Based Organisations* should be used to guide programme discussions and contracting with Praxis and with Pacific agencies. NZAID could also draw further on the way in which churches are seen as enhancing community and family as an underpinning strategy in the New Zealand MSD *Pacific Youth Development Strategy* for Auckland.

Political Upheavals

The programme ran over the period of the December 2006 coup in Fiji and during the political upheavals in Tonga. This affected the way in which some issues could be discussed during the programme. One of the students noted during the review however, that young people in Fiji have grown up through a series of coups and they have had a large impact on their life opportunities and so should be discussed. The coups have also politicised ethnicity in such a way that any faith-based initiative led by Fijians will be viewed with suspicion by other ethnic groups, especially Indo-Fijians. Nevertheless several of the participants in Fiji were of mixed heritage affecting their access to certain civil and political rights especially as they relate to ethnicity.[5]

4.2 Ola Fou Strengths and Achievements

Programme Impacts

A highly professionally programme
The programme was based on the Praxis New Zealand programme which was continuously adapted for the Pacific context. Praxis has long experience of running youth worker programmes for Pacific Island and Maori youth workers in NZ. Although the Praxis leaders had not worked in the Pacific before, the programme was seen as

-

---

[5] E.g. one of the participants came form a village who were all descendents of *beche de mer* traders originally from Spain and Portugal and are therefore described officially as part European even though they have had no European ancestors for more than 100 years.

highly relevant to the Pacific context by the youth workers themselves, the programme leaders and the agencies.

The programme content, although not directly accredited to the NZ Qualifications Authority (NZQA) framework, is based on the first year of the New Zealand Praxis Diploma in Youth and Community Studies course, which is accredited as a 100 credit course set at the equivalent to the level 4 of the NZQA framework. Further, course delivery and administration sat within the policies and procedures of the Quality Management System (QMS) of Praxis New Zealand and these are currently approved by NZQA.

As reviewed the curriculum is sound and Ola Fou is taught using participative teaching methodologies. The course is organised into three themes
- Through their eyes:
- The inward journey
- Agents of change

An overview of the course and an outline of the content can be found in Appendix 3.

The course was delivered through a series of four residential block courses over 18 months. The teaching methodology included a range of approaches including:

- Presentations followed by discussions style.
- Process groups of mixed nationalities, gender and ages
- The use of language groupings to aid discussions and understanding.
- Student's involvement in projects which generated rich learning for all involved; the students and their communities. Projects were based on sound participative needs analysis.
- Mentoring and reflective practice which provided ongoing support for students
- The introduction to a Code of Ethics which proved crucial when setting boundaries and dealing with young people involved in criminal activities.

The visits to students between the Block courses were valuable to motivate students. Support during each visit varied, but generally included assessing student's progress with the assignments, their agency visited and if sufficient progress had been made, their ticket booked to the next block course. In future these visits should be retained, however they should be more structured and include meeting with the student, their agency and supervisor; together and separately. Ola Fou leaders need to use this time to engage constructively in dialogue about change with agencies so as to increase their support for the programme, but more importantly to increase their understanding of its approach to youth work, as discussed below.

As their final assignment, each student was required to complete a portfolio reflecting on what they had learnt over the full-length of the course and how they applied it in their own community context. The Ola Fou leaders were generally pleased with the level of reflection in this work and the portfolios sighted by the reviewers showed a high level of reflective practice and involved many hours of work in compilation over a number of months. These appear to be highly valued and a source of pride for students. As they explained "Putting them together meant you could see where you had put things into practice; the evidence was there." At least one graduate is continuing to develop her

portfolio. Common themes in the portfolios included the Activity Based Learning (ABL) activities, the results of the community research activities, the 'inward journey" (which included mentoring and counselling) and the "Circle of Courage"[6].

Reflecting on the programme, participants found all aspects useful and the new approaches to youth work introduced were "eye-opening". All reported increased self-confidence as a result of the programme. The most valued components were the ABL (and the associated debriefing), risk assessments the skills developed to conduct community research and setting boundaries. Evidence of these being applied could be found in community work completed during the course and in subsequent work.

Students reported that the programme was based on their existing experience. It surfaced approaches already being used and built on them whilst at the same time it gave them new insights into the young people they work- changing the way they thought about young people and moving their perceptions away from negative images. It increased their understanding of the challenges many young people face in their lives and how they have coped. This was very positively received. They further felt that the programme gave a voice to young people and built their understanding of how people with different skills and personalities can work together and how they as individuals can develop their skills to work with people from different backgrounds. The mix of people from different Pacific Island countries was also seen as positive as they gained from each other's perspectives. As a result of Ola Fou students have changed their approach to youth work and appear to be continuing to develop new approaches suited to their situation.

Nevertheless students also found the programme challenging. For some 18 months was a long stretch given the precarious nature of their employment and they felt that some students dropped out because they had competing obligations. They felt it would be better to run the course over a 12 month period with the dates for the Block courses scheduled and notified in advance at the start of the programme.

Those in Fiji felt the time between the Block courses was too long and it was sometimes hard to keep the momentum up, or material learned in one Block was forgotten by the next. Some also found it hard to get released from work for the Blocks, which appears to be the reason for some students dropping out. The practical side of the programme (especially staying in communities) was also highly challenging; but also very rewarding.

Several of the agencies were very supportive of the methodology noting that "youth work is practical so the training needs to be practical too. "A picture is worth a thousand words". Everyone involved valued bringing young people together from across the Pacific; as it provided multiple insights into common issues of concern and approaches to youth work. "It's a good reminder that we have Pacific neighbours and fosters a feeling that we can do things together". Participants themselves found coming together with a group of peers released stress and enabled them to learn from each other.

-

[6] The Circle of Courage is a model of positive youth development based in four universal growth needs of all children: belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity. For more details see *Reclaiming Youth Work* http://www.reclaiming.com/about/index.php?page=philosophy

Agencies noticed a number of positive changes in Ola Fou students as a result of the programme. These included increased commitment and empathy for working with young people, independence, confidence and maturity, development of public speaking skills and the ability to draw people in. The programme gave young people direction and organised their youth work more effectively, developed motivational skills and the ability to coordinate work with others. They were already respected by others, but they could show they were role models through their actions. As a result they were seen as more reliable and accountable and more likely to be trusted by their agencies. They are seen as a bridge between young people and school or church where they are working.

Two secondary stakeholders interviewed had completed the UNITEC Graduate Diploma in Not-for-Profit Management and now continue their involvement through teaching on the programme. They saw great benefits in the Ola Fou team teaching approach noting that Pacific Island teachers help ensure programmes are appropriately contextualised whilst New Zealand based teachers can ensure standards are established and maintained relative to the NZ framework and new perspectives introduced. The Ola Fou Pacific Island teachers noted the benefits of having NZ colleagues working with them especially when they needed to screen people out. This was needed to preserve the integrity of the programme, but the Pacific way would have let everyone continue.

> **Recommendations**
> In future courses, should they run, visits to students between Block courses should be retained but should be more structured and include meeting with the student, their agency and supervisor; together and separately. Ola Fou leaders need to use this time to engage constructively in dialogue about change with agencies so as to increase their support for the programme, but more importantly to increase their understanding of its approach to youth work.

Development of a Cadre of confident, reflective youth practitioners
Ola Fou's greatest achievement has been in the development of a cadre of confident, reflective youth work practitioners, who evidentially and through self report have radically changed their approaches to youth work. Previously they report they struggled to find answers to young people's questions. The programme made them realise that you can't give others answers to their problems, they need to find the answers for themselves. However, as they still quite inexperienced, they still need supervision and management. The have the potential to develop further and to become supervisors and mentors to others. The young people themselves also report they have developed maturity, responsibility, an ability to organise programmes, have strong public speaking skills and act as role models for other young people.

Graduates apply many of the skills learned in their work, and have passed on some approaches to their mentees e.g. journaling. Others have been asked to use their new found skills in a range of settings. As a result of the programme, youth workers are involved in a range of types of work, on a paid and voluntary basis. Agencies and youth workers alike describe substantially increased competence in a range of youth work settings. Depending on the agency focus and individual worker's preferred style, learning is being applied to work spread over
- Structured work with small and large groups
- structured one-to-one work

- Unstructured time

In the relatively short time since the programme completed students have continued their involvement in a number of programmes as outlined in Praxis' final report, but have also developed further activities. Students visited during the programme are involved in the following activities, although it is too early to comment on their ongoing sustainability.

- Working with small and large groups they have
  o worked as peer educators for the Division for Youth in Samoa and are considered their elite peer educators
  o run children's programmes. The *Joy Club* organised by a Fijian Salvation Army youth worker in Fiji has developed the trust if the Indo-Fijian families and more than 40 children now attend regularly. A 17 year old young woman from the settlement assists with the programme which is also attended by a number of parents. Eventually, the youth worker hopes the parents will start to engage more with their children. The group meets on a field near the settlement owned by a developer, who gave his permission for its use in this way. Through the *Joy Club,* the youth worker has become aware of a number of children who are not attending school and has arranged for the Salvation Army to pay their fees.
  o youth groups. In Samoa, Peace chapel has changed its youth programme to include structured single-sex *Life Groups* made up of approximately 10 young people aged 13-19, led by youth workers from Ola Fou. These groups meet each week to discuss every day life issues and the choices young people make. All of the young people attending have journals. Followed the groups each week there is a large group event called *Breaking Down the Walls* where young people can discuss things that people don't usually want to talk about. Peace Chapel hope that by working intensively with groups the members will eventually develop reflective skills in their own interaction with their communities; thereby creating a ripple effect.
  o teaching dance classes in an after school club at a High School.
  o lead community development programmes at a village level. (see the example below of the village bus stop).
  o Taken part in a Youth Parliament. The Division for Youth in Samoa noted that the Ola Fou graduate "MP" impressed through her public speaking skills during the parliament.

- in structured one-to-one work Ola Fou graduates have
  o mentored young people. In one case a youth worker took a street kid to live with his family after visiting the boy's parents and grandmother. In another a senior high school student was suicidal and wanting to leave school before her 7th form year. After working with the student, she returned to school and was made a prefect and is now assisting her friends. Another Fiji graduate is helping a family get a birth certificate for their six year old son so that he can enrol in school.
  o interpreted for deaf children at school and reported increased confidence in challenging other boys in the class who made discriminatory remarks about the deaf students
  o worked as a first aider at major rugby tournaments because of their Red Cross first aid Certificate.

- o Worked with a young man to set up a small incoming generating project cutting grass around the township.
- During unstructured time students
  - o provide informal advice during conversations with other young people in villages about life choices e.g. taking drugs or drinking alcohol.

Positive feedback was received from parents and young people in villages and settlements in Fiji, and from church youth groups in Samoa. Students have developed excellent community entry skills and would benefit from more support to enhance their community development skills. They appear to have developed the trust of the communities where they did their assignments and where some have continued with practical projects e.g. children's clubs which involve parents, exploring improving water supply in a village, village clean up campaigns, and planting flowers along communal footpaths. In at least two villages the youth groups had not been involved in any community development programmes for sometime and appear revitalised by the Ola Fou students' interventions. One project, to build a bus stop in a village in a rainy corridor so that children could keep dry while waiting for the school bus has had a wide impact on the community, as described in the example below.

The Village Bus stop

During Ola Fou students learned two community assessment methods- asking young people to take pictures of things they like about their community and things they don't like- and drawing pictures of the same things. In one village a boy drew the existing bus shelter, showing the rain coming through the roof, the muddy ground and people standing in the rain because the shelter was too small. On wet days children stayed home from school because of the inadequacy of the shelter. If they went to school wet, they were sent home; so many didn't attend school on rainy days. The Ola Fou student decided to work with the village youth group to build a new bus stop. Some funds were accessed from an Anglican University students group in Australia for the project. The village elders however tried to block the project as they wanted to complete the village hall which they started to build previously but ran out of funds. A number of concrete pillars were built and then the project stopped. With the assistance of his aunt and uncle and the youth group, the youth worker persisted. Various members of the group sourced building supplies (gravel, sand and cement) at a low price, others contacted relatives in town to help with the design and secure the metal poles needed. They also persuaded a relative who was a welder to help with construction. On the day the shelter was built, 55 people assisted in some way or other.

In addition to ensuring children from the village (and a neighbouring village) now arrive at school dry, the shelter is now a major source of pride for the youth group. It is the best on the road in the province. Women use it to sell bananas, saving them the time and cost of a bus trip to the town market. The young men meet there in the afternoons after they have finished work in the gardens to *talanoa*. The mother of the boy who drew the picture is proud of her son!

But the shelter has also had some quite profound affect on village relationships. The young men believe it is a daily testament to what they can do if the work together- pointing out that no infrastructure project had been finished in the village for the past 10 years because there was no agreement on priorities. They also believe the shelter shows that being young is not always negative as the label often leads people to believe.

The shelter has also lead to some deep village discussions. In 2001 the village sent two bus loads of young men to Parliament after the coup to support George Speight. As one older woman explained to us when we visited; "This is only a bus stop and it's been there for a year already, yet we're still talking about it. But we never talk about sending the boys to Parliament which was

the biggest thing to happen in this village for the past 20 years. Yes, the boys went- but we sent them. We haven't made good decisions for our young people in the past, and yet when they wanted to do something good for the children we tried to stop them, It's time we thought about how we make decisions affecting our young people.

The village also hosted Ola Fou students over two weekends during the course and explained that they benefited from having the girls from Samoa stay. They enjoyed the exchange of culture; but also later discussed the way in which the visiting girls allowed the young men and women of the village to play volleyball and do other activities together; which are usually the subject of cultural taboos. Relaxing those taboos for visitors didn't lead to any calamitous situations- but gave ground for refection.

Individuals also report changes in the way Ola Fou graduates interact with the members of a church youth group as the example below illustrates.

Changes in a Youth Group

One Ola Fou graduate traditionally preached to her youth group; giving them answers to their questions through repeating scriptures to them. Through Ola Fou she realised she did this because she did not know the answers to the young people's questions, but didn't know how else to respond. Through Ola Fou she realised people needed to seek answers for themselves. This year she has a totally different approach to her group. One of the group members described how the leader chooses a topic each week for the group to discuss e.g. relationships; with parents, boyfriends, siblings and God. She notes the leader now:
- asks questions- but never imposes on the members and leaves members to figure out the answers for themselves.
- lets the members figure out the right answer
- never rubbishes people
- is devoted
- sets out rules clearly
- respects the members of the group and they respect her
- asks "lots of hard questions about yourself".

The young member interviewed was also shares the discussions with her mother at home. The Youth Pastor reports that the girl's mother is impressed with her daughter's social development this year and attributes this to her membership of the youth group.

The Ola Fou student's mentor, a primary school teacher, also commented on how the graduate had become more confident and courageous, open and shared what she knew more readily with colleagues. She could communicate well and had good skills in leading small groups.

Communities also expressed surprise that youth workers would come into the community- leaving the walls of the church. There was some suspicion initially that projects were being carried out to mobilise and recruit young people to a new church, however once they saw the results they were happy to participate and benefited from them. One mentee commented that the Ola Fou students had "given him courage and motivation to do things" including beginning to operate a small scale grass cutting business. Others were led to reflect on their situation and decided to try and go back to school or further education, but were hampered by financial problems. Others

commented that in some squatter settlements there are many families without fathers. The young men youth workers were seen as valuable role models for these families.

Students have remained in contact with each other through online social networking sites, thus continue to exchange ideas and views. In Fiji, the Salvation Army Officer interviewed had observed a positive change in the way in which Ola Fou students worked together, assisting each other to organise programmes and events.

The Certificate awarded by the programme was important in that it provided increased recognition and status, and with status comes trust; which is essential within the agencies. But graduates all reported valuing the learning and experience as more important.

Partnership

Ola Fou is nested in a number of partnerships; key to sound development programming. The Partnership between YfC NZ and YfC Fiji and then Praxis, stretches back over more than 10 years and is the backbone of the Ola Fou programme. The Director of Praxis and the Director of YfC Fiji explored possible ways of training youth workers over several years in the late 1990s and early 2000s by sending young people to NZ for training. In each case the trainees wanted to stay on in NZ. With these early attempts proving unsustainable, alternative ways of increasing access to development opportunities were sought.

Praxis in turn is key to partnerships in NZ youth work involving Maori and Pacific Island youth and their leaders, including Te Ora Hou a Maori network of faith-based youth and community development organisations and a CID member. The programme also draws on relationships with the Salvation Army in New Zealand and Fiji. Ola Fou has benefited from these relationships in planned and unplanned ways. Maori and NZ-based Pacific Islanders taught on the programme and a group of Maori youth workers involved in the Praxis *Tipu Ake* training programme went to Fiji (at their own expense) for part of the final Block course and the graduation. The Ola Fou trainees and the Pacific Island based programme leaders greatly valued this exchange at a number of levels.

At a different level, observers commented that programmes such as Ola Fou are an over due and positive way for NZAID to begin developing partnerships and engagement with Christian faith-based groups in the Pacific as the church groups have felt ostracised by donor agencies for too long. Programmes like Ola Fou appear to be a relatively small scale and safe way to explore such programming. NZAID should explore ways it can learn about engaging with faith-based organisations in development through small scale programmes such as Ola Fou and follow developments in the DfID research on religions and development and the MSD youth Strategy for Auckland, discussed previously.

Recommendation

NZAID should recognise that small scale programmes such as Ola Fou have a value wider than the programmatic content. They afford ways the agency can learn about

- engaging with faith-based organisations in development

- follow developments in the DfID research on religions and development and the MSD approach to churches in the *Pacific Youth Development Strategy* for Auckland and

- Build upon and encourage the involvement of Maori and New Zealand-based Pacific Islanders in development.

Strong Leadership

Ola Fou has a dedicated leadership group driven by passion and vision who showed the same high degree of reflective practice as their students. In turn, the programme has provided support and motivation to the Pacific based leaders involved and as a result they have a network of colleagues by email which provides further motivation and support.

The ongoing involvement and collegial support is crucial as it is through Ola Fou Pacific leaders as they are also agency managers who interact with peers and colleagues, that change in agencies is most likely to occur rather than through the youth workers. Already YfC in Fiji has revitalised their mentoring programming; using skills developed during Ola Fou to develop a group of mentors working in a range of settings, including sports clubs. The leaders have also been asked by other organisations, not all of them faith-based, to become involved in their youth programmes. E.g. in Fiji the Fiji Women's Rights Movement (FWRM) which runs an Emerging Leaders Forum for young women can see possibilities for links between the programmes. In Samoa, there have been requests for more work with church groups to get children to reflect more widely on various aspects of their lives. They see a role for the graduates in running these programmes- but the initial links will be through agencies leaders.

Indeed it is unrealistic to expect the youth workers to be able to affect change in their agencies given the entrenched church hierarchies, although the Ola Fou students see the programme as "shaking the churches".

The programme has also been managed in a highly professional way, especially at the New Zealand end. The YfC Director in Fiji commented that he had benefited and learned from that. The management in the Pacific could be further developed; but this will require more resources to cover administration costs.

Meeting an Unmet Need

The Pacific based Ola Fou leaders see the programme as providing support to young people which is currently lacking. They report that over the past 10 years they have increasingly been asked questions by young people they find they are unable to answer and yet they had no alternative approaches to supporting them. The Ola Fou programme is seen as having the potential to continue to meet this need whereas traditional church methods are increasingly seen by some as irrelevant.

As described above there is little formal training of this kind across the Pacific. The few programmes which do run are aware of Ola Fou and can see its potential and value.

Value for Money

The programme as budgeted presented excellent value for money, and was much cheaper than other similar multi-country programmes of its sort. In fact it appears to have been under budgeted with administration and management taking more time than anticipated. No allowance seemed to be made for administration and monitoring and evaluation although these are usually included for NZ NGO programming. In preparing the initial proposal the Ola Fou team report they were told by NZAID they could not claim for administration as a category. In future allowance needs to be made for administration; monitoring and evaluation in line with the usual NZAID Guidelines for funding NGOs. The usual figures are up to 5% of the project budget for relevant appraisal, monitoring and evaluation and up to 8% for administration and management.

Throughout the process I was mindful of what could be realistically achieved through an intervention such as Ola Fou, particularly when the intensive nature of youth work is taken into account. Youth workers and those who train them need to move at a pace appropriate to young people which requires patient and sustained efforts.

<div style="border:1px solid black; background-color:#d9d9d9; padding:10px;">

Recommendation

In future budgetary allowance needs to be made for administration; monitoring and evaluation in line with the usual NZAID Guidelines for funding NGOs.

</div>

Changed Relationships

The programme has seen changes in relationships between students, leaders and their agencies, families and communities. Some of these have been complex and profound- as the example of building the bus shelter above illustrates.

In Samoa, the former Director of YfC changed his approach entirely and could no longer see the organisation only being involved in evangelising and young people's spiritual development. This lead to tensions with the Board and he eventually resigned and took up a position as youth pastor at the Peace chapel (which appears to have strong links with YfC. The Ola Fou students were caught up in this split with the majority also leaving YfC to work with Peace Chapel. As with any conflict there were ruptured and changed relationships and considerable pain. This was a negative consequence of the programme, but not one which could have been foreseen.

The programme has also seen a number of churches taking their programmes to the community and engaging in wider community development programmes than previously. E.g. the Scripture Union and Salvation Army in Fiji and the YfC mentoring programme discussed above.

Several young people who had left their own village have begun to reengage with their own community and are continuing projects in an individual capacity with other young people in their village and re-establishing ruptured relationships with their parents. Ola Fou has inspired students to engage with their community. They seem to now have an imperative to act on their knowledge. As one student explained it

> "I knew quite a lot about counselling and things before the course, but didn't use that knowledge. Ola Fou made me realise I have an obligation to use what I have learned. Learning things and not using them is not changing anything"

In Fiji, the Ola Fou graduates now meet informally every month to give each other support, motivation and to provide some accountability. They also help each other with activities.

In both Fiji and Samoa the programme is seen as a way in which the culture of churches will slowly change. Although not designed as a leadership programme the Ola Fou students are the next generation of church leaders and hopefully will bring about an organisational change in terms of culture.

4.3 Ola Fou Challenges

Gaining the Support and confidence of Agencies

Ola Fou recruitment was largely carried out through YfC[7] Fiji and its leader's networks. In Fiji graduates were recruited from YfC and three other agencies. In Samoa they were all YfC employees. There was some suggestion that YfC or any programmes which energises young people, were regarded with suspicion by the mainstream churches as they feared that young people mobilised by Ola Fou would be drawn away and lost to their sponsoring churches. This suspicion is not without foundation. Across the Pacific 'new' churches have begun through dramatic programmes attracting young people and their families- highlighting the perception of the traditional churches lack of relevance which Ola Fou is trying to overcome. The reviewers would agree with Ola Fou reporting that over the course of the initial Ola Fou project church and community networks were broadened in the four participating countries and have been successful in building both a wider credibility for the course, and understanding of what it is trying to achieve. Nevertheless, although they are supportive of the programme, agency leaders interviewed were not clear about Ola Fou objectives, their commitments and what exactly was expected of the students. One agency leader believed asking participants to write a short report for their agency at the end of Block 2 would also assist agency understanding, noting that this sort of report writing is a normal part of employment. Nevertheless, some still remain suspicious of the programme for the reasons discussed above.

Careful work will be needed to ensure that the churches do not see Ola Fou as only a spiritual development programme or a way to make evangelising more efficient by gaining young people's attention and interest through activity based learning (ABL). This seemed to be the driving force behind support for Ola Fou by the current YfC leadership in Samoa and given the organisation's recent history it is unrealistic to think the organisation will change its approach. Nevertheless more formal attention to the NZAID Guidelines on Working with Faith-Based Organisations could assist in clarifying the programmes objectives and setting acceptable parameters for its implementation.

Ola Fou leaders agree that in hindsight they needed to invest more time in ensuring the agencies employing youth workers (either paid of unpaid) fully understood the aims and

-

---

[7] YfC as an organisation only exists in Fiji and Samoa in the Pacific.

objectives of the programme and were kept abreast of its development. Ola Fou leaders were quite open in saying they were so surprised, and excited by receiving the NZAID funding given the history of aid agencies not engaging with faith-based groups, that they wanted to begin the programme as soon as possible!

The agencies themselves asked for the programme to run again, noting that they will continue to send youth workers to the programme as they can see the results. The Bible Society of the South Pacific, which also runs a NZAID funded community development and leadership programme, believes that the entry point for programmes such as this are key. If they are taken over by the mainstream churches, they will drown in the bureaucracy. However they need the support of the mainstream churches to be successful. Developing this entry strategy is important and needs investment. They also note that this is part of a wide learning process and needs to be developed slowly.

Change in churches in the Pacific is slow and complex. It also needs to be acknowledged that change in youth work will take time and will be incremental. The programme, with or without continuing NZAID support, has taken on its own momentum. However, success can only be judged in the long term by a sustained change of approach and if it is taken back to the community.

Nevertheless, in many ways, the few church-based youth workers interviewed who are involved in community development initiatives are breaking new ground. Increased work with their agencies is therefore required to ensure they are not asked to alleviate problems far beyond their resources or capacities. Ola Fou students are realistic about what can be achieved in the short term; noting that they are still developing their ideas and approaches. The downside of their early success however, is that people now have very high and possibly unrealistic expectations of them. They are aware that they need to remain focused and not try to do too much.

In Samoa however it is difficult for the young people to initiate community development programmes because of the church hierarchies and the *matai* leadership structure; unless they have been bestowed a *matai* title in recognition of lineage or service.

For these reasons there is little evidence that overall awareness of support and training needs for youth workers by Pacific NGOs has improved after this pilot programme. However it is evident that agencies now see a broader role for trained youth workers in their agencies, but have not moved to seeing how they will need ongoing support and supervision. The development of the cadre of workers has gone some way to providing support across agencies, but this could become more formalized with time.

Ola Fou needs to continue to invest in relationships with various churches but also be aware that they might not become the key employers of youth workers who could be employed by or drawn from organisations such as sports clubs or the Red Cross.

Recruitment

Related to the above, recruitment procedures will benefit from more concentrated, methodical and deliberate work with agencies employing youth workers- on either a paid or voluntary basis. The base could be broadened to include youth workers who are Christian but work in different ways; e.g. sports coaches. In Fiji recruitment through the YfC leadership and networks in Fiji provides access to a range of youth workers, but with further investment of time, the pool of recruits could well be widened. However in

Samoa, YfC recruitment is likely to remain the cause of suspicion for the reasons discussed above. Other avenues should be explored; possibly using the church-based networks associated with government Division for Youth *Talavou*[8] programme (which NZAID also provided seed funding for through the joint UN programme) as it is in harmony with its goals and has the support of the Director of the Division for Youth. If the programme continues, more time needs to be spent assessing the most appropriate mechanism for recruitment in each country.

This could result in a more formalised selection process involving
- Individual selection criteria (as discussed above)
- Ensuring gender targets are set at a realistic level and met
- A balance in the types of agencies students are recruited from. However it is likely that faith-based agencies will continue to be the main source of students, resonating the New Zealand experience where a survey of youth workers showed that 50% were engaged in youth work through faith-based organisations (Ministry of Youth Development; 2007).

Recommendation

If Ola Fou runs again there needs to be more investment in engaging agencies employing youth workers. An entry, recruitment and ongoing support strategy needs to be developed for each country involved in the programme.

Achieving Gender Equality

Block 1 of the programme was part of the selection process. Ola Fou had a target number of enrolees they were aiming for and knew that there was always going to be a considerable drop off in enrolments between Blocks 1 and 2. Young men made up the majority of course participants throughout as the table below shows.

	Block 1		Block 2		Block 3		Block 4	
Gender Balance	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Samoa	5	6	3	5	4	5	1	4
(total)	11		8		9		5	
Fiji	10	4	11	3	10	1	8	1

- _____

[8] Talavou aims to implement the Samoa National Youth Programme (2001 – 2010) through coordinating programmes under a common framework in line with the Mission of the Division for Youth which is; "To advocate and establish programs designed to enable the spiritual, physical, emotional, intellectual, social and economic development of Samoan youth; thereby empowering them to achieve a better quality of life for themselves, their families, their communities, and the nation." The programme also sits well with Samoa's approach to youth development, which sees spiritual development sitting alongside other aspects of development including economic, cultural, social, physical, intellectual and emotional.

(total)	14		14		11		9	
Tonga	11	5	4	2	2	2	2	2
(total)	16		6		4		2	
Solomon Islands	13	0	5	0	4	0	3	0
Totals	39	15	23	10	20	8	14	7
Total	**52**		**34**		**27**		**21**	

Table 1: Summary of Participants

Ola Fou's reporting points out that the programme did not meet the gender target band set at 60%/ 40% balance between men and women whilst aiming eventually for gender equity. The original selection for the course the ratio was 70-30 in favour of men and at the conclusion it was 66-33 in favour of men, although there appears to have been a slightly lower rate of attrition of women compared to men. Approximately 35% of men who enrolled in Block 1 completed the programme as opposed to 50% of women. The women participants report feeling overwhelmed at times and several of the facilitators interviewed noted that the women were restrained or reserved in discussions than the men.

There appear to be a number of reasons for the low recruitment numbers. There doesn't appear to have been any specific attention given to gender during the recruitment or selection process. This is further compounded by the nature of youth work in some Pacific agencies. In Fiji, for example, the Salvation Army does not employ any women youth workers and therefore did not have any women in the pool of potential recruits; possibly reflecting the dynamic of patriarchy in the church hierarchy in general. Cultural norms whereby young men and young women's contact is governed by cultural determinants could also have affected participation rates, along with concerns at young women travelling overseas unchaperoned.

However the issue of gender equality goes deeper than the number of participants on the course. In many ways "youth" has taken on a masculine and negative connotation (as described by the young Fijian men in one of the villages visited).

Apart from one debate on the importance of men and women in society there was no attention to gender in the course content. In future, the course should include a greater focus on the different issues facing young men and women in the Pacific and there is ample material available to aid this. Provision for gender specific processing groups would also enable young men and women to discuss issues that affect them without the need for bravado or competition. Finally, further efforts should be made to have equal numbers of men and women teachers in order to model gender equality and positive relationships between men and women as youth workers, although it is acknowledged that attempts were made to ensure men and women taught on the course and were seen as leaders.

Recommendations

In future, the course should include a greater focus on gender equality through

- Inclusion of course content material on the different issues facing young men and women in the Pacific.
- Provision for gender specific processing groups should be made to enable young

> men and women to discuss issues that affect them separately.
>
> Further efforts to have equal numbers of men and women teachers in order to model gender equality and positive relationships between men and women as youth workers and leaders.

Human Rights

NZAID takes a mainstreaming approach to human rights. Ola Fou had no specific focus on human rights but appears to be based on most of the principles for rights-based programming. The young people trained are certainly aware of and able to articulate their rights. More formal focus on rights should occur if the programme runs again; especially at the Diploma level. Links to the RRRT community paralegal programme[9] could benefit the programme; especially its focus on legal literacy.

> **Recommendation**
>
> The programme should include a more formal focus on rights if the programme runs again; especially at the Diploma level. Particular attention should be given to legal rights and literacy.

Gaining NZQA Accreditation.

At the outset of the programme, Praxis intended gaining New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) accreditation for the programme. However this process was stopped as NZQA were slow in releasing guidelines for programmes delivered off shore; they were only released as the programme ended. Praxis is confident that the programme will be accredited and the reviewers also believe the documentation produced so far will meet the standards required. Accreditation will be pursued if funds are approved for a second programme.

Given the work involved, and the relationship between the Praxis New Zealand programme and Ola Fou , Praxis intend proceeding with seeking accreditation to run a two year Diploma level course with the ability for students to exit after one year with a Certificate. This will provide them with flexibility in deciding on future programme implementation. Once the course is accredited, Praxis will use their approved Recognition of Prior Learning process to award the NZQA approved qualification to the initial Ola Fou graduates. NZQA are aware of these plans.

- _____

[9] The RRRT community paralegal programme emphasises human rights education, awareness and advocacy but also includes legal literacy knowledge. More information is available at http://www.rrrt.org/page.asp?active_page_id=104

Once the programme gains NZQA accreditation the formal certificate will be more valued – but only if it is acceptable in-country. With the development of the Samoa Qualifications Authority, formal recognition of a New Zealand qualification will be a simple procedure; however how the qualification will be viewed in other countries is unclear, although a New Zealand qualification is readily recognised in the Pacific.

Employment for Youth Workers

Although the students who graduated from the programme have developed a very useful, transferable skill set, there are limited avenues for them gaining paid employment in faith-based agencies as a consequence of the programme. The only youth workers currently getting any form of salary for their work were already employed by their agency at the start of the programme.

Although there has been some progress in Fiji with creating a paid position for one of the trainees in the Salvation Army and completion of the programme enhances the chances of this happening, this has not yet eventuated, leading to a feeling of frustration on behalf of the student. However with Ola Fou support students could explore employment in other agencies and NGOs, so while engagement with faith-based agencies is crucial for the programme's ongoing success, they might not become the key employers of the graduates.

In Samoa, two of the four women graduates are still employed by their sponsoring agency. One other student now has employment as a law clerk and has begun studying for a Certificate in Legal Studies at USP with the intention of completing a law degree. She attributes her success in gaining this position to Ola Fou as she used the skills developed to reflect on her own life choices. She was also told she secured the position because of the confident and reflective ways she answered questions in the interview. Two of the graduates have left their sponsoring agencies. The one male graduate worked as a casual fisherman for the Ministry of Fisheries as well as volunteering for Peace Chapel. He was promoted to the position of leading hand among casual fishermen because of the skills he had developed through the Ola Fou programme but has now migrated to New Zealand. Another young woman now has a baby but attends Peace Chapel events on a regular basis.

Challenges in the Ola Fou Relationship with NZAID and its Priorities

During the course of the programme, there have been five NZAID Development Programme Managers (DPMs) responsible for the contract with Ola Fou. This has lead to some frustration on behalf of Praxis as they just develop a rapport and working relationship with the DPM and they move on- and often the NZAID understanding of the programme goes with them. Praxis notes however that they have found all of the DPMs professional and easy to work with.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Despite the challenges outlined, Ola Fou is a sound programme; valued by the students and their agencies alike which has created considerable interest from other observers in the countries where students were drawn from. The reviewers would recommend that the programme continues, for another three to five years. This would allow time for Pacific trainers to build competence in leading the programme and a permanent Pacific base to be established (either in an NGO or an educational institution) and the qualification to be accredited. At the end of this period there should be a further review of the programme which could include tracking of graduates and attention to the longer term impact of the programme.

Specific Recommendations for the Future

In their final report on the programme, Praxis outlined their current aspirations for the future of the programme. Their aspirations are included in the left hand column of the table below, with comments alongside.

Praxis Aspirations	Comment and recommendations
Start a new Ola Fou group in the second half of 2008, with a ceiling of another 30 and aim to include another two or three countries.	The reviewers consider that the programme should be consolidated in the existing countries first before it is extended to Vanuatu and PNG. The current countries give a good mix of Polynesian, Melanesian and Micronesian students in countries matching NZAID's priorities. Expanding the programme to further countries, yet maintaining the same enrolments numbers, would dilute the number trained in each country and dampen the overall impact of the programme through the formation of a cadre of trained youth workers. Expansion would also increase the costs of visits to students between Block courses. Although discussions with agencies should start in the second half of 2008, this period should be used for the necessary ground work of systematically establishing relationships with a range of agencies in each country, ensuring they understand the programme's aims (and the breadth of its focus on all aspects of youth development) and deciding on the best vehicle for recruitment in each country, with an aim to teaching the first Block course in early 2009.
Identify a smaller group (12-15) from the current participants and run a second (Diploma level) year for them with a goal of	This should only proceed if the course receives NZQA accreditation so that students will be assured of a qualification

helping them to develop specialised skills and expertise in areas of learning that have been introduced in the first year (experiential learning, mentoring/counselling, organisational leadership etc). This would build a group of potential future leaders as they go on to gain more experience in their communities and support other young people to train as youth workers.	at the end of the course. This will further raise their and the programme's profile will agencies but also ensure the students have more chances of gaining employment with a wider range of employers; including secular NGOs. Again however, work will be needed with sponsoring agencies to ensure they will provide ongoing support for students are in fact likely to employ them at the end of the programme. Several of the pilot programme students have expressed an interest in continuing their study- or assisting in the Certificate level programme should it run again.
If we are successful in developing an ongoing partnership with NZAID for the Ola Fou project, our medium term goal (2-5 years) is to develop a pool of Pacific based resource people who have established practical expertise in specialist areas of youth development and use them to phase out the contribution of NZ based tutors and facilitators.	This will require careful planning and a well developed strategy. Further discussions with the UNITEC programme could well assist in this.
Another long term goal would be to identify vocational pathways for graduates (e.g. in community development, education, youth health services, social work, town planning, regional development, policy analysis, tourism, etc.) and work with partners in each country to include career planning and graduate support services.	Planning for this should occur sooner rather than later to help students gain paid employment at the end of their study.

Recommendations

- The programme should continue, for another three to five years. This would allow time for Pacific trainers to build competence in leading the programme and a permanent Pacific base to be established (either in an NGO or an educational institution) and the qualification to be accredited. At the end of this period there should be a further review of the programme which could include tracking of graduates and attention to the longer term impact of the programme.

- the programme should be consolidated in the existing countries first before it is extended further.

- Further discussions with the UNITEC Graduate Diploma in not for Profit Management should occur to learn from their experience of developing a pool of Pacific based resource people.

- Planning to identify vocational pathways for graduates and support services

should occur sooner rather than later to help students gain paid employment at the end of their study.

Appendices

1. Acronyms

ABL	Activity Based Learning
CYP	Commonwealth Youth Programme
DPM	Development Programme Manager
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NZQA	New Zealand Qualifications Authority
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
TOR	Terms of Reference
USP	University of the South Pacific
YfC	Youth for Christ

2. **Evaluation terms of reference**

OLA FOU – PASIFIKA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Terms of Reference for Project Evaluation (As agreed between NZAID and Praxis NZ)

January 14 version: includes changes suggested by SAEG

These terms of reference apply to an evaluation of Ola Fou, a project aimed at developing youth work in the Pacific. This evaluation is a joint exercise involving an independent evaluator managed between NZAID (key funder) and the Ola Fou team (who will assist with logistics). As the commissioner of the evaluation, NZAID is the legal owner of the evaluation findings.

Background information

Ola Fou has been developed as a partnership between a group of NZ and Pacific based organisations, the project aims to provide contextualised training and support for youth workers across the Pacific nations.

The team that managed the project has included the (then) leaders of Youth for Christ in Samoa and Fiji (Isaia Lameta and Sereki Korocowiri respectively), the coordinator from Praxis New Zealand (Lloyd Martin), and a board member of Te Ora Hou (Danette Abraham). A wider group of people including NZAID staff, assisted with planning, advice, teaching resources and reporting during the project.

The following goals were established for the project in the original proposal to NZAID:

- o **Promote indigenous approaches to youth development in the Pacific**
- o **Raise the credibility and worth of youth work and youth workers in the Pacific.**
- o **Assist church and community organisations to recruit and up skill youth workers.**
- o **Deliver a recognised qualification for youth workers in NZ and Pacific**

A fifth goal was added after an initial Ola Fou evaluation of where the students 'were at' in their approach to youth work:

- o **Promote participatory and developmental approaches to youth work.**

NZAID agreed to provide a maximum of NZ$203,996 (inclusive of all taxes) the Youth Cultures and Community Trust (trading as Praxis) to operate the programme for the period 1 February 2006 to 31 December 2007. After an initial small scale pilot, the Ola Fou project began in June 2006, and was completed in October 2007 by 21 students, from four Pacific nations who graduated with the Certificate in Pasifika Youth Development. This was an adapted version of the

Certificate in Youth Work, an NZQA approved level four course (which is offered by Praxis in New Zealand).

The course was delivered over a series of block courses. The first four of these were held in each of the four participating nations (Samoa, Fiji, Tonga and the Solomon Islands). These events were open to all youth leaders, and other practitioners. Participants in Samoa and Fiji were invited by Isaia Lameta and Sereki Korocowiri respectively. These invitations were mainly given to church and community groups to send their youth leaders. In Tonga and the Solomon Islands, local contact people were approached and asked to contact people in their networks. From these initial workshops, participants for the ongoing project were selected.

The remaining three (residential) block courses were held at youth camps in Fiji over the following twelve months. The aim of this was to offer the course in Pacific cultural context as far as is possible. During the block courses, the students were also hosted by Fijian families in villages and squatter communities (settlements) as a break from the camp environment.

A series of smaller scale objectives were established at the beginning of the project. Ola Fou's own evaluation of these will also be provided to the evaluator.

Stakeholders

The following groups have been identified as stakeholders in this project:

Primary Stakeholders

- Participants in the Ola Fou course.

- The agencies (community and church organisations that had people on the programme).

- The young people who are the primary beneficiaries of the Ola Fou Programme

- The communities that the students operated in

Secondary Stakeholders

- The Ola Fou management team (some of who were also agency reps).

- NZAID and other donors (Te Ora Hou and The Salvation Army in NZ).

- Pacific Island Government and community agencies with an interest in how youth work could assist the development of their communities.

The evaluation should include consultations with representatives of all stake holding groups.

The purpose of this evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is

1. To enable implementing agencies and NZAID to learn (for future projects and programmes) from the successes and mistakes in designing and implementing Ola Fou.

2. To assess what difference the project has made to the Ola Fou participants, the young people they work with and their communities.

3. To help NZAID make a decision about possible extension of the project to a second phase

Scope of the evaluation

This evaluation will cover the project period 1 February 2006 to 31 December 2007.

Objectives of the evaluation

To meet its purpose, the first questions to be addressed in this evaluation focus on how the project has *impacted* (positive or negative, planned or unplanned) on the lives and practice of the participants, and (in turn) how their communities and agencies have been affected by their practice.

These questions include the following:

1. What difference has the project made to participants? Are these differences likely to be sustainable?

   - How effectively has Ola Fou developed participants' understanding of youth work, of issues for young people, and connections with other youth workers in the Pacific?

   - How has Ola Fou affected participants' approach to working with young people and communities?

   - How effectively have participants been supported by both their agency and by the Ola Fou team during this course?

   - How important was the recognised qualification to participants? What difference does this make?

   - How accessible was the structure and teaching style of the course?

   - How has undertaking the course changed relationships participants have with members of their family and the wider community?

   - Have there been any negative outcomes from participating in Ola Fou?

2. What difference has the project made to the communities in which the students live and work? Are these differences likely to be sustainable?

   - To what extent have Ola Fou participants adopted participatory processes in their work with young people? How have these approaches (if they occurred) impacted the community groups and the agencies that participants have worked in?

   - How effectively have Ola Fou participants engaged young people and members of the wider community (formal and/or informal groups) in (a) researching community needs, and (b) developing responses to their findings?

   - What have been the outcomes resulting from this project?

   - What have been the costs or negative outcomes for agencies with participants in Ola Fou?

The evaluation also needs to address questions relating to the *relevance*, *effectiveness* and *efficiency* of the project. These questions include the following:

3. Was the design of Ola Fou *relevant* and appropriate, given needs? What level of alignment exists between the goals and outcomes of this project and the objectives of NZAID's Pacific Leadership Development Strategy?

4. Did Ola Fou meet its objectives? i.e. was it *effective*?

5. Can any comparison (even qualitative) be made of costs with benefits? Did Ola Fou provide value-for-money, compared to other possible approaches? Was it *efficient*?

6. Has this project been well delivered and managed?

7. What have been some of the challenges and benefits of the relationship between NZAID and Ola Fou? What opportunities exist for this relationship to be enhanced if the project continues?

8. What have been some of the challenges and benefits associated with cross-cultural engagement between course participants, trainers and project managers?

9. How has Ola Fou dealt with cross-cutting issues, particularly gender and human rights?

10. Are there any management or impact issues relating to the choice of participants (for example, impact on non-participants or potential participants; or non-optimal outcomes from poor choices)

11. What external factors have impacted significantly (positively and/or negatively) on the activities and outcomes of the project?

Methodology

The consultant will be responsible for developing an appropriate methodology based on available data sources and the best forms of analysis, given the evaluation purpose and objectives, and the budget limitations.

As their final assignment, each student was required to complete a portfolio reflecting on what they have learnt over the entire course and how they have applied it in their own community context. The portfolios provide evidence of both learning and practice from the perspective of the students (who were also required to include evaluative feedback from their community). A random selection of these documents will be provided to the evaluator who will return them to students in Fiji and Samoa.

The evaluator will familiarise themselves with relevant project documentation prior to undertaking a visit to Fiji and Samoa, Ola Fou will help to arrange contacts in each country and will arrange visits to participants and stakeholder groups. It is expected that the fieldwork will take place in February/March 2008.

Whilst in Fiji and Samoa, the evaluator will interview a selection of the Ola Fou participants in their practice context and use these interviews to identify stakeholder groups (young people and the wider community), with whom they should subsequently consult. Participatory methods should be used as far as is practicable.

The evaluator will also attend a pre- and post-fieldwork briefing with Ola Fou and NZAID in Wellington.

The evaluation will pay particular attention to relevant cross-cutting issues, including gender and human rights as set out in the relevant NZAID policies. For example, all data will be sex-disaggregated if possible and analysis (quantitative or qualitative) will take gender into consideration.

Reporting Results

A draft written report of not more than 20 pages should be presented to NZAID within 14 days of returning from the field. A suggested format is attached at Annex A. This draft report will be sent to Ola Fou for comments and to make any suggested changes. The final report is to be presented within seven days of receiving feedback from NZAID and Ola Fou (incorporating any changes agreed to by the evaluator). The final report will be available to all interested stakeholders, including via NZAID's website. Both Ola Fou and NZAID will have the opportunity to record any responses to the report.

Use of the findings

The Ola Fou team have indicated to NZAID a desire to continue the project, with a further intake of (new) students, and extending the project into a second year aimed at developing a group of previous participants into mentors and resource people for youth work in their own countries.

The findings from this research project will be used to assist NZAID to make a decision about the continuation of the project, and provide feedback that will be helpful (to both Ola Fou and NZAID) in the planning of any continuation of the project.

Consultant Specifications

This evaluation will be undertaken by one consultant. The consultant will be selected on the basis of the following skills and experience:

- Experience in project evaluation in developing countries (20%)
- Technical expertise relevant to the project, including skills in youth development and youth work training (20%)
- Problem solving and analytical abilities (10%)
- Skills and experience in participatory and consultative approaches, facilitation and negotiation especially with young people. (20%)
- Cross-cultural communication skills (10%)

- Advanced verbal and written communication skills, especially report writing (10%)

- Understanding of the NZAID Policy Framework (10%)

Evaluation Report Model Format

Title Page (including project name & country, authors' name, date and report type and status (e.g. Draft Project Evaluation Report))

Table of Contents (including figures and tables as appropriate)

Executive Summary

A summary (2 to 4 pages) of the purpose, method, findings and conclusions of the evaluation.

Introduction

This should include:

- purpose of the evaluation
- method of the evaluation

Project Background

- summary description of the project and its objectives
- explanation of the project rationale

Findings and Analysis

This is the most important section of the evaluation report. It should document all of the analysis required to answer the evaluation questions outlined in this Terms of Reference. It should:

- identify strengths and weaknesses of the project, with reference to why specific project objectives and anticipated benefits were or were not achieved
- identify any risks, constraints and mitigation measures which could be incorporated into future projects
- document relevant lessons learned from the project

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section should summarise the evaluation, highlighting key points.

Appendices

These should include:

- Glossary / acronym list (as appropriate)
- evaluation terms of reference
- consultant itinerary
- list of persons consulted
- chronology of key project dates
- list of background materials or papers utilised

- working papers (especially of cost/benefit analysis and survey documentation) if applicable
- project workplan

SELECTION OF CONSULTANT

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

OLA FOU – PASIFIKA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Project Evaluation

#	CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
1	Experience in project evaluation in developing countries	20
2	Technical expertise relevant to the project, including skills in youth development and youth work training	20
3	Skills and experience in participatory and consultative approaches, facilitation and negotiation especially with young people.	20
4	Problem solving and analytical abilities	10
5	Advanced verbal and written communication skills, especially report writing	10
6	Cross-cultural communication skills	10
7	Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of NZAID Policy and priority objectives, including commitment to reducing poverty, fostering gender equity and women's empowerment, and human rights.	10

Individually, score each suggested candidate on each of the criteria using the assessment guide on the following page. I.e. provide a grade for each criterion and then adjust according to the agreed weighting. You should come to the teleconference call with your individual ratings for each candidate.

ASSESSMENT PANEL GUIDE TO SCORING

%	DESCRIPTION
90-100	Demonstrates full coverage of skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes as requested, in a strategic, cohesive and structured manner, with no gaps and demonstrated successful practice
80-89	Demonstrates full coverage of skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes as requested, with no gaps and demonstrated successful practice
65-79	Demonstrates full coverage of skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes as requested, with no gaps
50-64	Demonstrates skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes as requested, with some gaps which are not regarded s problematic
40-49	Asserts skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes as requested, with some gaps which are not regarded as problematic
20-39	Asserts skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes as requested, with some gaps which would need to be addressed
1-19	Some aspects of skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes addressed, with major gaps and/or superficial understanding
0	Skills, systems, methodology approach and outcomes not addressed, or ineffective, or where there are grave concerns

3: Ola Fou Overview and Content Outline

OLA FOU

Purpose

Students who have completed the OLA FOU course are contributing to the support and development of young people in villages and urban communities around the Pacific Islands. They have developed community survey skills to help them identify the needs of young people in their community and are responding to these needs with youth development programmes, advocacy, and relational work. They are operating out of safe and ethical practices that reflect a participatory and wholistic approach to youth development

They have established support networks with other youth workers across the Pacific and have an appreciation of how global and national issues are impacting the development of and opportunities for young people in their communities.

Course Overview

- The course delivery and administration sits within the policies and procedures of the Quality Management System (QMS) of Praxis New Zealand (these are currently approved by the NZ Qualifications Authority).
- All components are locally developed modules (many are based on the Praxis NZ course) and these are outlined in more detail on the following page.
- Students are enrolled with Praxis NZ, the course is jointly administered from New Zealand and Fiji.
- The advisory group (TAG) for the course is made up of stakeholders from participating Pacific nations and New Zealand.
- The course is funded by NZAID and student contributions.

Year One

- A 100 credit course set at an equivalent to the level 4 (NZQA approved) Certificate in Youth Work currently offered in NZ by Praxis.
- Delivered though a series of residential block courses over 18 months.
- The course is organised into three themes (each theme is followed in one of the three combined block courses:
  - o Through their eyes
  - o The inward journey
  - o Agents of change
- Students exit Year One with a **Certificate in Pasifika Youth Development**

Year One (Certificate) Course Outline:

Code	Module Title	NQF Level	Number of Credits[10]
	o and content summary		
	All modules are compulsory		
OF11	**Safe practice** *(Danette)* o Code of Ethics o Risk Management o First Aid	4	8
OF12	**Pacific Youth and Society** *(Sereki and Isaia)* o Youth trends in the Pacific o Youth health, and economic issues o Globalisation and media o Pacific church and mission history o Challenges of the future	4	6
OF13	**Youth Work Practice** *(Lloyd)* o Introduction to youth development theory o Experiential learning o Communication skills	4	8
OF14	**Project Development** *(Sereki, Danette & Lloyd)* o Researching youth and community needs o Integrating research and project design o Accountability and project structures o Project evaluation	4	6
OF15	**Helping Skills** *(Claire and Asinate)* o Listening and responding skills o Introduction to Counselling theory o Mentoring o Crisis management	4	6
OF16	**Reflective Practitioner** o Action reflection cycle o Getting the most out of supervision o Self Care	4	6
OF17	**Leadership** *(Stan Tiatia)* o Models of leadership o Leadership lifestyle o Team development	4	6
OF18	**Supervised Practice** o Completed through a local community organisation or church	4	54
	TOTAL CREDITS		100

- _____

[10] Each credit is equivalent to 10 hours of directed learning.

4. Consultant itinerary

Date	Activity
21.02.2008	Briefing with NZAID and Praxis
25.02.2008	Travel to Suva
26.02.2008	**Am** Meeting with Sereki Korocowiri Meeting with Amani Waqetia and Manasa Tagi Visit to Nanuku Settlement (Rifle Range rd end) to meet parents of children involved in Joy Hour Kids Club **Pm** Meeting with Marika Serei Salvation Army Raiwaqa Visit to Nauku Settlement to meet with youth group **Evening** Dinner with 5 Ola Fou students
27.02.08	**Am** Visit to Gospel High School and observation of Ola Fou student sign interpreting for deaf students Meeting with Rita Raikanihiwa Miller and Livai Lum On Meeting with Joe Tamani, mentor **Pm** Meeting with Frank Rodan Ola Fou student and William smith, mentee; Nukuwatu village
28.02.2008	Visit to Logani village; Tailevu
29.02.2008	Meeting with Sisa director, Scripture Union Fiji
01.03.2008	Travel to Samoa
02.03.2008	**Am** Briefing with co-worker **Pm** Own arrangements
03.03.2008	Own arrangements
04.03.2008	**Am** Meeting with Fitu Mau, director YfC Samoa Meeting with Lupe Failalo Ola Fou student **Pm** Observation of activity at Vaimea Primary school Apia
04.03.2008	**Am** Meeting with Kika Ulberg, Olive Lameta and Agaaletoelau Motusaga; Ola Fou students **PM** Meeting with Renee Orange, mentee Visit to Vaimea Primary School to observe YfC activities. Meeting with Matafonau Matagi, mentor **Evening** Meeting with Agaaletoelau Motusaga
05.03.2008	**Am** Meeting with staff at the Division for youth, Ministry for women and community Development Meeting with Isaia Lameta, Peace Chapel Youth Pastor and Ola Fou leader **Pm** Team Debriefing
06.03.2008	Travel Apia – Auckland

5. List of persons consulted

In New Zealand

1.	Geoff Woolford	NZAID DPM
2.	Rebecca Spratt	NZAID DPM (former Programme Manager) (by email).
3.	Danette Abraham	Praxis and Te Ora Hou (Christchurch)
4.	Lloyd Martin	Praxis

In Fiji

5.	Sereki Korowiciri	Director Youth for Christ Fiji
6.	Rita Raikanihiwa Miller	Fiji Association of the Deaf; volunteer for Youth for Christ Ola Fou student
7.	Livai Lum On	Scripture Union, Fiji, Ola Fou student
8.	Joe Tamani	Counsellor and Christian Education teacher at Gospel High School Suva. Student Mentor
9.	Tomasi Raiviu	Youth for Christ Youth Worker Ola Fou student
10.	Amani Waqetia	Salvation Army Youth Coordinator, Ola Fou student
11.	Manasa Tagi	Salvation Army volunteer youth worker ; Ola Fou student
12.	9 parents of children participating in Joy Hour a Kids Club and 15 members of the youth group.	Namuku Settlement, Suva
13.	Marika Serei	Co-Officer, Salvation Army Church, Raiwaqa
14.	Frank Rodan	Youth for Christ Youth worker- Nukuwatu village- Lami
15.	William Smith	Frank's mentee Nukuwatu village- Lami
16.	Sisa	Director Scripture Union Fiji/Ola Fou student Mentor
17.	Solomon Druru	Director Bible society of the South Pacific.

In Samoa

19.	Fitu Mau	Director Youth for Christ Samoa
20.	Lupe Failalo	Ola Fou student/ organiser of YFC primary school programme
		Observed YfC session with 80 children at Vaimea primary school
21.	Kika Ulberg	Ola Fou students/Peace Chapel
22.	Olive Lameta	Ola Fou student/Peace Chapel
23.	Agaaletoelau Motusaga (Lau Mo)	Ola Fou student
24.	Renee Orange	USP student Mentee
25.	Matafonau Matagi	Peace Chapel Primary School Teacher/Mentor
26.	Sydney Faasau,	Director, Division for Youth Govt of Samoa
27.	Sovala Agaiava	Division for Youth Govt of Samoa
28.	Seletuta Visesio Pita.	Division for Youth Govt of Samoa
29.	Isaia Lameta	Peace Chapel Youth Pastor

6. Chronology of key project dates

2006	**Contract signed May 2006**
	Blocks One **Samoa: June 26-30** *Reported to NZAID in July 2006* **Fiji: July 9-14** *Reported to NZAID in July 2006* **Solomon Islands: August 17-21 2006** **Tonga: October 2-6 (2006)**
	Block Two *(October 29th to November 10th 2006, Deuba, Fiji)*
2007	**Block Three** *(March 4-16, 2007, Sabeto, Fiji)*
	Block Four *(September 23 to October 5th 2007, Deuba, Fiji)* **Graduation October 2007**

7. List of background materials or papers utilised

Barwick H (2006) *Youth work today: a review of issues and challenges* Ministry of Youth Development available online at
http://www.myd.govt.nz/uploads/docs/Youth%20Work%20Today1.pdf

Commonwealth Youth Programme *The Commonwealth Plan of Action for Youth Empowerment 2007-2015* Commonwealth Secretariat available online at
http://www.thecommonwealth.org/shared_asp_files/GFSR.asp?NodeID=169313

Commonwealth Youth Programme *CYP Diploma*
http://www.thecommonwealth.org/Internal/152838/cyp_diploma/

DfID Religions and Development Research Programme
http://www.research4development.info/projectsAndProgrammesResults2.asp?search=simple%20List&SearchType=0&Topic=Religion%20and%20Development&SubTopicID=41&TopicID=8&Projects=undefined&Outputs=Yes

Division for Youth *Talavou Programme* Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development, Government of Samoa

Strategic Plan Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development, Government of Samoa available online at
http://www.spc.int/Youth/PDF/Documents/NYP_%20SAMOA.doc

Government of Samoa (2001) *Samoa National Youth Policy.* NZAID (undated) *Pacific Leadership Development Strategy and Programme*

Haberkorn G (2004) Current *Pacific population dynamics and recent trends* SPC Demography/Population Programme available at
http://www.spc.int/demog/en/stats/2004/2004%20Current%20Pacific%20population%20dynamics.doc

Ministry of Youth Development (2007) *Report on the 2006 Questionnaire on Professional Development and Training of Youth Workers.*

MSD (2005) *Pacific Youth Development Strategy: Deliver positive life-changing and affirmation for all Pacific youth in Auckland.* Available at
http://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/publications/strategic-social-policy/auckland-pasifika-youth-development-strategy.doc

NZAID Guideline: working with Civil society Organisations. NZAID Tools.

NZAID (2006) NZAID *Pacific Strategy 2007-2015*

Octagon Group (undated) *The Octagon Leadership and Community Development Strategy; a Bible Society of the South Pacific Program of Leadership Development for the Community.*

(February 2008) *The Octagon Leadership and Community Development Strategy; a Bible Society of the South Pacific Program of Leadership Development for the Community Newsletter.*

Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (2006) *The Pacific Plan*

Pacific Youth Bureau (2005) *Pacific Youth Strategy 2010* SPC available online at http://www.spc.int/youth/PYS2010/youth_pys_2010.html

Praxis *Ola Fou Overview and Content Outline*

Reclaiming Youth Work *Circle of Courage available at* http://www.reclaiming.com/about/index.php?page=philosophy

RRRT *Community Paralegal Training Programme* available at http://www.rrrt.org/page.asp?active_page_id=104

UNESCO (2006) *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2007; Summary.*