



Formative Evaluation of the Northcote  
Child and Youth Development  
Project

Final Report

September 2006

Dr Sarah Greenaway  
Hector Kaiwai

Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation  
& Te Ropu Whariki



# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 Background.....	7
1.2 Evaluation methodology.....	8
1.3 Formative evaluation support.....	9
1.4 Report structure.....	10
2. Objective One: Promote evidence-based approaches to child and youth service development.....	11
2.1 Key outcomes.....	11
2.2 Processes.....	11
2.3 Feedback from key informants.....	12
2.4 Discussion.....	14
2.5 Action points.....	15
3. Objective Two: Learn what works best to improve outcomes at a local level and to feed this into national level work on child and youth development.....	16
3.1 Key outcomes.....	16
3.2 Processes.....	16
3.3 Feedback from key informants.....	17
3.4 Discussion.....	18
3.5 Action points.....	19
4. Objective Three: Encourage central and local agencies to take a ‘whole child’ approach and collaborate to improve services for children and youth.....	20
4.1 Key outcomes.....	20
4.2 Processes.....	20
4.2.1 Project governance.....	20
4.2.2 Action planning.....	21
4.3 Feedback from key informants.....	22
4.3.1 Strengths and benefits of collaborative approaches.....	22
4.3.2 Challenges and improvements to collaborative ways of working.....	24
4.3.3 Project governance.....	27
4.3.4 Wider community engagement.....	27
4.3.5 Sustainable development.....	30
4.4 Discussion.....	31
4.5 Action points.....	32
5. Objective Four: Increase participation in community decision making by children and young people.....	34
5.1 Key outcomes.....	34
5.2 Processes.....	34
5.3 Feedback from NYPD members.....	35
5.4 Feedback from key informants.....	37
5.4.1 Strengths and benefits of child and youth participation.....	37
5.4.2 Challenges and improvements to youth participation processes.....	38

5.5 Discussion .....	40
5.6 Action points .....	41
6. References.....	42
Appendix One: Formative evaluation support.....	44
Appendix Two: Evidence rubric .....	47
Appendix Three: Project products .....	48
Appendix Four: Work strand outcomes and objectives.....	49
Appendix Five: Summary of key issues identified by children and young people in Northcote.....	51
Appendix Six: Action Plan Template .....	56

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluation team would like to acknowledge the project partners who formed the original governance group for the Northcote Child and Youth Development project: Louise Mason and Robyn Rusher from the Ministry of Social Development; Orchid Atimalala and Ross Moffat from North Shore City Council; Alice Foster and Charles MacCulloch from Housing New Zealand Corporation and Jill Nerheny from the Birkenhead/Northcote Trust. In particular we would like to thank the project manager/strategic broker Wendy Reid; the research analyst Alex Woodley and the child and youth facilitator Peter Wolf. We are also grateful to the many people who generously gave their time to be interviewed for this evaluation and we appreciate the energy and commitment of Northcote Youth Project Development members and the other young people who have contributed to the NCYD project.

This research was funded by the Ministry of Social Development for the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme.

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

- The Northcote Child and Youth Development (NCYD) Project is a demonstration project for the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme (ASCP)
- NCYD has four objectives which are to:
  1. Promote evidence-based approaches to child and youth service development
  2. Learn what works best to improve outcomes at a local level and to feed this into national level work on child and youth development
  3. Encourage central and local agencies to take a “whole child” approach and collaborate to improve services for children and youth
  4. Increase participation in community decision making by children and young people

## Evaluation

- Since May 2005 SHORE and Whariki have been contracted to provide formative evaluation for NCYD. There have been two rounds of key informant interviews and two focus groups with NYPD members. Evaluation support has included advice on action planning and ongoing evaluation, feedback of evaluation findings, refining the programme logic and participation at governance and planning meetings.
- This final formative evaluation report covers the period May 2005 to August 2006 with particular emphasis on the period since the last evaluation progress report (March-August 2006).

## Progress toward project objectives

### *Objective One: Promoting evidence-based approaches*

- A number of methods have been used to gather evidence about key issues for children and young people in Northcote and effective ways of addressing those issues. These have included gathering data and information to develop a statistical profile of Northcote, establishing a database of local services, an indicator list, a literature review, research by NYPD, 100% Pure Conjecture workshops and evaluation support.
- While there has been promotion of evidence-based approaches, gaps in the evidence base have been identified and a regular review process is needed to ensure evidence-based approaches are prioritised as each work strand in the action plan is implemented.

### *Objective Two: Learning what works best to improve outcomes*

- There has been a strong emphasis on identifying and documenting what has worked (and not worked) as part of NCYD, especially the challenges with accessing local data to inform planning processes.
- There was general agreement that it is too early to identify what has worked to improve outcomes for children and young people in Northcote.
- There is a need for ongoing evaluation (either internal or external) to identify impacts and outcomes of NCYD as the action plans are implemented.

*Objective Three: Encourage whole child approaches and collaboration to improve outcomes*

- A wide range of stakeholders have been involved in regular action planning meetings and workshops.
- Five work strands have been developed in response to evidence from the statistical profile, research by young people, consultation with community members and feedback from stakeholders. These are: cultural respect, environment, safety, opportunities and wellness/health.
- Supports for collaboration included: the dedicated project management/strategic brokerage role; a clear action planning framework and tools; focus on systemic change; support of senior staff and good-will of central and local agencies.
- Benefits of collaboration included: improved communication between central and local agencies and strong buy-in by stakeholders.
- Challenges to collaboration included: ensuring the “right” people from different organisations were involved in action planning; maintaining support from senior staff; organisational demands; differing planning cycles and historical relationships between tangata whenua and local government.
- More emphasis on whole child approaches is required as the main focus to date has been on youth.
- A wider range of organisations, in particular, representation from the education sector is needed at project governance level. This will be addressed as part of the new governance arrangements.
- There have been different levels of community engagement in NCYD. Strong working relationships were established with the local community co-ordinator and key Northcote networks.
- There is a perception that many Northcote residents and community members are not aware of the project
- A comprehensive communication strategy had been developed for NCYD and further opportunities for raising awareness of NCYD need to be explored as the action plans are implemented further.

*Objective Four: Increase participation in community decision making by children and young people*

- Young people from Northcote have been actively engaged in project activities through a range of methods and NYPD members report that this has been a positive experience
- The child and youth facilitation position was identified as central to involving young people, especially hard-to-reach young people, in NCYD and for the ongoing involvement of children and young people in decision-making in Northcote.
- Improvements to the way children and young people have been involved included: prompt feedback on how children’s input has influenced project planning, need for concrete outcomes and organisational change so that young people want to be involved.
- More work needs to be done to create sustainable pathways for child and youth involvement in decision-making.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

The Northcote Child and Youth Development (NCYD) project is a demonstration project for the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme of Action (ASCP).<sup>1</sup> The Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme was a three-year multi-agency pilot project which ran from mid-2003 to mid-2006. The programme included six work strands which were responsible for fourteen projects. NCYD was one of these projects under the Regional Child and Youth Development work strand. The aim of NCYD is to demonstrate how central and local government can work together to support long term development for children and young people in the Auckland region.

Northcote was selected as the site for the demonstration project in mid-2004 because: there was an opportunity to build on existing community strengths; potential synergy with the Northcote Central Project (a partnership between Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) Community Renewal programme, North Shore City Council (NSCC) and the Northcote Central Trust) and the diverse and youthful population. Children and young people had already been identified as a priority by the Northcote community and there was regional support for the location of the project in Northcote. Other features of the Northcote community are the ethnic diversity of the resident population as well as the existence of pockets of deprivation surrounded by areas of affluence.

NCYD has four objectives which are to:

1. Promote evidence-based approaches to child and youth service development
2. Learn what works best to improve outcomes at a local level and to feed this into national level work on child and youth development
3. Encourage central and local agencies to take a “whole child” approach and collaborate to improve services for children and youth
4. Increase participation in community decision making by children and young people

The NCYD has a particular focus on how children and young people can better participate in the decision-making processes in their community and how to encourage learning for sustainable development. Part of this focus has involved the establishment of a youth leadership group called Northcote Youth Project Development (NYPD). NYPD members used PhotoVoice, a Participatory Action Research (PAR) technique, to identify what is ‘good’, ‘not so good’, and areas for improvement in the Northcote community. The research by young people was used to inform the design of the collaborative action plans in order to address the issues and concerns for Northcote children and young people. Other NYPD activities included presenting and talking at local schools about their work and research, helping to organise after-school programmes for other young people in Northcote and

---

<sup>1</sup> For more detail on ASCP please go to [www.sustainableauckland.govt.nz](http://www.sustainableauckland.govt.nz). The ASCP has also been evaluated **Ryan, K. and Sutton, A.** (2006), 'An evaluation of the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme', Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme Combined Steering Group.

participating in and eventually helping to run workshops that encouraged learning for sustainable development. The NYPD also ran a school essay/poster competition that gave other Northcote youth an opportunity to provide feedback about life as a young person in Northcote to further inform action planning processes.

The main form of community engagement for NCYD has been the establishment of a strong partnership between the project manager and the community coordinator and child and youth facilitator. Information about the project has been disseminated via local networks. A community reference group was established at the beginning of the project but this has been recently disbanded as it was viewed as duplicating existing networks. Updates about the project have been distributed via fliers and articles in the local newspaper. As the action planning progresses a number of community organisations are becoming more closely involved in the project.

A key focus of the project has been to develop collaborative working relationships between the different local and central government agencies that have an interest in Northcote. This has been done through collating available local information and the development of joint action plans to address the issues for children and young people in Northcote raised by young people themselves and from consideration of available local information. Since the last evaluation report the action planning process has been progressing steadily with a concerted effort to manage the transitional arrangements for the project as the ASCP came to an end in June 2006.

A number of other projects and initiatives have been running in the Northcote Central area at the same time as the NCYD including the Northcote Central project, Housing New Zealand Community Renewal and the Safer Northcote Project.

## **1.2 Evaluation methodology**

In May 2005 SHORE and Whariki were contracted to provide formative evaluation for NCYD. The objectives for the formative evaluation are to:

- To identify transferable learnings: what worked, in what context, how it can be applied to other communities
- To demonstrate how to put an evidence-based approach into action
- To gather key information and provide developmental assistance to help the project learning, by modifying and improving its implementation processes
- To identify the most effective methods to engage the community and ensure community reach
- To focus on processes to help produce effective outcomes for the project.

The following statement provides a concise definition of the utilisation-focused evaluation model used by SHORE and Whariki:

*Evaluation is the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of information about the activities and outcomes of actual programs in order for interested persons to make judgements about specific aspects of what the program is doing and improve the program. This general purpose takes its specific focus from the information needs of primary stakeholders and the decision-making context of the particular program being evaluated (Patton, 1987).*

Two rounds of key informant interviews have been conducted for the evaluation. The first round was conducted between late July and early October 2005. The majority of interviews in the second round were completed in May 2006 by Sarah Greenaway. Hector Kaiwai interviewed Maori key informants and NYPD members. A few people were interviewed in June and July 2006 as they were not available to be interviewed earlier. In total, thirty-four people were interviewed in the second round.

The following areas were covered in the interviews:

- Child and youth participation
- Community engagement
- All-of-government and collaborative approaches
- Action planning processes
- Progress of NCYD
- Project strengths and challenges
- Project impacts and achievements to date
- Project roles
- Sustainable development

A thematic analysis of the interview transcripts was undertaken using Nvivo (a software package for analysing qualitative data). Thematic analysis involves identifying, analysing and reporting themes within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006:79). A deductive approach was used to analyse the data where the evaluators focused on identifying themes and information that were relevant to the formative evaluation questions, that is the extent to which progress has been made towards each of the four objectives for NCYD and analysing areas of strength and where improvements can be made.

The evaluation is also informed by a review of project documentation such as meeting minutes and presentations; reports about the project to different groups; and preparation for the regional workshop<sup>2</sup> which focused on key learnings from the project. The formative evaluators also reviewed information collected by NYPD and the child and youth facilitator from other young people in Northcote.

### **1.3 Formative evaluation support**

The main evaluation activities over the last five months have been:

- undertaking the second round of key informant interviews with members of the project governance group, government agencies, community members and members of NYPD to gain perceptions of the project to date, to help inform future activities and strategic directions;
- assisting with the evaluation and monitoring component of the action plans for each work strand;
- encouraging and advising on incorporating evidence-based approaches;
- refining the programme logic for each work strand;
- presenting evaluation feedback at the Regional Child and Youth forum;

---

<sup>2</sup> Combined Learning Forum for the Sustainable Communities and Regional Child and Youth Workstrands of the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme (Auckland, 14<sup>th</sup> July 2006).

- suggesting ways of increasing community reach such as a launch of the action plan with provision for community members to provide feedback
- working with the child and youth facilitator on collating and recording project information.

A summary of recent evaluation activity is included in Appendix One.

#### **1.4 Report structure**

This report provides an overview of the project from the beginning of the evaluation (May 2005) up to the end of August 2006, with more emphasis on the period since the last evaluation progress report (February 2006). The report begins with a review of each of the four objectives of NCYD. At the early stages of the evaluation a programme logic matrix was developed which contained information about the key outcomes and success criteria for each of the four objectives. A summary of these outcomes is included at the beginning of each section. The main processes used to meet each of the four objectives are outlined, followed by feedback from key informants, a discussion and a list of action points.

## **2. Objective One: Promote evidence-based approaches to child and youth service development**

### **2.1 Key outcomes**

At the start of the evaluation key outcomes identified for this objective included:

- All NCYD activities and future planning are based on reviewing/seeking relevant evidence and ensuring there is a robust rationale for development and delivery of services
- Project stakeholders are well informed and use key findings from evidence to develop a shared vision, decide on priorities and develop an action plan collaboratively
- Ownership of evidence-gathering is achieved by project stakeholders undertaking or over-seeing data-gathering

Success criteria and standards included:

- Written plans and roll-out of activities of all agencies involved in the project demonstrate they are underpinned by the evidence gathered
- Current evidence is updated and drawn on to further improve the project activities
- Priorities and completed Action Plan reflect the findings of the evidence gathered
- All stakeholder groups have quality data gathered

### **2.2 Processes**

A number of methods have been used to promote evidence-based approaches to child and youth service development as part of NCYD.

The first step in establishing an evidence base for the NCYD project was the development of the Statistical Profile (Northcote Child and Youth Development Project, 2005). A research analyst was contracted to assist with the collection and analysis of data. The original aims of the profile were to establish baseline data that could be tracked over time; identify trends and highlight problems; provide greater transparency to the community, NGOs, and central and local government through equal access to data to inform discussions; identify areas where action is needed to inform planning and decision-making and compare different groups in Northcote with others living on the North Shore and in New Zealand (Reid & Woodley, 2005).

The development of the profile was a difficult process as much of the quantitative data was not available at the local Northcote level, which meant that the original aims had to be refined. A comprehensive methodology report by the project manager and research analyst outlines the challenges and lessons learned through the process of developing the statistical profile (Reid & Woodley, 2005). Interviews with key informants were undertaken to provide local information in areas where statistical data was lacking. Therefore, the profile provided a snapshot of what was happening to children, young people and their families in Northcote and the environment in which children and young people in Northcote were being raised.

A database of services available to children, young people and their families in Northcote was compiled at the beginning of the project. An indicator list recording where local and TLA statistical information can be sourced has also been produced by the research analyst along with a comprehensive guide to writing a community profile that can be used by other communities across New Zealand (Woodley, 2006).<sup>3</sup> Further work has also been done to improve the quality and availability of local level data (see section three).

Evidence about local issues for young people was gathered by and with children and young people in Northcote using interviews, PhotoVoice, 100% Pure Conjecture workshops and a school competition (see Section Five for more detail). This information along with input from other stakeholders and community members was used to prioritise the five work strands for the action plan development.

The evaluation team conducted a literature review of positive youth development, collaborative approaches and participatory action research methods (Jensen et al., 2005) and this was circulated to the project governance group and posted on the ASCP website. The formative evaluators and the research analyst have reiterated the need for evidence-based approaches to inform action planning. An example of how evidence about effective strategies could be used to inform the safety work strand was presented at the all-of-government workshop in June 2006. The evaluator and research analyst also asked participants for suggestions about key experts or organisations that could be used to inform each of the action plans and this information has been collated. The formative evaluators have made suggestions about where information about best practice approaches can be accessed. In addition, there is a specific role in each action planning group to access research and evaluation evidence to inform the further development of each action plan.

### **2.3 Feedback from key informants**

Key informants were asked about whether or not they thought evidence-based approaches were being promoted in NCYD. Analysis of the interview data indicated that there were (at least) two different interpretations about what counts as “evidence”. For some, evidence referred to knowledge about current issues and concerns for children and young people in Northcote and for others, evidence referred to information about effective ways of addressing these concerns. Some interviewees were unsure about what an evidence-based approach would mean in practice.

A few informants pointed out that there were gaps in the evidence base used to inform project activities. For example one of the transferable learnings from the development of the statistical profile was the difficulty that agencies had when they tried to access local data about issues facing children and young people in Northcote. One key informant thought that in areas where there are gaps in statistical data it was particularly important to have people with good local knowledge involved in action planning processes.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Guide to Writing a Community Profile is available here:  
[http://www.pointresearch.co.nz/current/community\\_profile.html](http://www.pointresearch.co.nz/current/community_profile.html)

Another difficulty identified was the short time frame available to gather information as the ability to access local data was dependent on establishing good relationships with people in local agencies and that process took time.

In relation to action planning processes one person thought that good local knowledge about crime issues had been available whereas in other action plan areas there were gaps in the evidence base, for example on-the-ground knowledge about local health issues. However, the action planning processes used in the wellness and health work strand were also cited as an example of the promotion of evidence-based approaches. The members of the action planning group had sourced best practice reviews to inform the original proposal to develop a school-based youth health centre. Furthermore, when it became clear that there was a gap between this proposal and knowledge about the priorities for children and young people in Northcote the action planning group decided to review the health centre strategy and gather further evidence on local issues for children in Northcote. The use of the Youth Development Strategy as the basis for the opportunities work strand was also seen as important by one person because it is based on sound research and evidence of best practice.

There was some concern expressed about people involved in action planning who stepped outside their area of expertise, for example some people had excellent knowledge of local issues but less knowledge of research evidence about a particular problem. One key informant also thought that expert knowledge about effective strategies needed to be included in each of the action planning areas so that evidence-based approaches form the basis of the action plans.

*I think involving people like Emma Davies [an expert on family violence] is just such a good move and there are other action plans where that really needs to happen with too because it's involving people who have that expertise to know what's already been done, what's already out there, what's worked effectively and what hasn't worked effectively because it feels like we might be re-inventing a wheel.*

It was suggested that the establishment of a project advisory group might have enabled additional expertise to be fed into action planning processes. Another key informant thought that there should be a final review of the action plans to ensure that evidence-based approaches are being used. One person hoped that the current evaluation report would provide an opportunity for gaps in the evidence base to be discussed and addressed.

One of the best aspects of the project is that it has raised the need for using evidence-based approaches to inform decision-making regarding service delivery according to one key informant. They thought that this could result in more effective services being funded.

In relation to the development of the Statistical profile one person believed that quantitative data has a tendency to gloss over the specific needs of some ethnic communities:

*In some instances its put some validity around some of the rationale and that sort of stuff, but some of that evidence stuff-based is very, very light on Māori perspective... unless its very, very Māori orientated [...].*

Some thought that the identification of issues by young people was itself an evidence-based approach and that it was important to stay true to the issues that young people had identified.

The formative evaluation component of NCYD was also reported as building the evaluation and research capacity of some members of the project governance group. One person reported that the evaluation has provided opportunities for project partners to learn as they go through the feedback of information from the first round of key informant interviews and reflect on project planning processes.

## **2.4 Discussion**

As the comments made by key informants indicate, there is a need to balance the input from young people and community members with the available research evidence about effective approaches to inform the development of the action plan. The focus of the five work strands on cultural respect, environment, safety, opportunity and wellness and health are consistent with the areas identified in the *Investing in Child and Youth Development* strategy in the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme of Action (Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2003), Te Rito (Ministry of Social Development, 2002) and the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2002).

Currently, the objectives for each of the action plans are fairly broad, indicating general areas where collaborative work can proceed. This gives opportunity for further analysis to be done on the most appropriate strategies for the Northcote area.

As the action plans are developed there is a need to ensure that project activities are based on available evidence and local knowledge. Lessons learnt from a number of different community action and development projects indicate that projects are more likely to be successful when the knowledge and expertise of community members is combined with research evidence (Greenaway & Witten, 2005). The likelihood of this happening is increased by having regular opportunities to critically reflect upon and review the project development process. The ability to do this through regular all-of-government workshops has been a key strength of NCYD, but this process needs to continue as the action plans are implemented. The formative evaluation team has developed a rubric that can be used by each of the work strand groups to assess the extent to which evidence based approaches are being promoted as the action plans are developed and implemented (see Appendix Two).

Recent observations at action planning meetings indicate that there is limited research capacity in many of the work strands. Additional research advice and support is recommended to ensure that the most effective approaches are used and less effective or harmful strategies are avoided. It is also a year since the Statistical Profile was completed for Northcote and when the latest Census data becomes available it may be timely to use the Guide to Writing a Community Profile to update the profile to inform the further development of each of the action strands.

## **2.5 Action points**

- Clear outline regarding the role and expectations of the research/evaluation role for each work strand
- Ongoing critical review of each work strand to ensure they are consistent with available evidence
- Identify possibilities for additional research support/expert advice for each work strand
- Consider updating Statistical Profile once 2006 Census data is available

### **3. Objective Two: Learn what works best to improve outcomes at a local level and to feed this into national level work on child and youth development**

#### **3.1 Key outcomes**

At the start of the evaluation key outcomes identified for this objective included:

- Regular reviews of the effectiveness of current activities and practice are built into stakeholder planning and programme development
- Stakeholders have good understanding of what works best and how to implement activities for optimum effect
- Stakeholders discuss and debate best approaches and activities to achieve priorities

Success criteria and standards included:

- Identified effective approaches and activities are reported on, best practice guidelines/templates developed and transferred across sectors and to other localities
- Best practice is demonstrated through implementation of approaches and activities that effectively address key activities
- Planning meetings held and action plan developed based on best practice

#### **3.2 Processes**

The action planning process has been led by an experienced project manager and there has been a consistent emphasis by the project partners on the need to identify tools that will benefit other communities in New Zealand, for example “the community co-ordinator in Temuka”. As the action plans have yet to be fully implemented it is not possible, at this stage, to identify what works best to improve outcomes at the local level. Therefore, the best practice guidelines and templates developed to date focus mainly on the methods used to gather data on the Northcote community.

As mentioned above one of the key findings from the NCYD project has been the difficulties with accessing high quality local data to inform action planning processes. A number of the project tools and processes developed in response to these challenges offer important learnings that can be transferred to inform other communities and policy development at a national level. These tools include the:

- Statistical Profile (Northcote Child and Youth Development Project, 2005)
- Methodology Report (Reid & Woodley, 2005)
- Guide to Writing a Community Profile (Woodley, 2006)

There are plans for the Community Profile Guide to be used by other community co-ordinators across the North Shore to develop a community profile for their area once the latest Census data (2006) becomes available.

The approaches used in NCYD have also been presented in a number of forums by the project manager and project partners including a presentation to the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme Steering Group. As a result of this the project manager was invited to present the project to a meeting of Metro Sector Mayors and CEOs from local and regional Councils. The Prime Minister also visited Northcote in

August 2006 where the NCYD project was show-cased along with the Northcote Central project and the Safer Northcote project. The project manager, local government lead and the evaluation team presented key learnings from the project at a regional child and youth development forum in July 2006.

The research analyst (along with others in New Zealand working on this issue) has raised concerns about the difficulty local communities have trying to access quality data about children and young people with the head of Statistics New Zealand. She has also made recommendations about ways access to data could be improved.

In addition, each of the work strands in the action plan includes the development of project products or tools that could be transferred to other communities (see Appendix Three). Further scoping work needs to be completed to assess whether some of these best practice models have already been developed and/or to ensure that they are consistent with the current evidence base.

Information about the NCYD is available via the ASCP website and has been fed into the overall evaluation of the ASCP (see Ryan & Sutton, 2006). In addition the quarterly formative evaluation reports document project progress and identify key findings and transferable learnings.

### **3.3 Feedback from key informants**

Many key informants thought that it was too early for findings to be fed back to inform national level work on child and youth service development, as the project was still at the action planning stage so it was not possible to identify what had or had not worked to improve outcomes at the local level.

Some of the key informants were unsure about whether or not information from NCYD was being fed into national work on child and youth development. This is not surprising given that many of the key informants were focused either on Northcote or the North Shore, rather than what is happening at a national policy level. Many assumed that as NCYD is a demonstration project, information would be fed back to the national level.

Some people were aware of efforts to transfer learnings from the project to other areas:

*I know that this project has been reported back to ASCP and that's a way of feeding information back to national or at least local if not national structures and that's been a good thing because there's been discussion about how difficult it is to work collaboratively and how difficult it is to get local information [...] I think its critical mass, it's like at some point people sit up and go well actually this is a problem.*

One key informant reported that the NCYD was a good case study and was being used to inform their government department about Auckland issues especially about the importance of including children in social processes.

Information about NCYD had been successfully disseminated at a regional level according to one key informant.

*I think we've done it well at the regional level in terms of the forums and in terms of the presentations that we do to both individuals and organisations and a steering group, but nationally I don't think we've been given the opportunity by the Sustainable Cities programme, but having said that we are making a presentation at the Metro sectors meeting in July. But I just think we have to be careful not to forget to do that. I don't think the website is a very good way of doing it. We have to do better than that.*

The difficulty with transferring information to the national level even within government departments, was acknowledged. Barriers to transferring knowledge included staff turn over, especially at the senior level, and organisational restructuring leading to a loss of institutional knowledge about the project.

The contribution of NCYD to raising awareness at a national level about the problems with access to data at a local level was seen as the main example of how learnings had been transferred to the national level.

*The indicators, well its right up there now. But that's been hard work to get it up there. But the notion that information, government information needs to be readily available at community level and that there should be a comprehensive set of data ...that argument has been won. Now that's not only Northcote that has done that, but ....because there was already the indicators project which is going through Council, Canterbury project, but the voice we've been able to bring is that it needs to be involving people. That if you're really going to get communities engaged and able to start responding to their own issues then they need their own information about their community whatever level it is. So I think that's been a win. The fact that Brian Pink [head of Statistics New Zealand] is now picking it up.*

Some people thought that the evaluation was a way of capturing the learnings from the project so that other people have access to this information.

*I think the evaluation had been great and I think that [...] people have been very open to the findings of the evaluation and it's absolutely essential because if we haven't evaluated it or worked out what we are evaluating or got the findings or the learnings, what's the point?*

One key informant reported that there had been enquiries to their government department in Wellington about the Northcote project, for example from LGNZ and a Wellington based researcher.

### **3.4 Discussion**

At the current stage of project development it is too early to assess the extent to which NCYD will lead to improved outcomes for children and young people in Northcote. There has been a concerted effort by the project manager and partners to document and disseminate key learnings from the project at both a regional, and where possible,

a national level. As the action plans are implemented there needs to be mechanisms in place for regular and ongoing documentation and review of project activities and achievements, including impact/outcome evaluation components to assess what has worked best to improve outcomes in Northcote. Efforts have been made to incorporate evaluation measures into each of the action plans so that project partners can monitor their progress towards improving outcomes for children and young people in the Northcote area. However, it is likely that each of the action work strands will need further assistance with the research and evaluation components as the action plans are refined and implemented. Further work also needs to develop evaluation measures of environmental factors that support positive youth development, such as increased opportunities for youth participation in community decision-making and the creation of opportunity structures (see Section Six for more detail).

The project managers' ability to clearly identify and articulate key learnings from the project has been a key factor in the transfer of knowledge. NCYD also benefited from the networks of the research analyst, enabling indicator issues to be raised at a national level. This could potentially result in improvements to the ability of local communities to access data which is an important part of robust planning processes.

Key informants identified that one of the barriers to the transfer of knowledge within organisations and agencies is the turnover of staff. This is an issue that impacts on many community and government projects. The establishment of an online group for the Northcote project could be very useful way of addressing this issue. The online group has its own website where project files as well as email communications are stored. The website can be completely private or there can be some parts that are open to public viewing. Online group members communicate by emails with clear subject lines. This means that members don't have to read every email but if people do want to check something they can look at the relevant emails stored on the project website. Another advantage is that if a new person joins the group they do not have to rely on information about the project being stored by their own organisation as it will all be available on the website. Furthermore, an online group will allow all of the Northcote project partners to check out what is happening in other work strands and improve communication. The action plans, terms of reference, evaluation reports, project fliers, methodology reports and so forth can all be made available through the online group site. There are some costs associated with setting up and running the online group and it is also a good idea to have a nominated person who can coach other members as they learn to use the site. The State Services Commission has done some work in this area and SHORE is currently piloting online groups with public health collaborative projects.

### **3.5 Action points**

- Continue to identify opportunities to transfer learnings. This role needs to be the responsibility of the steering group and the new umbrella organisations.
- Continue to develop evaluation and monitoring components of each work strand so the impacts and outcomes of project activities can be identified
- Provide clear evaluation guidelines for each work strand
- Consider evaluation training for work strand participants
- Consider establishing an online group to facilitate communication and access to project information.

## **4. Objective Three: Encourage central and local agencies to take a ‘whole child’ approach and collaborate to improve services for children and youth**

### **4.1 Key outcomes**

At the start of the evaluation key outcomes identified for Objective Three included:

- Agencies work together to provide a coordinated range of complementary policies, services and activities
- Agencies work collaboratively in agreeing on priorities, developing the NCYD Action Plan and activities as part of their work plans
- User-friendly communication of plan and community involvement to Northcote families and young people
- All stakeholder groups and community better informed about, and keen to develop and use, a ‘whole child’ approach

Success criteria and standards included:

- There is demonstrated collaboration on ‘whole child’ approaches and alignment of policies and practices
- ‘Whole child’ collaborative approaches incorporated in work plans and service delivery
- Stakeholder agencies, families and young people report better integration of services
- Meetings held to inform and discuss implementation of the approach
- Clear protocols developed and communication strategy initiated

### **4.2 Processes**

One of the reasons that Northcote was selected as the site for the child and youth demonstration project was because of the existing relationships and networks between agencies in the Birkenhead/Northcote area. Although there were processes in place for agencies to work together around particular issues, such as youth offending, there was a gap at the systems level. For example there was no shared work programme to address the needs of children and young people and agencies planned in isolation. There was frustration by some community members about government programmes that did not deliver improved outcomes for children and young people in the community. North Shore City Council has traditionally had a stronger focus on physical infrastructure rather than social issues and the NCYD provided an opportunity to develop stronger relationships between local and central government.

There have been two avenues where collaboration between central and local agencies has occurred; at the project governance level and through the all-of-government meetings and action planning processes.

#### **4.2.1 Project governance**

The following organisations formed the original governance group for NCYD: MSD, NSCC and HNZC. The local community co-ordinator (employed by the Birkenhead/Northcote Trust) and the child and youth facilitator (employed by Te

Roopu Waiora) were also active members of the governance group. At the beginning of the project a formal Partnership Agreement was signed to establish the governance framework. This included both partnership principles and community interface principles.<sup>4</sup>

The governance group met each month and focused on the progress of each aspect of the project such as the development of the community/statistical profile; services and assets stock take; child and youth engagement; community engagement; all-of-government processes; project management; communications; evaluation and progress in other Northcote projects (HNZC Community Renewal and the Northcote Central Project).

As the action planning progressed and the end date for the Auckland Sustainable Cities project drew near the need for a new governance arrangement arose. The project manager proposed that each work strand in the action plan needed to be represented on the governance group by both a government and community agency representative and this was endorsed by participants in the all-of-government process and the governance group. This model was seen as enabling more ownership of the project by the all-of-government group and community organisations. At the time of report writing the project is transitioning between the original governance structure and the new governance model.

#### **4.2.2 Action planning**

A wide range of government departments and agencies have been involved in the all-of-government meetings and action planning processes. Representatives from the following organisations have been involved at some stage of the project: Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC); North Shore City Council (NSCC); Ministry of Social Development (MSD); Birkenhead/Northcote Trust; Te Puni Kokiri (TPK); Child Youth and Family Services (CYFS); Waitemata District Health Board (WDHB); Auckland Regional Public Health Service (ARPHS); New Zealand Police; Ministry of Education (MoE); Ministry for the Environment (MfE); Department of Internal Affairs (DIA); Office of Ethnic Affairs (OEA); Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA); Ministry of Youth Development (MYD); Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC); Ministry of Health (MoH) and Strengthening Families.

As action planning for each work strand has progressed more community-based organisations have become involved such as the Harbour PHO, Community Health Voice, Awataha Marae, Refugee and Migrant network, Raeburn House, Public Health Nurses, Dental Service, PHAB, Northcote College Board of Trustees representatives, and a local church leader.

---

<sup>4</sup> The partnership principles included agreement to: act in honesty and in good faith; communicate openly with 'no surprises'; work co-operatively and constructively; recognise others responsibilities to stakeholders and own organisations; encourage quality and innovation to achieve positive outcomes for the community; acknowledge the value of diverse input and promote inclusion. The community interface principles included the following: do no harm to the community; collective effort will be directed towards the capacity building of the community; build on existing community initiatives; ensure project activity is well-planned and timed and does not become a burden on the community; work with the community and at the pace of the community and be honest about what the project will or will not deliver or resolve.

Over the course of the project there have been regular meetings of all the agencies and departments, as well as separate action-planning meetings once the work strands were identified. The five work strands that were developed in response to young people's concerns, local data and community, local and central government input were: cultural respect, safety, environment, opportunities (school, work and leisure) and wellness and health. The outcomes and objectives developed by each work strand are outlined in Appendix Four. Work has already begun on the cultural respect work strand through the development of a resource kete and the identification of best practice models for agency approaches to cultural diversity.

NCYD also sought to have community input into all-of-government processes and the action planning. Again, there were a number of processes used for community engagement. These included:

- Establishment of strong working relationships with the Birkenhead and Northcote Community Co-ordinator
- Feedback about the project through networks of Community Co-ordinator and Child and Youth Facilitator
- Child and Youth Facilitator links with schools and parents of NYPD members
- Regular updates to the Birkenhead/Northcote Community Board and to the Multi Agency Strategic Team (MAST)
- Creation of a Community Reference Group with representatives from a local school network, community board, youth trust, church and parents.

The main focus of the key informant interviews were on the overall action planning processes rather than each specific work strand, however comments on work strands are included where relevant.

### **4.3 Feedback from key informants**

#### **4.3.1 Strengths and benefits of collaborative approaches**

The adjectives used by key informants to describe the NCYD project give an indication of the value of collaborative processes: respectful; open; inclusive; good-will. A number of people noted that there is lots of laughter and energy at the all-of-government meetings indicating the high levels of good-will of people involved in the project.

*I think it has been very soundly put together and the aims and the principles that are looked at are very clear. The work that has been done around them I think is heading in a very good direction. The meetings that we go to I think are very indicative of what people think. At other meetings [...] you can often get some very dull responses afterwards or over a cup of coffee and that's never evident in this one. I think it's such a good initiative.*

Key informants were unanimously positive about the value of the project's management/strategic brokerage role. This role was seen an important support for collaborative ways of working through: the coordination of meetings; the provision of an action planning framework (through the action planning templates and meetings)<sup>5</sup>; strong leadership; ability to build and maintain relationships; clear articulation of

---

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix Six for a blank Action Planning Template

project purpose and vision; transfer of knowledge to community organisations and an inclusive approach.

*I think it's been really good to have someone who is very inclusive facilitator and who is also very good at pulling together a strategy out of all of our contributions, I think that has been a really very powerful part of the success of the project.*

The development of positive working relationships between the different agencies and departments operating in Northcote was seen as important because it is easier to get in contact with people and stronger working links have been established: “One of the main benefits I think is that it stops us from being so insular.”

Another benefit of improved relationships has been more communication about the planning processes of different agencies.

*What happens with central government is that all of us as organisations working independently in our silos all set our business plans for the year without talking to each other. A really fantastic outcome last week was [name] from [organisation] inviting me and [name] to look at their strategic plan for the year and give some feedback, God that's unheard of. That's about relationships really and if you don't have those relationships within government then...It's [NCYD] provided that which has been fabulous.*

One key informant reported that the focus of NCYD on systems rather than silos has been an important support for both reinforcing the benefits and the need for all-of-government ways of working.

Other benefits from the increased communication identified by key informants included the identification of gaps in services for children and young people, for example the need to improve links between schools and community resources and services. Some people thought that there is now a stronger focus by North Shore City Council on ‘social’ concerns as a result of the project and that the profile of young people has been raised on the North Shore.

Some reported that local stakeholders have ownership of and buy-in to the project, as opposed to other initiatives that have been developed without involvement from local people and organisations.

Although key informants were also able to identify ways the project can be improved (see below) a number of people thought that NCYD is a good model that can be transferred elsewhere.

*I think it's been an awesome project, I think it's a really great way to get agencies to understand the community and those communities needs, priorities and concerns and then work collaboratively together to develop interventions or projects to achieve health gains or safety because that process has proven to be effective, you've got community participation and then you've got the inter-sectoral collaboration, and if everyone commits to the project together then, it is going to be sustainable.*

The time allowed for the action planning process was appreciated by some as they felt it gave people time to make sure that their business plans are aligned with the project work strands.

Most of the Māori respondents interviewed found that the objectives of the NCYD, particularly if they were from a government organisation, aligned well with their own organisational objectives. One respondent also felt that the project was very timely and that getting the diverse ethnic communities in the Northcote area to work collaboratively, via the cultural respect work strand, was another key strategy for producing positive health, safety and environmental outcomes for the community.

The majority of key informants who have been involved in the all-of-government workshops and the action planning processes, reported that their level of involvement had been about right. Some would have liked to have been more involved but also commented that their own work schedules meant that they had little additional time to spare. A number of key informants reported that the project purpose and objectives aligned very closely with those of their own organisation and that their involvement with the project added value to their own work. This was the case even for agencies with a strong national level focus.

Generally, key informants were comfortable with the pace of the action planning and project development. For some the process has been too slow but they believed that it was important for the implementation processes to be sound in order for the project to be sustainable. Some key informants mentioned that the evaluation component gave them additional motivation to keep involved with the project because they knew that they would be interviewed about it at some stage and it provided another opportunity to have input into project development.

#### **4.3.2 Challenges and improvements to collaborative ways of working**

Although key informants were positive about the collaborative approaches used in NCYD some people believed that the project had only just got underway. At the time that the majority of key informant interviews were undertaken there was some concern that the project could flounder if the project manager was no longer involved. Others thought that the real test of whether agencies could collaborate effectively would be in the implementation phase.

A number of obstacles to effective collaboration were identified by key informants. Some people were not sure whether the 'right' people from some organisations were involved. For example, some key informants thought that there needed to be more 'decision-makers' or senior management at the all-of-government meetings. Another key informant also reflected on this issue.

*[T]here is no way we would have got senior people to spend as much time at those workshops. It just would not have happened, so you've got to be realistic too. And so I guess the thing I've learnt from it is, it's not so much who you have at the workshops, it's what you're doing extraneously as well as the workshops, that's actually probably become far more important and we probably need to [do] more [...] one on one visits, [to] the senior managers and just doing brief updates, senior to senior.*

Senior management awareness of the project was identified as an important way of supporting the involvement of agency staff in collaborative efforts. Key informants identified the need for higher level buy-in from organisations because each individual is reliant on the person above understanding and supporting their involvement in the project. This is an ongoing issue due to changes in personnel at both project and higher management levels.

Key informants also identified gaps in the groups who have been involved in the project to date. A number of people thought that there needed to be more school and education representatives involved in the action planning, especially as there is concern about education issues. Another gap was organisations working with pre-schoolers, parents, disabled young people and wider social service networks.

*Well, I'm not sure that they've taken a whole child approach absolutely if you look at the definition of whole child. But I think they have definitely tried to look at things from the perspective of children and young people. And drawn the links between what's not good for their development and what happens in their community and what's not helpful in terms of their development and that's fed our action plans. But I think it's about putting the child at the centre, the child or the young person at the centre of the planning process, which is slightly not a whole child approach. And we haven't quite covered off all the stages of development, and the action plan still won't do that.*

One key informant pointed out that at the beginning of the project the priorities of young people were unknown so there has been an ongoing process of identifying who needs to be involved as the action planning progressed.

Systemic barriers to collaboration and the need for organisational change to support collaborative ways of working were also identified.

*[I]f we talk about the government silos, and how people talk about we're all meant to be working in a whole of government way, it's all in our strategic plans, but I've got to do my real job, it's on top of my real job. And why they are saying that is because no one is re-designing the system that they're working in, to enable them to work in a whole of government way [...] And it's almost unfair not to address that and to expect people to do double duty and it's because no one is actually picking up on it.*

One key informant thought that the project was quite complex and was not sure that everyone had grasped the need to focus on changing systems and the way that government and community agencies work together to address the needs and issues identified by young people. A few people thought that the planning cycles of different agencies means that it is difficult to access resources, for example the planning for the next two years has already been completed by one large organisation. It was also suggested that individuals with an operational rather than strategic focus may not be able to exert much influence on the direction of their particular agency.

Another key informant commented that some parts of her organisation were very supportive of the aims of the project, whereas other sections had not identified how

the project could benefit their core business. There was concern that the corporate objectives of some organisations are not aligned with the objectives of the project and that the understanding of the project within organisations does not extend far beyond the key individuals who have been involved to date.

A number of Māori respondents also mentioned that being consulted at a “late stage” in the project; not being Mana Whenua; and being from a government department also impacted on their level of involvement, although the latter two issues weren’t specifically related to the NCYD.

One key issue that came out amongst Māori respondents was the lack of Māori involvement in the initial planning and design stages of the NCYD:

*... [tangata whenua needed to be] brought into the loop earlier as far as I can see... [had] a prominent place in the planning stages, in the decision-making... not like an after thought...*

One respondent also felt that the current project design needed more of a Māori focus:

*I’m not quite sure that it’s the appropriate approach, personally... from a Māori perspective, and I guess, at the outset the set-up of it in my mind, was very, very mono-cultural... so consequently it didn’t encourage me to be offering my Māori expertise, because the framework was put together from a mono-cultural perspective.*

For some groups, money, time and people resources were an issue that impacted on their participation in the NCYD. One group also mentioned that a ‘conflict of personalities’ has hindered some of their members attending project meetings.

Rebuilding a sense of trust and faith amongst the Māori community in government services was an issue for one Māori group, while another Māori respondent mentioned local historical factors as contributing to the mistrust between Māori and the North Shore City Council.

*... there was a hell of a hue and cry and the whole thing about ten years ago, when there was obvious signs that Māori were being pushed out of this area and going -- being pushed across into West Auckland and down to South Auckland, and that local government was tending to make this area more of an elite type of an area... And so Māori became quite disenchanted by that. And some of us are still on the Shore, and haven’t forgotten that.*

In addressing some of these issues, and in improving Māori participation in the NCYD, the establishment of a Māori Liason Officer role with the North Shore City Council and the development of a Māori reference group were seen as key strategies in ensuring a continuous Māori presence in the project and in helping to coordinate services; coordinate relationships, and keep the lines of communication clear. Although there were some initial hesitancy and concerns about tangata whenua not being consulted earlier in the project, most respondents who attended the cultural respect work strand hui found them to be useful.

### 4.3.3 Project governance

Many of the key informants felt unable to comment on the project governance arrangements as they had not been directly involved. One person thought that it was beneficial to have MSD sitting alongside North Shore City Council as they thought that this encouraged the Council to have a stronger focus on social issues. A few people questioned why HNZA was part of the governance group as they thought it would have made more sense to have the Ministry of Education, local schools or the Ministry of Health involved. Some people thought that more agencies needed to be involved at the governance level and that other agencies could have been invited to join as the project progressed.

Some thought that members of the governance group hadn't really taken on the leadership role and they could have done more liaising with other agencies at a senior level. One person thought that, as the emphasis is on sustainable development the governance group needed to be able to articulate the four well-beings and keep drawing the links between these and the way organisations operate.

Some thought the governance arrangements had worked well:

*I think the structure that we had; the governance structure has worked well. we knew quite well what our parameters were, what it is we had to achieve from meeting to meeting, I think that's the focus has been really good, it has been in check, we haven't wasted energy.*

### 4.3.4 Wider community engagement

Many key informants commented on the positive working relationships with key community workers and the links established with wider groups and networks, such as MAST and the community board. The importance of working at the pace of local community processes, for example planning meetings around existing timetables, was acknowledged. The involvement of the Community Co-ordinator who has great local knowledge, was seen as critical to the project which could not have proceeded without this person's involvement.

*[T]he Community Co-ordinator, is a vital role because what they bring is that background information and the networks when you're starting off, and without them it would never grow because you'd struggle, I mean for Wendy [the project manager] to come into Northcote, raw and try and find something, she would struggle, she really would. But you put a coordinator beside her and it just opens up all those doors and you're away.*

Some key informants thought that it was also important to engage with groups and organisations that may not be part of existing networks in order to get input from a wider range of perspectives. A few people mentioned that the North Shore Council of Social Services should have been more involved with the project. Others believed that the project has connected well with local community organisations and groups.

One key informant noted that there had been some negative comments about the NCYD from other organisations or groups on the North Shore who are not directly involved in the project.

*So the gossip that I'm hearing is more strongly against it than how I feel. I can see some really good things that have come out of it, but I guess they're not privy to that and they don't see those things. But it's that whole thing about community inclusion because I suppose a lot of energy is put on that governance group and getting government departments together. I don't think many of the community have actually been involved. I think bringing the government departments together to sit down and what are you doing in Northcote, sitting around table has been so good and so useful.*

There were reports from a few key informants that community organisations in other areas of the North Shore questioned why the Northcote community was receiving so much resource when there are other areas that also have high needs. One key informant reported that there has been a long history of competition for funding between the different wards on the North Shore, with key gatekeepers in each ward.

Some key informants thought that there had been a lack of engagement with the wider Northcote community and that perhaps this had been the weakest part of the project. The complexity of the project was seen as a barrier to community engagement by some. One key informant thought that they would have difficulty articulating what it is about in less than five minutes. They thought that this was an important factor that needed to be addressed in order for the project to be clearly communicated to members of the wider Northcote community

Many of the key informants thought that most Northcote residents would be unaware of the project, however it is believed that there will be more opportunity to engage with Northcote residents once the implementation of the project begins through each work strand.

*I almost imagine this to be a project actually to be quite exciting, like [...] you'd hear people talking about it in the community and unfortunately that's not what I've heard, I mean I haven't heard anything negative but I haven't heard anything you know it's just [...] it's a bit like the Northcote central project you know, it all just sort of underground stuff or... whatever it is they're doing it's not being communicated.*

The difficulties with engaging with schools were acknowledged by some key informants due to the demands on staff and parents. One person suggested that email updates could easily be circulated to school staff members and that meetings could be held shortly after the school day finishes, so staff don't have to return in the evening. Engaging with Boards of Trustees' members was seen as a potential strategy. One key informant thought that if the project was going to be transferred to another area it would be important to get key school contacts involved at the project governance level right at the beginning of the project. Another person thought the project offered a good opportunity to build closer relationships between the schools and the wider Northcote community.

Key informants believed that members of the wider Northcote community would judge the success of NCYD on the basis of whether it resulted in improved outcomes for children and young people in the area.

*I think this project [...] is it's a sustained effort and it's trying to change [...]the] way people are doing things, right through lots and lots of agencies and so it's a big sustained effort which will have a more profound change but also, what people in the community want to see, are those small changes.*

In retrospect, a few people thought that more opportunities for including parents and whanau in NCYD processes would have been useful. The 100% Pure Conjecture workshop for community members was mentioned as a useful way of engaging with the wider community, especially with local Chinese migrants. However, one person thought that there needs to be more follow up, for example by providing feedback on how contributions to the workshop have fed into the action plans. Another key informant thought that there needed to be a greater diversity of ethnicities at the 100% Pure Conjecture workshop.

The communications support for the project was seen as useful by a number of key informants. Some thought that there could have been more media items about the project and that there had been some missed opportunities. One person reported that there was less freedom to use the press for NCYD compared to other projects. Other suggestions for raising the awareness of the project included a letter box drop of a project flier to every household in the catchment area. One person noted that there had been favourable comments about the display of children's entries to the school competition at the local library.

Key informants suggested other ways of communicating and engaging with the wider Northcote community. Some people thought that there will be lots of opportunities to encourage wider participation once the action plans are implemented. For example one of the work strands includes a programme aimed at zero tolerance to family violence which would present opportunities for community members to get more involved through family fun days and other processes.

There was general agreement that the Community Reference Group (CRG) has not been particularly effective and that it would have been better to concentrate on existing networks. The CRG members interviewed in round two would have liked to have received more information about how the project was progressing. One person thought that the children involved in the school essay/poster competition also needed to hear how their input has contributed to the project.

*I think I would have liked, I don't feel as informed as I could have been. I mean the statistical profile has been brilliant and I've given it to people to use, not just to find out information about children's services but as a statistical profile I think it has been brilliant. We working in numbers all the time, so, I think I have felt in the last..., since this year,... I haven't heard where it's going and what progress they've made.*

Some people felt that the project partners could have been a bit smarter about who they recruited to be part of the CRG, for example people working in the early childhood sector could also have been invited.

#### 4.3.5 Sustainable development

In the first interviews round of key informant interviews it was apparent that interviewees had different understandings of sustainable development. This was still the case in the second round of interviews.

For one person sustainable development represented a long term vision where families and children are safe and healthy because any health or behaviour problems are addressed effectively at an early age. This key informant commented that this was not what was currently happening. For other people sustainable development meant ongoing initiatives that build the capacity of the community, rather than one-off projects that disappear because energy or money runs out. In a similar vein another key informant believed that in the context of NCYD sustainable development would mean the collaborative ways of working would become “business as usual” rather than the silo approach. This person also commented that sustainable development also meant taking a wider view and considering environmental and economic concerns alongside social and cultural issues.

Some key informants were critical of the three year term of the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme as they believed that sustainable development is an ongoing process that requires ongoing resources rather than short-term projects.

*I can not believe that ASCP is finishing in June. It's like, are we suddenly sustainable in Auckland? This is nonsense, it's absolute nonsense. So I can't believe it was set up as such a short term plan.*

One person believed that awareness of sustainable development had increased especially for NYPD members:

*Sustainable development. I think we made more of an awareness of it definitely we had, last year we had a speaker about it and that was good. She was really for the kids...she came in and she had gone overseas to look at sustainable development, in rain forests, so she talked about it We made more of an awareness around it and in terms of when we were talking with community groups about, what about our children's children? Thinking about for example when someone leaves, what's sustainable? So we're making an awareness of it. I don't know, if we have done such a good job of incorporating it into a lot more of what we were doing.*

NYPD members described sustainable development as:

*It's providing for the future, like for example, in the forestry industry they have trees, then they cut them down and plant more, so they don't use all the resources now, so you keep on a cycle so you can continue to provide.*

*Putting something into the community and having more awareness of what's going on and more youth thinking about the future rather than thinking about now.*

#### 4.4 Discussion

Considerable progress has been made towards building collaborative relationships between central and local agencies in Northcote and developing the NCYD action plan. Key informants identified a number of factors that have supported collaboration:

- working where the energy is
- the strategic brokerage role to ensure project momentum
- value of expertise to inform action plans (for example, a family violence expert's input into the safety work strand)
- the use of a calendar with gave a clear timeline of meetings and deadlines
- combined action planning sessions to identify connections across work strands
- well-structured planning process with clear tasks to be completed in each session
- taking the time to consider and reflect upon the issues children and young people had identified
- the action planning template
- joint planning process

The project is at an important transitional stage with the project manager's recent departure and new governance arrangements being established. The effective delivery of each work strand will require commitment and resources from the agencies involved. Members of the steering groups will need to advocate both within their own agencies and networks for the importance of continuing the collaborative relationships that have been established to date. New relationships will also need to be established between each work strand and new organisations (such as early childhood agencies) that need to be brought on board to further develop "whole child" approaches. There is still considerable work to be done to bed-in collaborative ways of working. It is also clear that young people's articulation of their views, priorities and perspectives was a powerful way of engaging agencies in the action planning process.

Further work needs to be done on communicating the action plan to members of the wider Northcote community. If, or when, this model is used in other areas it is advisable that the project partners develop a community engagement plan with a clear articulation of what "community" means in that particular context.<sup>6</sup> The plan should be reviewed on a regular basis. For example, if community is defined as a "community of interest" (as agencies or groups that have an interest in or work with children and young people) the project partners have done very well in engaging these groups although there are some gaps (the early childhood sector for example). If "community" is defined as the residents of Northcote then further development is needed, although connections have been made with the parents of young people who have been involved with the project through NYPD and the poster competition. If "community" is defined as the children and young people of Northcote then some

---

<sup>6</sup> A useful resource for considering this issue is **Kretzmann, J.P., McKnight, J.L., Dobrowski, S. and Puntenney, D.** (2005), 'Discovering Community Power: A Guide to Mobilizing Local Assets and Your Organisation's Capacity', Evanston, Asset-Based Community Development Institute. [www.northwestern.edu/ipr/abcd.html](http://www.northwestern.edu/ipr/abcd.html)

important first steps have been taken which can be built upon as the action planning and implementation proceeds (see Section Five).

In the literature review the following “best practice” principles for collaboration were identified (Jensen et al., 2005).

- a clearly articulated purpose, based on shared values and interests and alignment of purpose of the initiative between partners
- a supportive policy environment in both local and central government
- engagement of key players and potential partners at the very beginning of the process is a cornerstone of the success of any intersectoral initiative
- investment in the relationship building process
- focus on achieving concrete objectives and specific, visible results
- shared leadership and accountability; team building and supports
- development of frameworks and procedures which facilitate and promote collaboration (Ball, 1999; Ciborra, 2002; Evans et al., 2003; Graham, 2005; Hackman, 1990; Haynes et al., 1999; Kimberlee, 2001; Milbourne et al., 2003; Ross & Wright, 2001; Weick, 1995; Wilkens, 2002).

A key finding from this evaluation has been the value of the strategic brokerage role undertaken by Louise Mason and Wendy Reid on behalf of MSD. This investment in building relationships both with and between local and central government agencies and the development of frameworks and procedures that facilitate collaboration has been central to the levels of buy-in by participants in the NCYD project. This finding is consistent with other research that has identified the importance of strategic brokerage and co-ordination positions to support collaborative ways of working (Craig & Courtney, 2004; Greenaway et al., 2005).

The project has had a clearly articulated purpose and objectives. Considerable effort was made to engage key players and partners at the beginning of the project. This work continued as priority areas were identified and different stakeholders needed to be involved. Although stakeholders closely involved with the project have been able to identify the benefits and results from the project, visible outcomes may be less obvious to wider community members. In part this is because of the time it has taken to develop the action plans and the current stage of project development.

#### **4.5 Action points**

- Utilise partnership assessment tools to review effectiveness of both governance and implementation of the work strands.
- Establishing the terms of reference for the combined steering group to ensure the kaupapa of the project is maintained and continued.
- Explore opportunities for education and training about factors that support collaborative ways of working including organisational development
- Collaborative ways of working need to be included into everyone’s work programmes and performance objectives
- Consider the use of an online group to support collaborative ways of working
- Communicate and encourage involvement in the action plan to members of the wider Northcote community

- Continue to explore opportunities for encouraging discussion and debate about sustainable development issues (see for example Sustainable Aotearoa New Zealand [www.phase2.org](http://www.phase2.org)).

## **5. Objective Four: Increase participation in community decision making by children and young people**

### **5.1 Key outcomes**

At the start of the evaluation key outcomes identified for this objective included:

- Young people take ownership of plans and activities and are more involved in community life at all levels
- Agencies ensure their policies and processes are designed to promote youth participation and voice in decision-making
- Young people have better knowledge of community/agency processes and are developing/ transferring appropriate skills
- Key stakeholders and community have better understanding of young people's needs and aspirations
- Young people's voice identified and young people engaged in the process

Success criteria and standards included:

- Representative range of young people involved in leading activities and in decision-making positions.
- Inclusive youth-friendly policies and practices are evident across agencies and reflected in their processes
- More young people involved in initiating own activities and in decision-making positions
- Stronger networks and relationships across the community spearheaded by the NYPD
- Priorities and Action Plan reflect input from young people
- An active NYPD group representing/with good links to a diverse range of young people
- Large numbers of Northcote youth aware of/engaged with project activities

### **5.2 Processes**

A number of different processes have been used to engage children and young people in NCYD. The main methods used were:

- The appointment of a local and experienced youth worker with extensive networks as a Child and Youth Facilitator
- The formation of NYPD
- One-on-one follow-up with NYPD members by the Child and Youth Facilitator
- One-to-one communication with 'hard-to-reach' young people in Northcote
- Video research by NYPD and the Child and Youth Facilitator where young people were interviewed on camera
- PhotoVoice research by NYPD
- 100% Pure Conjecture workshops at three local schools and at the Bruce Mason Centre
- Poster/essay competition for local school students
- Display of competition entries at the local library with a computer so people could provide feedback on the information presented

- Appointment of a youth worker to work with at-risk young people and deliver after-school activities
- Building of relationships with schools by the child and youth facilitator

Overall, there have been about ten committed NYPD members and the child and youth facilitator is still in contact with these young people. The original purpose of the group had been to undertake research on the views of children and young people in Northcote as well as undertake leadership development. Some of the NYPD members have moved out of the Northcote area and it was a big commitment for the young people involved. This means that the child and youth facilitator has worked with individual members rather than convening the group on a regular basis. Some NYPD members have gone on to take up other leadership opportunities such as working on an after-school programme in Northcote and within their own ethnic community.

During 2006 the child and youth facilitator has maintained contact with NYPD members and supported the delivery of the after-school programme for at-risk young people in Northcote. He has also continued to build relationships with local schools in order to: improve community and school linkages especially in relation to students at risk of stand down or exclusion; encourage the use of the after-school programme, and; identify leadership opportunities for young people. The NCYD project manager has also worked with the Child and Youth Facilitator to develop a three-year plan for the child and youth facilitation role in the Birkenhead and Northcote ward.

The formative evaluation team has undertaken a review of the information gathered by and from young people. Over the course of NCYD 14 young people were interviewed on video by either the child and youth facilitator or members of NYPD. These young people included members of PHAB (Physically Handicapped, Able-Bodied); young people attending alternative education; Chinese young men playing basketball; and young people at the Northcote Shopping Centre. There were 20 entries to the school poster competition and about 45 young people were involved in one of three 100% Pure Conjecture workshops at local schools. Members of NYPD were also involved in the larger 100% Pure Conjecture workshop at the Bruce Mason Centre. In total, over 80 young people have contributed to the development of NCYD in some form.

### **5.3 Feedback from NYPD members**

*[it] motivates you to like tell other people what's going on [Northcote young person].*

Members of the NYPD found their involvement in the NCYD to be a very positive experience, with one of the members describing their time in the group as “really fun”. When asked how they got involved in the NYPD a few mentioned that they were referred by friends; some through their parents; and some through other community groups they or their friends/relatives were involved in (i.e. church or other community-based committees/groups). The young people also mentioned that the Child and Youth Facilitator– who has a long work history with youth services in Northcote and has developed extensive community networks during this time - was a central reason for them participating in the NYPD.

Initially, the NYPD met once a week, particularly during the early formative stages of the group where there was a focus on establishing the NYPD as a viable working group, and recruiting members. The PhotoVoice research, done during the early formative stages of the NYPD, also required that the NYPD meet more regularly in order for the research to be completed in time for a planned all-of-government and community meeting at which the NYPD eventually presented. Many of NYPD members commented that meeting so frequently impacted on other activities they were involved in (including school and other extra-curricular activities), preferring the monthly meetings that were implemented later on the project (and after all the initial set up and research work was done).

The members also valued and appreciated the skills they learned while participating in the NYPD. Many mentioned that their self-esteem and confidence improved while participating in the group. Others felt that they gained important leadership and public speaking skills. Some NYPD members also mentioned that they enjoyed the activities they were able to participate in. This included presenting at local schools such as Hato Petera and St Mary's Primary School; organising and judging a school poster/essay competition; the 100% Pure Conjecture workshops and helping out with an after-school programme. They also felt that by participating in these activities, they were able to forge important community links.

When asked if there were other activities they would like to have seen included as part of their time in the NYPD, one member wanted to be interviewed by John Campbell about issues affecting young people in Northcote. A couple of other members also wanted to do radio and TV advertisements that promoted the NYPD and encouraged young people to get more involved in their communities.

When asked how the NYPD could have been improved to attract more young people, a few mentioned that other people their age saw the group as being for "goody goods" and that it sounded "boring". Some members felt that this negative perception of the group caused people to miss out, although they also felt that "people who are not committed" or people who didn't have the "right attitude" weren't the right people to be involved in a group like the NYPD. As one young person mentioned:

*... if you want to make something happen... something good for your place, area then you should like do some group like NYPD... like making good things happen [Northcote young person].*

NYPD members saw that the approach used to engage young people in Northcote could be transferred to other areas.

*I feel like New Zealand should learn to speak the truth... to get input from the young people... they should like spread it [the project]... [to other] councils from different areas [and get them] to listen to the[ir] young people – what's good, what's bad about their area [Northcote young person].*

NYPD members reported the following positive impacts from the NCYD project:

*... there are some changes just in the local basketball court... they've repainted all the lines of the court...*

*Interviewer: ... [have] you seen... changes in the places that you live...*

*Northcote young person: yeah... like before it was fixed... I was like scared to go down there at night... I was like if something happens right now I'm gonna die... but it was a good feeling just walking through and nothing happened.*

*Yep, and now Northcote is better than Glenfield... with Glenfield it was the other way round, but now Northcote's better.*

## **5.4 Feedback from key informants**

### **5.4.1 Strengths and benefits of child and youth participation**

A number of key informants reported that NCYD has led to increased participation of children and young people in community decision-making often giving PhotoVoice and/or NYPD as an example of this. Some thought that the use of PhotoVoice was a good model for gathering information to change the local community.

*... what I saw in the workshop when the youth were there... they were presenting what the issues were and... using PhotoVoice... having them there and saying directly to all these public servants and councillors, telling them directly what they wanted done in the area... I think that... goes a long way.*

Indeed, many of the key informants commented on the impact of the presentation by young people in the second interview round. Key informants commented favourably on the diversity of the young people involved and the value of being involved in a project where young people were asked for their opinions. People were impressed by the quality of the feedback given by NYPD members.

*[T]he thing that's coming out is that I think the young people have been really very responsive and responsible in their feedback and the feedback I've seen it's very encouraging and I think it's a good model, the information that has been gathered about how they feel the community itself can be shaped and modified to better suit the needs of those there, themselves included.*

Some people thought that because the action plan priorities were developed in response to the views of young people, it has opened the door for other adults to get involved with the project. This is because the emphasis is to address young people's concerns rather than having a project imposed by a government agency. One person also commented that the people involved in the project have a genuine desire to do the right thing by young people, which fostered buy-in and support for NCYD.

Most respondents commented on the pivotal role that Peter Wolf, the Child and Youth Facilitator played in engaging children and young people in the Northcote community, particularly amongst those young people who came to make up the Northcote Youth Project Development (NYPD) group. His local knowledge and years of work with youth services and young people in the Northcote community and the extensive networks he had developed during that time were also seen as a major strength.

The ability of the Child and Youth Facilitator to communicate with young people, and especially with young people who are “hard-to-reach” was valued by key informants. This was seen as a change from previous youth participation in the area which tended to involve more traditionally “successful” young people, such as representatives on the Youth Council.

Some key informants thought that the child and youth facilitation role is important for the Northcote community as a whole and not just the NCYD project. Indeed, one person considered that the main successful outcome of NCYD was the creation of the child and youth facilitation position. The establishment of an after-school programme with at-risk Northcote young people was seen as a positive outcome, as restorative rather than punitive approaches were being used.

There were reports that the Birkenhead/Northcote community board will support a second school poster competition, which will provide further opportunity for children and young people to get involved in the project. Some key informants noted that the community board has been very supportive of the project and young people’s ongoing participation in democratic processes. The need to maintain strong links between young people and decision-makers was also emphasised.

The leadership development opportunities for NYPD members were valued by key informants and NYPD members have been invited to speak in other forums. For example, one NYPD member spoke at the North Shore Settlement Strategy launch at North Shore Council. One key informant described the impact of this speech.

*I think without this project I might not have been able to actually access that point of view as effectively, which was delivered in Council in front of the Mayor and the councillors which was very powerful in terms of giving young people a voice, it was a very useful exercise. And quite empowering for him and I think really well for the politicians to actually hear real stuff...so it was another good opportunity to put young people in front of politicians to really make them conscious of the different perspectives and things.*

#### **5.4.2 Challenges and improvements to youth participation processes**

Some key informants were unsure whether NCYD had led to increased participation in community decision-making by children and young people but some thought that some important first steps had been taken.

Networking with schools and activities, such as the school essay competition was also mentioned as ways that the project tried to engage young people, although one respondent felt that a better follow-up process was needed so that school staff and those young people who participated in the competition know about the project status and how the information from the essay competition was going to be used by the project’s key stakeholders.

There was some frustration from a few key informants as they believed that NCYD and other projects in Northcote had not yet resulted in positive changes for young people and children in Northcote.

*The kids do this and they enjoy doing that, they participate [in the school poster/essay competition] and yet sort of nothing has come out of it in those 6 months. Ok they've got the prizes, but there has been nothing comes out to say yes, this is for the kids of Northcote going to happen...or things like that.*

***Interviewer: That's what you'd like to see happen?***

*Something concrete coming out of it. To me for the kids in Northcote there have been no changes and nothing different. For Safer Northcote, the youth programme and Northcote re-development, to me there are not a lot of changes that you can actually see or know that's happening.*

This person noted that is still a lack of facilities and things for young people to do in Northcote.

A few key informants questioned whether the information gathered by and from young people was representative of all the young people living in Northcote as they thought only small numbers of young people had been involved in research activities. A number of people also mentioned that younger children (i.e. primary age and younger) weren't being engaged and that younger children needed to be included. It was suggested that other creative ways of involving younger children need to be explored. One respondent also commented that there was a focus on young people from Northcote Central. Analysis of information about the young people who did contribute to the project indicates that a diverse range of young people participated including young people from the affluent areas of Northcote, as well as young people living in Northcote Central. One person did note that the young people themselves focused on Northcote Central as the part of Northcote where improvements were needed.

One person thought that NYPD should not be viewed as the default way of engaging young people and that there is a need to work with existing groups. This view was supported by others who thought that there needed to be ongoing mechanisms for engaging young people in decision-making processes, rather than a specific group. The short-term funding of Peter's role was questioned by some key informants as they thought that project is just getting started.

Key informants identified the need for organisational change so that participating in decision-making processes by young people is encouraged. For example one person noted that at local government meetings there are often trivial arguments, which does not make them attractive to young people. One suggestion was that community board members could each mentor a young person to increase young people's knowledge and involvement in democratic processes. Another person discussed the Provoke project run by the Ministry of Youth Development (MYD), which encourages and provides tools to support youth advocacy which could also be a useful resource for children and young people in Northcote. It was noted that MYD are developing a youth participation in local government strategy. Key informants hoped that the NCYD would give impetus to the development of a Youth Strategy by the North Shore City Council.

According to one key informant, NCYD has created opportunities for some young people to progress into leadership and to understand how local government works. It has also provided the opportunity for agencies to come together and improved the way community and local government work together.

For one key informant another positive aspect of the PhotoVoice research along with the wider NCYD project is that the strengths of the Northcote community were also show-cased.

*You look at the positives as well as the negatives. I think that if you don't consciously do that, you tend to focus on the negatives all the time. Until you do a stock take and you say, hang on a minute, we've got this and we've got that and we've got all these facilities there, we're actually quite a well resourced community. So what are we going to do with it? That sort of thing, understanding and an opportunity to build a bit of pride and ownership in the community when you actually add up what's there as opposed to not really thinking about it and just repeating existing prejudices almost.*

One key informant reported that there had been an increase in vandalism and graffiti at the local primary school, since the increased police presence in the Northcote Central area. They believed that this was because young people were now hanging out and drinking in the school grounds to avoid detection by the police. This person thought that schools should not be disadvantaged by attempts to reduce problems in other areas of Northcote.

Other key informants reported that there has been a dramatic decrease in crime since the increased activity of police in the Northcote Central area.

One person thought that children and young people would find it difficult to distinguish the NCYD from other projects or services that are currently operating in the Northcote area.

## **5.5 Discussion**

In general, the expression of young people's views was valued highly by key informants and members of NYPD were positive about their experiences and the skills they had developed. The PhotoVoice research was particularly well received.

As noted in the last evaluation report, a key issue for the project is creating sustainable pathways for youth participation in community decision making. Findings from the literature review highlighted a number of factors that support youth participation and positive youth development. Key supports for youth participation included: the availability of multiple and varied opportunity structures and supports for young people; participation in decision-making as way of strengthening young people and their communities; and involvement of young people in all aspects of decision-making from programme and fund development to personnel and governance.

Successful strategies and initiatives for encouraging child and youth participation include: clear objectives and boundaries; active steps to include children and youth not traditionally involved; broadcasting benefits widely and responding quickly to children and young people's requests; and informing them of outcomes and consequences. The aim of youth leadership development is to equip children and

young people with a set of practices that enable them to lead others over the long term (Jensen et al., 2005).

Each of the work strands will need assistance to make sure that children and young people continue to have the opportunity to participate in community decision-making processes. The child and youth facilitator role will be an important support for this process. It is important that a strategic approach is taken with a focus on strengths-based approaches and environmental change. The three-year work plan developed by the project manager and the child and youth facilitator provides a solid foundation for the future development of this role in the Northcote community.

The need to embed processes for child and youth participation into the way organisations operate was identified by key informants as an important goal. There needs to be clear pathways so that young people know that they can have a say and that they will be heard. In other words, organisations need to change in order to respond to young people

Some important first steps have been taken to increase participation in community decision making by children and young people in Northcote. There is a need to explore additional ways of engaging young people and children as the project develops. There is also a need to ensure that the data and information gathered is collated in a systematic manner so that the number and diversity of young people's involvement is documented.

## **5.6 Action points**

- Need to ensure that opportunities for young people's participation incorporated into each of the action plan areas
- Use Hart's Ladder of Participation to assess the extent to which young people have been involved in project activities
- Provide feedback to young people and children about how their input has influenced the action plans
- Explore ways of connecting to younger children and their parents/caregivers
- Explore other creative methods for involving young people in the ongoing development and implementation of each work strand

## 6. References

- Ball, S.** (1999), 'Policy Sociology and Critical Social Research: A Personal Review of Recent Education Policy and Policy Research', *British Educational Research Journal*, 23, 3, 257-.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V.** (2006), 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Ciborra, C.** (2002), *Information Labyrinths: limits to the wisdom of systems*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Craig, D. and Courtney, M.** (2004), 'The Potential of Partnership: Key learnings and ways forward', Waitakere, Local Partnerships and Governance Research Group.
- Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet** (2003), 'Sustainable Development for New Zealand: Programme of Action', Wellington.
- Evans, B., Percy, S. and Theobald, K.** (2003), 'Mainstreaming Sustainability Into Local Government Policymaking', Project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council.
- Graham, F.** (2005), 'Making the Connection Between Human Health and Sustainable Cities - Myth or Reality?' *Public Health Association of New Zealand*, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Greenaway, A. and Witten, K.** (2005), 'Meta-analysing community action projects in Aotearoa New Zealand', *Community Development Journal Advance Access*, March, 1-17.
- Greenaway, S., Conway, K., Casswell, S., Huckle, T. and Sweetsur, P.** (2005), 'Auckland Regional Community Action Project on Alcohol: Final Evaluation Report', Auckland, Centre for Social and Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation and Te Ropu Whariki.
- Hackman, J.** (1990), 'Groups That Work (and those that don't): Creating Conditions for Effective Teamwork', San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Haynes, J., Atkinson, M. and Kinder, K.** (1999), *Starting Join: A Baseline Study of Multi-Agency Activity*, Slough, NFER.
- Jensen, V., Kaiwai, H., Greenaway, S. and Conway, K.** (2005), 'A Literature Review: Effective Youth Development Practice, Sustainable & Collaborative Approaches & Participatory Action Research Methods.' Auckland, Auckland Sustainable Cities Program.
- Kimberlee, R.** (2001), 'Chasing the money: the common and local problems facing partnerships involved in short term funded projects for young people in areas of urban deprivation', *International Conference of Multi-Organisational Partnerships and Co-operative Strategy*, Bristol.
- Kretzmann, J.P., McKnight, J.L., Dobrowski, S. and Puntteney, D.** (2005), 'Discovering Community Power: A Guide to Mobilizing Local Assets and Your Organisation's Capacity', Evanston, Asset-Based Community Development Institute.
- Milbourne, L., Macrae, S. and Maquire, M.** (2003), 'Collaborative solutions or new policy problems: exploring multi-agency partnerships in education and health work', *Journal of Educational Policy*, 18, 1, 19-.
- Ministry of Social Development** (2002), 'Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy', Wellington.

- Ministry of Youth Affairs** (2002), 'Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa', Wellington, Ministry of Youth Affairs.
- Northcote Child and Youth Development Project** (2005), 'Statistical Profile of Northcote: With a Focus on Children and Young People', Auckland, Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme.
- Patton, M.Q.** (1987), *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*, Newbury Park, London, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
- Reid, W. and Woodley, A.** (2005), 'Methodology Report: Northcote Child and Youth Development Project-Statistical Profile of Northcote With a Focus on Children and Young People', Auckland, Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme.
- Ross, J. and Wright, L.** (2001), 'Participant-Created Case Studies in Multiagency Training', *Administration in Social Work*, 25, 1, 75-.
- Ryan, K. and Sutton, A.** (2006), 'An evaluation of the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme', Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme Combined Steering Group.
- Weick, K.** (1995), *Sensemaking in Organisations*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Wilkins, P.** (2002), 'Accountability of joined-up government', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 61, 1, 114-.
- Woodley, A.** (2006), 'A Guide to Writing a Community Profile', Auckland, Auckland Sustainable Cities Project.

## Appendix One: Formative evaluation support

Date	Activity	Summary
14 <sup>th</sup> February	Hector and Sarah attended the Combined Workshop at Northcote	Wendy presented summary of third evaluation report. Updates on action planning provided for each project work strand. Discussion of different project governance models
24 <sup>th</sup> February	Sarah met with Wendy	Wendy updated Sarah on recent meetings and project planning. Discussed need for process evaluation
24 <sup>th</sup> February	Sarah attended the Project Governance meeting at Northcote	Discussion of communication strategy, clarification of evaluation purpose, learnings from the FACs database development, action planning and governance, community engagement and NYPD
28 <sup>th</sup> February	Sarah met with Wendy and Alex	Discussed development of indicators for the Action Planning template
2 <sup>nd</sup> March	Hector and Sarah met with Peter at Northcote	Discussed how the evaluation team can assist Peter over the next few months. Also talked about the purpose of the NYPD group and some of the impacts of the project to date from Peter's perspective
3 <sup>rd</sup> March	Sarah met with Wendy and Alex	Further discussion of indicators for action planning and evaluation
14 <sup>th</sup> March	Meeting planning with Wendy Reid and Alex Woodley development of indicators for monitoring and evaluation section of the action planning template	Meeting postponed until further work completed on project matrix
21 <sup>st</sup> March	Sarah met with Rachael Trotman (evaluator for the Sustainable Communities workstrand).	Discussed evaluation findings to date and identified common themes. Shared evaluation reports and discussed possibility of meeting prior to next learning forum to further investigate commonalities across evaluations.
23 <sup>rd</sup> March	Hector met with Peter at Northcote	Discussed after school programme, future and goals for NYPD and ways Hector can assist Peter to implement systems for recording project progress and storing information.
24 <sup>th</sup> March	Sarah attended Project Governance Group meeting at Northcote	Discussion focused on after school programme and future of NYPD. Alex raised challenges with ability of community organisations to access local level data and the capacity of government departments to respond to requests for data. The group was updated on action planning, community engagement, and community renewal progress
30 <sup>th</sup> March	Sarah met with Wendy and Alex at SHORE	Discussed progress with data access issues, transition management regarding the future of the Northcote project, process for further development of indicators/measures for action planning.
7 <sup>th</sup> April	Hector attended hui regarding the cultural respect action plan	Hui focused on cultural respect action plan and ways in which key stakeholders would like this to be progressed

11 <sup>th</sup> April	Sarah attended and presented information at All of Government meeting in Northcote	Sarah and Alex Woodley presented information about the monitoring and evaluation component of the action-planning template.
26 <sup>th</sup> April	Sarah attended and participated in action planning workshop	Action planning focused on Opportunities, Environment and Safety work strands and further progress was made on identifying who, what and when things needed to happen
28 <sup>th</sup> April	Sarah attended Project Governance meeting at Northcote	Updates on different aspects of the project were given and a number of key learnings identified
4 <sup>th</sup> May	Hector met with Peter at Northcote	Discussed useful ways of organising project information and documentation
5 <sup>th</sup> May	Sarah met with Wendy and Alex	Sarah provided brief verbal feedback on interviews that have been undertaken to date. Discussed current status of the project, recent developments and way forward with action planning process
11 <sup>th</sup> May	Hector met with Peter at Northcote	Discussed Community Project Indicator Framework templates
12 <sup>th</sup> May	Sarah met with Wendy and Alex at MSD	Discussed action plan models and possibility of using the outcomes hierarchy for the action plan
12 <sup>th</sup> May	Hector attended Cultural Respect work strand planning meeting	Discussed re-establishment of a Maori Advisory group at NSCC and action plan.
8 <sup>th</sup> June	Sarah met with Wendy and Alex	Discussed the format for the All of Government workshop and respective contributions
9 <sup>th</sup> June	Hector met with Peter at Northcote	Discussed possibility of an intervention programme for children and young people who have been suspended or expelled for alcohol or drug use at school.
13 <sup>th</sup> June	Sarah and Hector attended AOG meeting	Sarah presented an action planning example with a specific focus on the Safety Workstrand
30 <sup>th</sup> June	Sarah attended project governance meeting	Discussion of transition arrangements as ASCP draws to a close and update of project activities
6 <sup>th</sup> July	Sarah met with Wendy and Orchid at ARC	Prepared for Regional Child and Youth forum presentations
7 <sup>th</sup> July	Sarah attended Cultural Respect workshop at Northcote	Presentation of findings of service provider scan of current resources and training about cultural diversity by Imogen Neale (OEA) and presentations by Youthline and NZ Police.
11 <sup>th</sup> July	Sarah and Hector met with Wendy, Orchid, Rachael Trotman and Viv Sherwood at DIA office, Te Atatu	Prepared for Regional Child and Youth forum and identification of key learnings regarding child and youth engagement, community engagement and all-of –government processes across the Sustainable Communities and Regional Child and Youth Development work strands of ASCP
13 <sup>th</sup> July	Sarah met with Wendy and Viv at DIA office	Further preparation for child and youth forum
14 <sup>th</sup> July	Hector and Sarah attended Learning Forum in Ponsonby	Hector and Orchid outlined approaches to child and youth engagement and identified factors that support this process. Sarah and Hector presented the evaluators perspective on the NCYD project.
28 <sup>th</sup> July	Sarah attended project governance meeting in Northcote	Discussion of new governance arrangements for NCYD and Wendy's contribution acknowledged
1 <sup>st</sup> August	Sarah attended Opportunity and Safety work strand meetings	Checklist for collaboration completed and participants volunteered for work strand roles

2 <sup>nd</sup> August	Sarah attended Wellness/Heath work strand meeting	Checklist for collaboration completed and participants volunteered for work strand roles
3 <sup>rd</sup> August	Sarah attended Environment work strand meeting	Checklist for collaboration completed and participants volunteered for work strand roles
4 <sup>th</sup> August	Hector and Sarah attended Cultural Respect work strand meeting	Discussion of NSCC's work on history of relationships between Council and tangata whenua and processes for moving the cultural respect work strand forward

## Appendix Two: Evidence rubric

### Use of evidence-based approaches to child and youth service development

Excellent	Clear evidence that all activities implemented by each of the work streams are based on (1) community priorities and (2) sound empirical evidence from previous studies (from similar communities both in New Zealand and overseas) and/or (where little research evidence exists) a sound rationale based on related work about what works for whom and under what circumstances in child and youth services.
Very Good	Clear evidence that the vast majority of activities implemented by each of the work streams are based on (1) community priorities and (2) a reasonable volume and quality of empirical evidence from previous studies (from similar communities both in New Zealand and overseas) and/or (where little research evidence exists) a sound rationale based on related work about what works for whom and under what circumstances in child and youth services.
Good	Clear evidence that most activities implemented by each of the work streams are based on (1) community priorities and (2) at least some empirical evidence from previous studies (from similar communities both in New Zealand and overseas) and/or a reasonable rationale based on related work about what works in child and youth services.
Just Adequate	Evidence that activities are based on community priorities and have a sound rationale showing why the activities are likely to be effective and will not cause harm.
Inadequate	Little evidence of a link between activities and community priorities; weak or no rationale showing why the activities are likely to be effective and will not cause harm.

#### Sources of data:

- Interviews with key staff participating in the work streams
- Critical appraisal from independent expert

#### Instructions:

For each interviewee, use one of the following methods:

- Give the person a copy of this rubric and ask them to provide a rating and give a brief justification explaining their reasoning
- Interview the person yourself to gather evidence that you will later use to combine with other information to make a rating yourself.

#### Rating given (circle one):

Excellent      Very Good      Good      Just Adequate      Inadequate

#### Justification for rating:

Briefly (in one or two sentences) explain what specific evidence leads you to make the rating above. Note the source of the evidence (for later cross-checking or use, if necessary).

---



---



---



---



---

## Appendix Three: Project products

Work Strand	Project Products
Cultural Respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A model of tangata whenua leadership in a multi-cultural setting</li> <li>• A resource kete developed by young people containing their stories, history and culture to be used by agencies and to share with young people in other communities</li> <li>• Training in cultural diversity-resource kete for frontline staff and community workers</li> </ul>
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good practice guidelines</li> <li>• How to encourage young people to have pride in their neighbourhood environment</li> <li>• How to give young people a voice in the urban design and planning process</li> <li>• How to raise awareness among young people about the relationship between living environments and health and well being</li> </ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of “zero tolerance” to violence for the Northcote community</li> <li>• Best practice models and methods for:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Growing community commitment towards zero tolerance of violence across all age groups</li> <li>○ Raising social awareness of the importance of fathers</li> <li>○ Building empathy in the community</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model of community accountability (involving young people) for implementation and monitoring of the six principles of the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa in practice</li> </ul>
Wellness and Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A model of how to engage parents and caregivers in the health care of their children</li> <li>• A model of how to reach hard to reach 0-10 year old populations in an urban setting</li> <li>• A model of how to build trust, build levels of engagement and wrap services around a target resident population</li> <li>• A model of how to become more effective by capitalising on opportunities to enhance working relationships between agencies and sectors</li> </ul>

## Appendix Four: Work strand outcomes and objectives

Work Strand	Outcome	Objectives
Cultural Respect	All children and young people expect to feel secure in their own cultural identity and demonstrate respect for other cultures	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change community attitudes through positive, direct, youth engagement</li> <li>2. Engage with diverse young people throughout Northcote in a positive and participatory way to encourage and promote confidence in cultural identity</li> <li>3. Foster an environment where residents learn to celebrate and accept Northcote Community's diversity, and value and respect each others culture</li> <li>4. Research strategies best suited to Northcote community/ies</li> <li>5. Realise Maori and ethnic minority potential via investment initiatives between Awataha Marae and Northcote refugee and migrant populations (e.g tourism, business opportunities for youth population, etc)</li> <li>6. Develop joint work programme with DoL funded NSCC Access to Information project at ward level</li> </ol>
Environment	Northcote young people's perspective influences the planning, protection and enhancement of their living environment and they are all proud to live here	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To actively engage young people in projects that enhance their homes, streets and neighbourhood</li> <li>2. To actively engage young people in projects to change behaviour and attitudes to rubbish and waste management</li> <li>3. To actively involve young people in local urban design and environment decision-making processes</li> </ol>
Safety	All children and young people are able to grow up safe and secure, contributing to a society free from victimisation, physical and mental abuse, violence and avoidable injury in Northcote	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To actively raise awareness to the nature of violence and the consequences of it for our children</li> <li>2. To actively raise awareness about the string relationship between alcohol and violence (including the availability of alcohol and drugs)</li> <li>3. Elicit community commitment to zero tolerance of violence throughout Northcote</li> <li>4. Build empathy in the community through schools, homes, health and social services</li> </ol>
Opportunity	Greatest number of Northcote 11-24 year olds have ready access to opportunities which operate within a consistent quality youth development framework	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase collective (providers, young people, families) understanding of the positive youth development approach and six key principles outlined in the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa</li> <li>2. Develop and share effective practice models relevant to areas of service (e.g. multi-agency approach to suspensions and stand downs, quality alternatives)</li> <li>3. Ensure Northcote young people have positive youth development opportunities beyond or in addition to school (e.g. financial support to play sport outside of school hours)</li> </ol>

Work Strand	Outcome	Objectives
		4. Increase level of parental involvement particularly in supporting sports and recreation teams ad events
Wellness and Health	The health and well being of Northcote children aged 0-10 years is improved and maintained	1. Implement a transparent systems of active and appropriate referrals so that children and young people get the help and assistance they require 2. Provide learning opportunities for parents and caregivers and build supportive relationships between homes, communities and schools 3. Develop best practice model of inter agency collaboration by sharing information , joint planning, and joint initiatives that identify and address key health issues for Northcote children aged 0-10 years 4. To lay the foundations to enable children to take greater responsibility for their personal health and well –being as they transition into adolescence

## Appendix Five: Summary of key issues identified by children and young people in Northcote

Description	Good	Not so good	To improve
Northcote young female	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is big</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smoking drugs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drugs</li> <li>No smoking</li> <li>No drink driving</li> </ul>
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hanging out</li> <li>Going to shops</li> <li>Mall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing to do for young people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 Pin Bowling</li> <li>Movies</li> <li>Performance place</li> <li>Performing arts school</li> </ul>
PHAB young woman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good education</li> <li>School</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More activities</li> </ul>	
PHAB young woman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Place to gather and chat</li> <li>Shopping centre</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area for teens to hang out (no adults)</li> <li>Internet café</li> <li>Swimming pool – people should pay</li> <li>Place in shopping centre for young “cool” people to hang out</li> <li>Skate park</li> <li>Café</li> <li>Sounds shop</li> <li>Wheelchair access need to be improved</li> </ul>

<b>Description</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Not so good</b>	<b>To improve</b>
Xseed young female	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People know each other well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tinny houses</li> <li>• Too much traffic, not good for little kids</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses – paint jobs</li> <li>• Bigger fences – dogs fighting – clothes getting stolen</li> </ul>
Xseed young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong bond</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helicopters fly over houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubbish</li> <li>• Tinny houses</li> <li>• Dogs</li> <li>• Basketball court</li> <li>• Things actually happen!!</li> </ul>
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friends</li> <li>• Primary School</li> <li>• Safe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tinny houses</li> <li>• Drug dealers</li> <li>• Houses in poor condition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gangs make things unsafe for younger children</li> <li>• Graffiti – places for young people to practise graffiti art</li> <li>• Houses to be painted and fixed</li> </ul>
Asian males	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Shoal Bay</li> <li>• Seaside</li> <li>• People</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul>
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Shoal Bay</li> <li>• Basketball courts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make beach “swimable”</li> </ul>	
Northcote parent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community feel</li> <li>• Places for young people</li> <li>• Sports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More places for kids</li> </ul>	

<b>Description</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Not so good</b>	<b>To improve</b>
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likes same things that his mum likes</li> <li>• Soccer club</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No skate park</li> </ul>	
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People, different kinds/cultures</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internet cafe</li> </ul>
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family feel</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change TAB to spacies parlour</li> <li>• More opportunities for young people to come together</li> </ul>
NYPD young female		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul>	
NYPD young female	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tennis club</li> <li>• Lots of people in Northcote play</li> <li>• Family feel at tennis club</li> </ul>		
NYPD young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green space by Northcote Tennis Club</li> </ul>		
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to shops</li> <li>• Close to friends</li> <li>• Friendly neighbourhood</li> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Like people and places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trolleys all over the place</li> <li>• Not much things to do</li> <li>• A lot of kids doing drug dealing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area around the shops for teenagers</li> <li>• Pay to stay</li> <li>• Safe and supervised</li> <li>• Swimming pool</li> </ul>
Northcote young	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone knows</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tongan young people –</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for all ages of young people</li> </ul>

<b>Description</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Not so good</b>	<b>To improve</b>
male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>everyone</li> <li>Family on every street -</li> <li>Can walk around and feel safe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>especially when they are drinking</li> <li>Nothing for youth</li> <li>Parents telling kids to stop smoking weed – but nothing else to do</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fix houses</li> <li>More hang out spots for young people – hanging out at schools at night (so police can't see them)</li> <li>Broken bottles left around school from young people drinking there</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Friendly neighbourhood</li> <li>Good leisure activities</li> <li>Good college</li> </ul>		
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People hanging out</li> <li>Different nationalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Racism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tagging</li> <li>Vandalism</li> <li>Racism</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Centre</li> <li>Good place to relax</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No safe place to ride bikes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More public spaces for recreation</li> <li>Reduce criminal dens like in Tonar St</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cheap stores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too crowded</li> <li>Not many places to sit and eat</li> <li>Too many junk shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Run down shops</li> <li>Smashed bottles</li> <li>Fun things for kids</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good school</li> <li>Big library</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many people littering</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More parks</li> <li>More bins</li> </ul>
Northcote young male	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pizza Hut</li> <li>Access to motorway</li> <li>Grocery shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking and traffic</li> <li>Environment too dirty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More parking</li> <li>Better traffic light, particularly near the school</li> <li>Repaint state house</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People and their attitudes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drugs around young children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The atmosphere</li> </ul>
School poster/essay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boring parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add flowers</li> </ul>

<b>Description</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Not so good</b>	<b>To improve</b>
competition			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make them bigger</li> <li>• Houses rebuilt</li> <li>• Gym to play sports</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Playing with friends + neighbours</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAB</li> <li>• Tagging</li> <li>• Beer – too much drinking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop parents from going to TAB</li> <li>• Stop people drinking lots of beer</li> <li>• Stop tagging</li> <li>• Keep neighbourhood clean</li> </ul>
School poster/essay competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fresh air</li> <li>• Sports</li> <li>• School</li> <li>• Libraries</li> <li>• Shops</li> <li>• Fun</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More places for kids to hang out</li> <li>• Sports parks</li> <li>• Leisure centre</li> <li>• Movie theatres</li> </ul>
NYPD PhotoVoice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Shoal Bay</li> <li>• Friends</li> <li>• People</li> <li>• Community</li> <li>• Different nationalities and cultures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus system – not easy to catch a bus; buses are infrequent</li> <li>• Some streets in Northcote have a bad reputation because of tinny houses</li> <li>• Streams are polluted</li> <li>• Graffiti and vandalism – makes Northcote look rough and unsafe</li> <li>• Youth selling and dealing drugs</li> <li>• Cadness Reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be more regular</li> <li>• Clean up graffiti</li> <li>• Clean up streams</li> <li>• Cadness Reserve – needs better lighting, court lines repainted as well as new backboards, rubbish bins closer to playground, more seating</li> <li>• More understanding of different people from different cultures</li> </ul>

## Appendix Six: Action Plan Template

### PROJECT SCOPE

Outcome Statement

Objectives

<b>Project Title</b>	<i>Northcote Child &amp; Youth Development Project</i> <b>Work-strand</b>
<b>Prepared by</b>	
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Version</b>	
<b>Underlying Factors</b>	
<b>Community Priorities</b>	Insert relevant Priorities identified from engagement processes (e.g. profile, NYPD, community, local and central government agencies)

**Strategic Linkages**

**Assumptions & Expectations**

**Project Opportunities**

Opportunities  
Adding value to what is already happening in Northcote (capacity building)- list here

Strategy

---

**Stakeholders** Who needs to be involved to make it a success?

---

**Implications for Children & Young People** (Including how Northcote children and young people will remain actively involved, i.e. able to initiate ideas and be involved in decisions about how the project is to be carried out and monitored)

**Implications for Tangata Whenua**

#### **PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**Scope of Work** (Including what the project will and will not include)

**Project Products (transferable learnings)**

**COMPLETE TO THIS POINT FOR 14 FEBRUARY WORKSHOP**

**Constraints**

**Project Governance & Responsibilities**

---

Diagram useful here

**Resource Requirements Schedule**

---

Who to be involved? In what way? And for how long? e.g. task – personnel – estimate of hours. Ongoing costs and savings to organisations. Evaluation component.

---

**Key milestones and timeline**

---

**Risk Identification & Management**

Risks

Scale of Impact

Mitigation measures

---

### **MONITORING & EVALUATION**

**Project Monitoring**

Measures/indicators (including baseline)  
Who? When? Criteria?

**Sustainability**

Will the project meet sustainability objectives? To what extent? Identify who will have ongoing responsibility

---

### **PROJECT COMMUNICATION**

**Communication and Consultation Plan**

Refer to overall Programme/Northcote Project C&C Plan

### **ENDORSEMENT**

**Sign-off**

Project sponsor:

Owner:

Project Manager:

---