**OFFICE OF THE FIRST MINISTER AND
DEPUTY FIRST MINISTER (OFMDFM)**

**TOGETHER: BUILDING A UNITED
COMMUNITY**

**Evaluation of the Summer Camp
Pilot Programme 2015**

FINAL REPORT

March 2016

APPENDICES:

Important Notice

This report is for the benefit of OFMDFM and the EA only. The report findings are based on an ongoing programme of consultation and research with representatives of funded summer camps and related stakeholders involved in the delivery and/or oversight of the programme. Documentation provided by OFMDFM has been reviewed, where available but we have not verified the reliability or accuracy of any information obtained in the course of our work and therefore this work does not provide the same level of assurance as an audit.

---

1   INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1   Purpose of this Evaluation

This evaluation has been prepared by the Strategic Investment Board (SIB) at the request of the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM) in relation to the Summer Camps Pilot Programme 2015, one of the headline actions within the Executive's strategic framework for improving good relations - Together: Building a United Community (T:BUC).

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to critically examine the roll out of the Summer Camps Pilot Programme in 2015, including the extent to which it has achieved its agreed outcomes and identifying lessons learned for the future. It is also required to provide recommendations for intervention beyond the pilot period, considering within this how the programme fits and contributes to OFMDFM's overall approach to intervention activities.

This Final Evaluation report builds on an Interim Evaluation of the programme that was presented to the Summer Camps Programme Board in November 2015.

1.2   Project Background

Together: Building a United Community (T:BUC) is the Executive's strategic framework for improving good relations, with the ultimate aim of building a united, reconciled and shared society.

The strategy is based on four key priorities aimed at building on the progress that has already been made in our community over recent years:

- Our children and young people;
- Our shared community;
- Our safe community; and
- Our cultural expression

The strategy identified seven strategic headline actions, one of which was the delivery of 100 Summer Camps in the summer of 2015.

The implementation of T:BUC is overseen by a Ministerial Panel, reflecting the fact that working towards building a united community is not confined to the remit of just one Department. The Ministerial Panel meets circa three times each year, reflecting commitment right across Government for all Departments to work together in order to successfully implement the strategy.

Additionally a Good Relations Programme Board, comprising senior officials from all Departments including the Senior Responsible Owners (SROs) for the headline actions, meets regularly to review and monitor progress of the Strategy's implementation. There are also a number of thematic subgroups established under the auspices of the Ministerial Panel; the Community Tensions subgroup, Housing subgroup, and Children & Young People subgroup. These sub groups report back to both the Good Relations Programme Board and the Ministerial Panel on a regular basis.

The development and application of the Outcomes Based Accountability (OBA) methodology and [1]Good Relations indicators is providing a common set of outcomes against which investment in Good Relations (via T:BUC) can be measured, to help determine if the meaningful change desired in society is happening.

It should be noted that the development of the Summer Camps programme has been a parallel process to the development of the wider interventions programme. On an annual basis since 2005 OFMDFM has provided funding for community activity to divert young people from anti-social and potentially criminal behaviour around contentious parades and public assemblies and to deal with heightened tension around interfaces during the summer period. The funding has commonly been referred to as 'summer interventions' and was put in place following the work of the Interface Steering Group in North Belfast.

Whilst there are thematic links between Interventions and the Summer Camps, it is important to note that they are fundamentally separate initiatives. The major difference between them is that Interventions are solely diversionary activities, running at specific known periods of tension. Their purpose is to take children and young people away from a given area during such a period – for example, during times when parades or protests are planned. By physically taking the young people away, the intention is that they will be diverted from engaging in antisocial or disruptive behaviour during the period of tension. The Summer Camps programme is not intended to be diversionary, rather it is aimed at improving good relations generally, not at removing young people from an area at a particular time, and is focused on long-term relationship building.

In the context of all of the above, the ultimate goal of the Summer Camps programme is to build positive relationships across what have become divided parts of the community in Northern Ireland (NI). This is to be achieved through challenging historic positions, encouraging debate and discussion and providing a mechanism where people can re-engage with one another, leading to sustained contact and friendship. The rationale for the programme was to ensure that there was a more joined up approach to interventions work in areas of heightened tension throughout the year as part of a year-round interventions engagement process. As such the intention was always that the programme would be an integral part of a longer term strategic approach to interventions with pre and post engagement activity, wrapped around the core camp experience to facilitate this. The Community Tensions Sub-group (established under the auspices of the Ministerial Panel as detailed above) was tasked with exploring options for developing this longer-term, more strategic approach.

A pilot phase of the Summer Camps programme was put in place for 2015, as a means to test what worked well (and less well) with the general aim that this would lead to a more permanent programme rolling out on an annual basis in subsequent years. The pilot phase of the programme was shaped through the establishment of a [2]Co-Design Team with representatives from organisations

---

[1] https://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/publications/good-relations-indicators-2015-update

[2] The role of the Co-Design Team was to take into consideration the criteria provided by Ministers along with all feedback received during the co-design process and make recommendations on the outcomes, design/criteria and delivery model for the Summer Camps pilot programme to be put to Ministers for consideration.

with a stakeholder interest in the programme including Good Relations Officers from local Councils, Youthnet, Youth Council, Education & Library Boards, the Community Relations Council, and OFMDFM. In parallel, a Youth Co-Design Team was set up to feed directly into the Co-Design Team meetings to ensure the views of young people were taken into consideration at all stages of development of the pilot programme. The key design specification/criteria for the 2015 Summer Camps Pilot Programme is summarised below.

Key design specification/criteria for the 2015 Summer Camps Pilot Programme

- There must be a significant community/good relations element to the project as a whole.
- Projects must run on a cross community basis (20% variance).
- Projects must consist of three phases (i) pre-engagement (ii) camp (iii) post engagement.
- Summer Camps must provide a safe, inclusive and welcoming environment for partners and participants. Therefore, in addition to the necessity of cross-community working, consideration should be given to including participants from various social/ethnic/gender/disability backgrounds.
- Applications are encouraged from across Northern Ireland, to include both urban and rural areas.
- The use of young people as leaders and, as appropriate, for young people to take on roles and responsibilities at camp, that would positively contribute to their own and others' experience is encouraged.
- Summer Camps must offer a range of age appropriate activities or focus on a specific theme according to young people's interests (e.g. arts, adventure, music, dance, digital media, sport, education)
- Groups may use their own discretion in targeting age bands within the 11-19 age range. However consideration should be given to the need for age appropriate activities (e.g. potentially using young people's suggested bands of 11-13, 14-16 and 17-19 years)
- Consideration must be given to the inclusion of young people who aren't attached to youth groups, or who are excluded from school
- Camps must be accessible by children or young people of all abilities
- Camps must be based in Northern Ireland and be 3-5 consecutive days, plus pre- and post-camp phases. The duration of the pre- and post-camp phases is flexible and will vary according to the groups involved.
- Camps and follow-up work isn't limited to the traditional summer period, but can be delivered at other holiday periods (e.g. Halloween).
- Parents/Guardians must be fully engaged in the process – both at pre- and post-camp phases

Applications were invited from registered youth organisations or bona fide voluntary and community organisations (to include churches, sports groups, arts groups etc.) schools, regional organisations and Councils that have experience in working with young people.

The Co-design Team determined that there should be two strands to the Summer Camps Pilot Programme in 2015 and that applicants could apply for either or both strands. These were as follows:-

- **Strand 1**: Camps may be led by one organisation or in a collaborative cross-community partnership involving two or more organisations operating within the same vicinity and, potentially working across community facilities. Strand 1 Camps must have a minimum of 20 participants from diverse backgrounds (i.e. people with different religious beliefs, political opinions – this may also include different racial backgrounds); and

- **Strand 2:** In the pilot phase there was an interest in "testing" out a number of innovative/different concepts to include a variety of models such as youth led camps, larger-scale or regional camps and "supported" camps which will enable less experienced groups to benefit from the experience. These pilots should have the potential to provide learning and practice development for future Summer Camp Programmes. Strand 2 Camps must have a minimum of 60 participants from diverse backgrounds (i.e. people with different religious beliefs, political opinions – this may also include different racial backgrounds).

The maximum award for Strand 1 was £6,000 and for Strand 2 the maximum award was £20,000.

In terms of implementing the pilot programme, strategic leadership and management resided with Programme Board/ OFMDFM. The Education Authority (EA) was responsible for operational administration of the programme. The pilot programme was promoted as being 'open for applications' in April 2015, with the closing date for applications in mid-May 2015. Applications were scored thereafter by Sub Regional Assessment Panels chaired by the EA and the chairs of these panels then presented their applications to a Multi-Agency Assessment Board (MAAB), chaired by OFMDFM, on 20th May 2015. However it took a further month (to the 26th June 2015) for award letters to be issued to successful groups. This delay of a month was mainly due to wider budgetary constraints entailed in the June 2015 Monitoring Round.

1.3   Target Outcomes of the Summer Camps Pilot Programme

In accordance with the OBA methodology, the approach to measuring the performance and impact of the pilot programme is framed by six outcome areas aligned to the four priorities within TBUC and consistent with the Good Relations Indicators linked to the same. Table 1.1 overleaf sets out all of the proposed outcomes, outputs and indicators for the Summer Camp Pilot Programme.

Table 1.2 then sets out the Report Card for the Summer Camp Pilot Programme, which is structured around the three domains as follows:-

- How much did we do?
- How well did we do it?
- Is anyone better off?

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 are essentially the reference framework for the evaluation of the pilot programme and have framed all aspects of the methodology.

Table 1.1 Outcomes, Outputs and indicators for the Summer Camp Pilot Programme

T:BUC Priority	Summer Camps Outcomes	Summer Camps Outputs	Project Level Indicators (Good Relations Indicators in bold)
Our Children & Young People: Improving attitudes & building a community where young people can play a full and active role in building good relations	✓ Positive attitudinal change towards people from different backgrounds	✓ No. awards * Strand 1 & 2 ✓ No. awards * county/rural/urban ✓ No. camps youth led	✓ **% of children who think relations between Protestants and Catholics are better than they were five years ago and will be better in five years** ✓ **% feel more favourable towards people from Protestant/Catholic/minority ethnic communities**
	✓ Sustained contact & friendships developed between young people from different backgrounds	✓ No. participants ✓ % minority ethnic ✓ % Protestant/Catholic ✓ % disability	✓ *% made new friends with people from different religious background/ethnic group* ✓ **% who regularly socialise or play sport with people from a different religion** ✓ *% young people in contact after the project ends*
Our Shared Community: A community where division doesn't restrict life opportunities & all areas are open and accessible to everyone	✓ Young people are more positive about shared activities (e.g. education, leisure)	✓ % live in all/mostly Protestant or Catholic areas ✓ % attend mostly/all Protestant or Catholic schools ✓ % not met anyone from different religion/race before ✓ % young people not involved in youth club/community group before	✓ *% participants had fun* ✓ *% participants who personally benefited from the experience (e.g. confidence, skills, participation)* ✓ *% participants joined new groups/new activities* ✓ **% prefer to live in a mixed religion neighbourhood** ✓ **% prefer a mixed religion school**
	✓ Better recognition of the role young people play in peace building		✓ **% feel sense of belonging to neighbourhood and able to influence local decisions** ✓ **% feel sense of belonging to NI and able to influence NI decisions** ✓ **% agree young people in NI can make a big contribution in bringing the two main religious communities together over the years to come** (participants & wider stakeholders) ✓ **% agree young people in NI are already making a big contribution to bringing the two main religious communities together** (participants & wider stakeholders)

Our Safe Community: A community where everyone feels safe to move around & are not inhibited by fears	✓ Projects create a safe environment for young people and enable sharing of experiences, skills and facilities		✓ *% felt able to talk openly about their culture* ✓ **% feel leisure centres/parks/youth facilities are more accessible and open to Protestants/Catholics** ✓ *% feel safer attending events or activities in areas or facilities often associated with another religion or culture*
Our Cultural Expression: A community which promotes mutual respect and understanding. Diversity is perceived as a strength & cultural expression is positively celebrated and non-threatening	✓ Young people have a better understanding and respect for cultural differences		✓ *% felt their cultural background was respected by others* ✓ **% agree culture and traditions of the Protestant/Catholic/minority ethnic communities add to the richness and diversity of Northern Ireland society**

Table 1.2: Summer Camps Pilot Programme Report Card

How much did we do?	How well did we do it?
✓ No. participants ✓ % minority ethnic ✓ % Protestant/Catholic ✓ % disability ✓ % live in all/mostly Protestant or Catholic areas ✓ % attend mostly/all Protestant or Catholic schools ✓ % not met anyone from different religion/race before ✓ % young people not involved in youth club/community group before	✓ % young people completing the project ✓ % made new friends with people from different religious background/ethnic group ✓ % young people in contact after the project ends ✓ % participants had fun ✓ % participants who personally benefited from the experience (e.g. confidence, skills, participation) ✓ % participants joined new groups/new activities ✓ % felt able to talk openly about their culture ✓ % feel safer attending events or activities in areas or facilities often associated with another religion or culture ✓ % felt their cultural background was respected by others
Is anyone better off?	
✓ % of children who think relations between Protestants and Catholics are better than they were five years ago and will be better in five years ✓ % feel more favourable towards people from Protestant/Catholic/minority ethnic communities ✓ % who regularly socialise or play sport with people from a different religion ✓ % feel sense of belonging to neighbourhood and able to influence local decisions ✓ % feel sense of belonging to NI and able to influence NI decisions ✓ % agree young people in NI can make a big contribution in bringing the two main religious communities together over the years to come (participants & wider stakeholders) ✓ % agree young people in NI are already making a big contribution to bringing the two main religious communities together (participants & wider stakeholders) ✓ % prefer to live in a mixed religion neighbourhood ✓ % prefer a mixed religion school ✓ % feel leisure centres/parks/youth facilities are more accessible and open to Protestants/Catholics ✓ % agree culture and traditions of the Protestant/Catholic/minority ethnic communities add to the richness and diversity of NI society	

1.4   Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation was required to cover the following:-

- A critical examination of the 2015 Summer Camps Pilot Programme in operation, determining to what extent it has achieved its intended Outcomes (with reference to the agreed objectives/outcomes in the business case approved in March 2015; the Outcome Framework, Indicator Set & Project Report Card; and the OBA report card – i.e. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 included previously);

- A critical examination of the success of the administration of the 2015 Summer Camps Pilot Programme through the Education Authority, and make recommendations for the administration of future programmes;

- A summary of the range of Summer Camps and associated quantitative outputs and outcomes identifying the varying types and approaches used in their delivery;

- Evaluation of the impact of the pilot programme on participants and local communities;

- Assessment of the value for money of the camps including the extent to which funding has provided leverage of funding from other sources and to consider the additionality and added value of the pilot programme;

- Examination of how the pilot programme has contributed to the out-rolling of T:BUC from a strategic, policy and political context;

- Consideration of the extent to which the expectations of the funder and partners been met through the leadership, development and delivery of the pilot programme;

- Identification of lessons learned, approaches and tools that can act as models of good practice and feed in to the development of a coherent programme from 2016/17 onwards and assist in the mainstreaming of good practice; and

- An overall consideration of the pilot programme, which includes a recommendation on whether it should be rolled out on a more permanent basis.

1.5   Methodology

The evaluation was implemented through a three phase approach undertaken between July 2015 and February 2015, culminating in attendance of the evaluation team at the Summer Camp Reunion Event at the SSE Arena on the 13 February 2016. The Reunion Event involved the two OFMDFM Junior Ministers and was attended by circa 1,000 summer camp participants and their

camp leaders. Table 1.3 below sets out the key phases of the methodology and associated activities.

Table 1.3 Key Phases in the Methodology and Associated Activities

Phase	Description	Activities
1	Research and Investigation	101 Moderation Visits (EA/OFDFM/SIB) to funded camps - Review of Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports submitted by funded camps. 4 X Focus Groups with Young People 4 X Shared Learning Fora across NI – with delegates from organisations that had secured funding for and delivered a camp; those who had applied but were not successful in the 2015 round; and regional partners and stakeholders (e.g. Education Authority and Council personnel). These were attended by 133 delegates and constructive input. - Stakeholder interviews (e.g. with DE, EA regional teams, Councils) - A final 'catch-all' independent catch all E-Survey with funded camps – completed in February 2016.[3]
2.	Co-Design	- Three meetings of Co-Design Group (October & November 2015) - To consider revised draft design proposals, criteria for 2016/17; draft outcomes; model of delivery; operating framework and arrangements for monitoring and evaluation. - Discussions informed by emerging real-time evaluation findings.
3.	Reporting	- Interim Report (end of November 2015) - Final report (end of February 2016)

In practice all three phases of the methodology overlapped and the focus throughout was on applying 'real time' findings from ongoing monitoring and evaluation activities to start shaping proposals for a potential successor programme beyond the pilot phase. The ethos of co-design with programme stakeholders and young people has prevailed through this process.

Copies of all of the key data capture and monitoring tools deployed within the evaluation are attached at Appendix I. This includes a blank copy of the forms used for moderation visits; a blank copy of the Camp Progress and Evaluation

---

[3] It should be noted that while the headline response rate at circa 60 responses out of 101 camps was high, in practice, the number of camps who consistently answered the questions put was around 31-35. It may be the case that where respondents could not answer the first question on the total cost of their camp, they did not proceed to answer the remaining questions. Nevertheless, it is the view of the evaluation team that 31-35 complete responses to the survey out of 101 camps is a reasonable response rate.

Reports submitted by funded camps; and a copy of the independent E-Survey administered by SIB to all funded camps in late January/ early February 2016.

1.6   Structure of the Evaluation Report

Table 1.4 below sets out the structure of the final report.

Table 1.4 Evaluation Report Structure

Section of this evaluation	Description
Section 1	Introduction and Background
Section 2	Performance Against The Three Domains of the OBA Report Card
Section 3	Good Relations Content/ Case Studies of Funded Camps
Section 4	Effectiveness of Management and Administration
Section 5	Additionality, Leverage and VFM
Section 6	Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Development Recommendations

2 PERFORMANCE AGAINST THE THREE DOMAINS OF THE OBA REPORT CARD

2.1 Introduction

This section summarises the performance of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme, with reference to the intended outcomes. The key reference points on this are the Outcome Framework, Indicator Set & OBA Project Report Card as set out previously in Tables 1.1 and 1.2. In effect these supercede the content in the original business case completed in March 2015 reflecting detailed work by the Co-Design Group on these measurement frameworks. This section also covers the requirement in the Terms of Reference to comment on the impact of the pilot programme on participants and their communities, in that much of the content of Tables 1.1 and 1.2 relate to this.

This section draws mainly on the content of completed moderation forms (authored by SIB/EA/OFMDFM) and Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports (submitted by funded camps). At the time of drafting this evaluation report there is a circa 90% completion rate of moderation forms and a [4]circa 60% completion rate of Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports – which in the view of the evaluation team is a solid and representative evidence base to draw from within the population of 101 funded camps. It also draws on all of other research tasks set out in Table 1.3 previously including the input of camp participants and camp organisers at Focus Groups and Shared Learning Fora in particular.

It is important to note that in the format of the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports that the key questions asked under each domain of the report card – (*How much did we do*?; *How well did we do it?*; and *Is anyone better off?)* differ in terms of their organisation under the three headings versus the information previously presented in Table 1.2. For instance in Table 1.2 the PUL/ CNR breakdown is considered under the first domain, whereas in the data capture for the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports it is considered under the second domain. Similarly in Table 1.2 the metric of the '*percentage of young people who made new friends with people from different community backgrounds at the camp'* is considered under the second domain and in the data capture for the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports it is considered under the third domain. What is presented below is mainly based on the order and organisation in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports, in that this has been used as the basis for aggregation of some of the data and information. The key issue is that the same ground is covered between the two but there is not an exact read across from what is presented in this section to the organisation of the key indicators in Table 1.2. In addition some of the key indicators in the third domain of the report card as per Table 1.2 have not been used in the data capture format in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports, including some that are linked to the [5]Good Relations indicators (*e.g. % of children who think relations between Protestants and Catholics are better than*

---

[4] These are still being submitted

[5] https://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/publications/good-relations-indicators-2015-update

they were five years ago and will be better in five years). This suggests that if the programme moves beyond the pilot phase, there needs to be an additional participant survey completed independently with camp participants to capture some of this as well as the need for alignment of what is currently captured under the key domains of the Report Card on a consistent basis.

This section of the report deals mainly with performance against the domains of the OBA Report Card. Section 6 of this report concludes on the performance against the six summer camp outcomes in Table 1.1 and contribution to the four priority areas of T:BUC. This is because these are directly relevant to the requirement in the Terms of Reference to conclude on the extent to which the Summer Camp Pilot Programme 2015 has contributed to the out-rolling of T:BUC from a strategic, policy and political context. It is most relevant to do this as part of the conclusions when all of the other evaluation evidence has been considered.

2.2   Performance – *How Much Did We Do?*

The business case target was to deliver 100 camps within the pilot phase. 106 letters of offer were made to successful applicants and 101 camps were subsequently implemented, with minor attrition due to some camps not being a position to proceed (with timescale and other constraints prevailing). As such **the business case target of implementing 100 camps has been fully achieved.** A list of the 101 camps is included at Appendix II.

The **101 camps engaged circa 4200 participants**, which in the view of the evaluation team is a strong performance in terms of reach, particularly given the extreme timing pressures that prevailed in terms of the window to mobilise the activity and recruit participants post notification of funding award (26th June 2015). These timing pressures effectively meant that the camp organisers lost the month of June to promote and recruit in schools, which then had 'knock-on' delays in terms of the ability to confirm bookings with venues to host the camps. In practice, as a result of these delays, some of the planned dates for camp activity had to be pushed out to later dates (including into the Autumn/half-term holidays).

The Strand 1 camps were to engage a minimum of 20 participants and Strand 2 camps a minimum of 60 participants. The above data suggests that on average there were circa 42 participants involved in each camp which, given that over 75% of the awards were for Strand 1 camps, is indicative of strong performance from a 'standing start' and indeed the attractiveness of the programme offer to young people. In practice the delineation in terms of participant numbers between Strand 1 and Strand 2 camps was somewhat arbitrary, in that there were several examples of Strand 1 camps with well over the minimum of 20 participants and some even over the Strand 2 threshold of [6]60 participants. These large Strand 1 camps offered good VFM for the investment of circa £6k. Overall the concept of Strand 2 did not materialise to

---

[6] Shankill United Football Club - Get Together this Summer Rising Star Soccer Academy Summer Camp; Peace Players International NI - (PPI-NI) PPI-NI Belfast Interface Games (Game of Three Halves Camps and Tournament)

the extent envisaged – apart from the issue above in terms of delineation of participant numbers between Strand 1 and Strand 2 camps, there was limited evidence for instance of 'supported camps' where more experienced organisations teamed up with less experienced groups, to deliver a camp of regional scale. Whilst time may have worked against this in pilot year, the learning would indicate that sometimes these partnerships (between experienced and less experienced groups) might be better at a sub-regional level to facilitate mechanisms to sustain the contact between young people on an 'all-year round' basis.

The list of the 101 funded camps is included at Appendix II and indicates **a good regional spread across NI** (and between urban and rural areas). The breakdown by EA region was as follows:-

- Belfast 42;
- North Eastern16;
- South Eastern 9;
- Southern 11; and
- Western 23.

It is also important to also note that the camps have been **accessible to participants with a disability**. The aggregate running percentage of participants with a disability is around 4% based on data within completed Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms. This included some outliers such as Camp Shamrock which had 12 people with a disability out of 73 participants (16%).

Finally a key aspect of the first domain of the OBA Report Card is the extent to which the Summer Camp Pilot Programme 2015, **reached young people that were not involved in a youth club/ community group before**. The data captured against this is inconsistent in format – with some camp organisers highlighting 'yes/no' in Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports and others recording absolute numbers against this. Therefore the totals cannot be aggregated across the completed Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports. That said, the completed reports submitted in this respect indicate that the majority recruited at least some participants that were not involved in a youth club/ community group before, and in one case 100% of participants were not involved in a youth club/ community group before.

A related point is considering the extent of reach of the pilot programme to groups **beyond youth organisations within the remit of the EA Youth Service**. This is important in that, given the tight timescales to promote the Summer Camp 2015 Pilot Programme, this constituency may have been most easily reached to meet targets. However only 29 out the 101 funded camps were in this category, indicating reach well beyond this into broader VCS / third sector groups working with young people.

All of this suggests that the **pilot programme made good inroads into reaching new constituencies of interest** that can be further built upon if the programme proceeds beyond the pilot phase.

2.3   Performance – *How Well Did We Do It?*

The community background of camp participants was recorded initially via the moderation visits but again and more accurately through completion of the Camp Progress and Monitoring Reports. Drawing mainly on the latter (and acknowledging that circa 60% of these are complete and submitted to the EA and onto OFMDFM) the aggregate running breakdown of participants by community background is shown in the table below.

Table 2.1 Community Background of Camp Participants

Protestant, Unionist and Loyalist (PUL)	Catholic, Nationalist. Republican (CNR)	Other
42%	51%	7%

 It should be noted that 'other' includes a significant proportion of participants whose community background was recorded as Black Minority Ethnic (BME) as well as participants who do not identify with either of the two main communities in NI (i.e. PUL/ CNR) or reported they were from a mixed background. The reporting is further complicated by the fact that in some cases participants from a minority ethnic background (e.g. from the Polish community) were also simultaneously of the Catholic faith and could have been reported under either CNR and/or minority ethnic. As such Table 2.1 should be interpreted in the context that there is likely to be a small amount of fluidity around this. The overall point that is important to note is that while the concept of the Summer Camp Programme is mainly centred on building sustained and positive relationships between the two main communities in NI (i.e. PUL/CNR) the **pilot programme has been welcoming and accessible to participants from the BME community**. Indeed it was evident through the moderation visits conducted to all funded camps that inclusion of participants from a BME background positively contributed to the dynamics of the debate and reflection on good relations issues. It often added an external perspective in terms of reflections on the conflict in NI/ divisions between the two main communities in NI that helped to frame the debate in a broader global context. It was also evident that for the generation of young people involved in the camps, some viewed good relations in a broader global context (e.g. inclusive of racial equality issues) with the debate about the divisions between the two main communities in NI (i.e. PUL/ CNR) more 'of their parent's generation'. For all of these reasons it is important in future that the programme remains welcoming and accessible to participants from a BME background and that the nature of the good relations content is not overly prescribed (a subject which is discussed further in Section 3).

In line with the core focus of the Summer Camp Programme on building sustained and positive relationships between the two main communities in NI, funded camps were required to recruit on a balanced basis from both. Funded camps were to ensure that there was no more than a 20% variance between participants from a PUL background and those from a CNR background. Put simply for a camp with 100 participants the permissible variations would have been 60 PUL/ 40 CNR or 40 PUL/ 60 CNR. In practice based on the captured

data **c35% of the funded camps were not within the 20% variance on PUL/CNR participation,** with participation more skewed than this to one part of the community. A range of reasons contributed to this and offer valuable lessons for the future – these include:

- Some camp organisers did not properly interpret/ understand how the prescribed requirements on the 20% variance were to work in practice;

- The short 'window' of time from promoting the Summer Camps Pilot Programme in April 2015, to the deadline for applications in mid-May, meant that there was limited scope to form new cross-community partnerships between camp organisers. If there was a pre-existing partnership of this nature this could have been deployed to good effect, but forming a new partnership with the need for approvals from boards/trustees of the relevant organisations for this within the available 'window' of time would have been almost impossible;

- The geographical hinterland/ catchment area of some funded camps, constrained the ability to recruit on a balanced basis from both sides of the community given the prevailing community background of the local population (and time pressures worked against forming partnerships outside their immediate locality in some cases);

- The extreme time pressures to recruit participants and mobilise camps post award of funding (with letters of offer only being issued on the 26th June) meant that there very little opportunity to promote the camps widely within both communities. Missing the month of June was a particular constraint in being able to promote camps in schools on both sides of the community divide; and

- The application form(s) did not do enough to robustly test the feasibility of intended recruitment mechanisms to reach participants from both sides of the community on a balanced basis, and therefore the recruitment mechanisms deployed did not fully deliver.

All of the above issues have the potential to be addressed if there is a greater window of time in any future programme and if there is greater clarity on what is permissible in terms of PUL/CNR participant balance and greater mechanisms to test the achievability of the same in the application process. To this end OFMDFM have already drafted a simple definition of what is permissible in relation to the 20% variance for use in future guidance notes.

The second aspect of the data captured related to the extent to which participants completed the camp programme; enjoyed the camp programme; and found the environment open and inclusive, thus facilitating sharing of experiences, skills and facilities – all indicative of the quality of the programme and relevant to ('*how well did we do it'* ?). Table 2.2 overleaf provides headline data on this with supporting narrative included thereafter.

Table 2.2: How Well Did We Do It?

Indicator	Percentage
1. % young people who completed the project	91 %
2. % of young people who enjoyed the project	97 %
3. % of young people who felt camp environment was open and inclusive and enabled sharing of experiences, skills and facilities.	96 %

Note: Based on averaged data from completed Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

In interpreting indicator (1) above the headline message is one of **very high retention of participants within the camp programmes**. This is underpinned by sign-in sheets/ records at the level of each camp. In broad terms all participants who attended the main camp phase completed it. Where there has been some drop off is between pre-camp and camp phases and between camp and post-camp phases, although for the majority of camps this too has not been experienced at any great scale. The lowest level of retention for any camp recorded in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports across all three phases is 56%.

In relation to indicator (2) again the headline message is that **the camps have overwhelmingly been enjoyable and fun for the participants i**nvolved – evident from the quotations by some participants included in the text box below.

'Great fun! Hope it's on next year'

'Being away from home for the first time with so many people made me feel so good about myself"

'A great time making new things and meeting new people'

'My favourite memory was spending time with all my new friends and I wish I could go again'

'I have really enjoyed the programme and learnt a lot about myself and others'

'I did not think I would enjoy it as much as I did. I have done some cross-community work before and it hasn't been very good if I am honest. I loved doing the lifeline and having the opportunity to tell things my way, from where I live and am coming from'

"I've loads more friends now, I started a new school this year and I made friends at summer camp who attend the school – this has made it so easy for me"

Source: Camp visits/ moderation forms and Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

In relation to indicator (3) similarly the headline message is that the **environments created at the camps are viewed by participants to have been open and inclusive enabling sharing of experiences**, skills and facilities. This is mainly down to skills and experience of camp organisers in

creating the right conditions for this and in no small way also to the positive attitude amongst young people to reinforce this environment created initially by camp organisers. In some cases young people progressed further than this to actually take ownership of the environment created at the camp. This was achieved through development of a contract of agreement between staff, peer educators and participants (e.g. based on respect, tolerance and acceptance of others) that then framed the camp delivery. The development of the contract helped to establish positive mind sets and attitudes from the outset and as a result a large group mentality was developed and friendships began to build quickly.

Overall the residential camps entailing shared accommodation, chores and activity groups (relative to day camps) facilitated much more depth in terms of shared experiences and associated relationship development. Within this the five day residential was been particularly effective relative to shorter residential camps. In a very small minority of instances participants reported that aspects of the camp environment could be 'too open' in that there was too many open group sessions, and they felt uncomfortable speaking out in these groups as they had no anonymity. In addition, in a couple of cases it was reported that mobilisation of the main camp was too rushed (due to lateness of funding awards) and that more 'bonding-time' pre camp was needed to help create the optimal open and inclusive environment at camp. The text box below reflects some of the views of participants on this issue/ the shared camp environment.

'I didn't think I could share a room with other people (I did not know) but I did and it was fine'

'The programme created a safe space to build relationships and to engage'

'I felt nervous sometimes asking questions as I didn't want to offend anyone but I did feel included'

'It's a neutral environment where you find out about each other's culture and religion……I felt confident because my ideas were wanted"

'We all respected each other and the camp definitely catered for better recognition of the role that young people can play in peace-building'

'The programme was open and inclusive although more bonding time could have been provided to help create the environment for the main camp'

"Learning new skills and sharing ideas in a safe environment allowed us to feel safe working as a unit and not as a group from differing backgrounds".

'During the workshops and camp activities we shared personal stories and considered our personal, cultural and social identity in the context of the group'

'A positive group dynamic and leadership style created a safe physical and emotional environment'

'I learnt that everyone could contribute to the success of the residential'

Source: Camp visits/ moderation forms and Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

Finally it should be noted that the model of **sustained contact between young people over typically a 3-4 month period, via pre, camp and post camp phases**, has worked well in building an open and inclusive environment, in that it has allowed time for friendships to form and develop in a controlled manner and at a pace appropriate to the context of the young people involved. This would have been much more difficult had the 'product' on offer been limited to the camp phase only, without the pre and post elements built on either side. In reality, for many, given the time pressures in 2015 to mobilise camps post award of funding the pre-camp phase was rushed and in a couple of cases limited to a briefing / induction about the main camp. Looking ahead, if support continues beyond the pilot phase, it is important that the pre-camp phase is always more than an induction and that there is more flexibility around the post-camp phase, i.e. not just a single 'celebration' event but could incorporate support for multiple sessions over a prolonged period. Good relations content should also be core to both the pre and post camp phases as detailed further in Section 3.

2.4   Performance – *Is Anyone Better Off?*

Each camp implemented their own questionnaires and data capture mechanisms to capture the impact of the camp programme on participants. These were then used to inform the responses back against the '*is anyone better off*' metrics within the Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms submitted by camp organisers (as per the format in Appendix I). A key point to note in this regard is that it would have been useful for camp organisers to have been introduced to these metrics/ the format of the Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms earlier to facilitate proper baselining with young people on these metrics. The processes deployed within the pilot programme have largely been centred on the capturing performance against these metrics on completion of the camp programme (i.e. 'after' attitudes rather than 'before and after' attitudes'). In addition, in some cases, camp organisers asked participants questions that were close but not 100% aligned to the metric being reported in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms; meaning that in trying to average across the funded camps the evaluation team has had to apply a degree of judgement to attribute responses to particular metrics. Again all of this is mainly a factor of time, in that with the late award of funding there was little time to brief camp organisers on the key metrics they had to report against and limited time for baselining prior to camp delivery. In any event there has still been a comprehensive and representative evidence base available to the evaluation team in respect of these '*is anyone better off*' metrics. The headline findings are summarised in Table 2.3 overleaf.

Table 2.3: Is Anyone Better Off?

Indicator	Percentage
1. % of young people who made new friends with people from different community backgrounds at the camp.	95%
2. % of young people who plan to stay in contact with friends made at the camp?	86%
3. % of young people who on completing the camp, feel more able to talk openly about their culture	88%
4. % of young people who now feel that young people in NI can make a big contribution in bringing the two main religious communities together over the years to come?	87%
5. % of young people who having attended the camp have personally benefitted from the experience (e.g. confidence, skills). Please provide details on how young people have personally benefitted.	94%
6. % of young people, following attending the camp, will now join new groups/activities?	85%
7. % of young people who now feel safer attending events or activities in areas or facilities often associated with another religion or culture?	87%
8. % of young people who feel that their cultural background is respected by others?	89%
9. % of young people who feel more positive in dealing with those from a different community background	93%
10. % of young people who would now consider taking part in other cross community activities?	98%

Note: Based on averaged data from completed Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

Again the headline data would indicate **strong performance in all areas of the 'better off' metrics.** In the vast majority of camps participants have had the opportunity to make at least one friend (and typically many more) from the 'other' community. Circa 65% of the funded camps had less than a 20% variance in participants from the PUL and CNR communities, indicating balanced participation from both. In the main the engagement with young people through moderation visits at these camps with balanced participation indicated little interaction of any depth between young people from either side of the community divide in NI prior to the camp, and therefore the potential for new relationships and new friendships to form.

The **expressed intent to keep in touch with some of these new friends was also high** (averaging 86%). However the range of figures captured against this ranged from 50% to 100%, indicating the greater effectiveness of some camps over others in creating a 'sustainable camp community' of connected young people. This data was mainly captured within or soon after the delivery of the camp programme and longevity of measurement is key on this metric. A key

good practice point emanating from some of the funded camps is their plans to link the camp into the work of their organisation on an all year round basis, thereby mainstreaming the contact between young people. The independent survey completed by the evaluation team in February 2016, with funded camps also provided additional evidence on this point. This is summarised in Table 2.4 below and indicates that all funded camps were active in implementing various mechanisms to sustain the contact between young people (and related impacts). The most common existing/ planned mechanism to maintain contact with the young people that participated in the camp was through linking camp participants into the work of the organisation all year round, followed by use of social media. Examples of 'other' mechanisms included through informal contact and through additional funded programmes. Encouragingly this indicates that camp organisers do not view the intervention the Summer Camps pilot programme as a 'one off' time-bound intervention but part of a wider programme of work.

Table 2.4: Mechanisms to Sustain Contact between Camp Participants

D1: Please indicate all of the existing/ planned mechanisms to maintain contact with the young people that participated in your camp (please tick all that apply)

Funded Post Camp Events	Use of Social Media	Linking the camp participants into the work of your organisation all year around	Other
Number/ % of respondents who answered this question			
21 (67.7%)	23 (74.2%)	28 (90.3%)	8 (25.8%)

Note: 31 respondents selected at least one mechanism to maintain contact with the young people.

Taking indicators (3) and (8) together, that is the extent to which the camps have enabled young people to **talk openly about their culture** and to feel that their **cultural background is respected** by others, it is clear that the Summer Camp Pilot Programme has performed strongly in both areas. That said, it should be noted that some of the responses were qualified linked to the environment/ context that they are placed in. For instance some reported that they would only feel able to talk openly about their culture, in a safe and controlled environment like a camp where there has been trust created in the shared space and a bond of trust with adults facilitating and leading in the space (e.g. where they had unlimited support from their own youth leader and peer support workers). This would indicate that while the camp programme has developed momentum in this regard, **sustaining it externally in wider community settings post camp, will require ongoing linkage and support** in many cases – reinforcing the points made earlier about integrating the work of summer camps into the 'year-round' work of funded groups. The text box overleaf provides examples of some of the impacts against these two indicators.

'I feel that I can now find it easier to trust people after sharing my stories and not being judged'

'It is class how we can all come together and nothing matters, religion or culture'

'I did not feel that anyone was different, we were all together without people slabbering or fighting'

'I am more confident in talking in talking about my culture and identity and more accepting of others'

'Young people who attended camp had limited experience of talking about their identity or culture. Positive experiences with other young people whose life experience was alien to them, enabled participants to reflect on their own values and begin to try to understand those whose faith, religion, class, status or school differed from their own. Friendships had the space to grow, and young people have maintained these through social media, and also in the real world, visiting other young people's areas and homes, and also meeting in neutral spaces'.

'I feel my cultural background was respected by others at the camp, but perhaps not by the community at large'.

Source: Camp visits/ moderation forms and Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

Indicator (4) i.e. the percentage who now feel that young people in NI can make a big contribution in bringing the two main religious communities together over the years to come, is a key barometer of the extent to which the Summer Camp Pilot Programme has **inspired young people to recognise the role they can play as peace-builders in society** more widely. Again the headline number is very positive at 87% but within this averaged figure there would be a small number of camps where the percentage was 60% or less. A potential reason for this is that in a minority of camps the good relations content was light; a subject that is discussed further in Section 3. Or a further reason is that the participation in the camp was not sufficiently balanced from a PUL/ CNR perspective to enable participants to be inspired about cross-community/ peace-building work. Or another reason cited was that young people commented that they did not know where to go outside of their camp group to help make a wider change or what help is out there. This was linked to concerns about overcoming the barriers than can still remain from attitudes in their family and their peers in the community about building a shared society in NI.

A key positive finding linked to this indicator is the extent to which **peer educators at the camps have been viewed as role models,** inspiring the camp participants to be future peer leaders and/or progress into mainstream youth work in future – all of which is relevant to building on the role that young people involved can continue to play in bringing the two main religious communities together in NI. Allied to this, 'spreading the word' about the summer camp programme in future and attending future camps was viewed as immediate steps. The text box below provides examples of some of the impacts in this regard.

> *"Yes we have a responsibility to bring the two main religious communities together in the years to come……….in terms of how to do this……going to next year's summer camp!!"*
>
> *"Young people talked about how they feel comfortable talking about issues within the camp group and that this has changed their culture but when it comes to talking about it with family, peers in their own community it is a bit difficult and they don't know how they can change things when people close to them feel differently.. Some of young people from Protestant background said they were in loyalist bands and would find it hard to help change others opinions".*
>
> *"[Post camp] 10 members of the group took on a pro-active role planning and running a Christmas event on the interface which brought together c80 people from both sides of the community. This has helped reinforced the view amongst camp participants that young people can play a positive role in bringing the two main religious communities together in NI"*
>
> *"Half of this year's participants have declared an interest in fulfilling the role of a peer educator for next year's participants which has resulted in staff having to create an online application process and schedule interviews after Easter".*
>
> *"I have learned that we are all the same, bringing us together as a group will stop us from rioting"*

Source: Camp visits/ moderation forms and Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

The responses captured around indicator (5) in Table 2.3 i.e. the percentage of young people who have **personally benefitted from the experience is again very high averaging 94%,** indicating that in the main all participants developed some new skills and/ or confidence through participation in the camp programme. Based on a review of data captured through the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports the key areas of skill development are mainly centred around the following:-

- Increased confidence, self-esteem and self-belief;
- Improved communication skills;
- Improved leadership skills;
- Improved relationships with friends, family and the community;
- Greater levels of trust and expertise in dealing with difference;
- Greater insight into human rights issues and global matters around this;
- Development of artistic, creative, drama and performing skills; and
- Improved sporting ability.

Peer educators at the camps also noted skills gained in understanding of *'how everything works behind the scenes'*, and better organisational, helping and caring skills – over and above some of the skills on the list above.

These skill gains at the personal level amongst participants have **contributed to positive attitudes in dealing with individuals from a different community background** (Indicator 9 in Table 2.3) and in participants feeling safer attending events or activities in areas or facilities often associated with another religion or culture (Indicator 7 in Table 2.3) – with the averages across

all funded camps being 93% and 87% respectively for these indicators. It is important to note that this data was in the main captured retrospectively in data capture mechanisms put in place by camp organisers and then used to complete their Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports. There has been no comprehensive baselining of 'before and after' attitudes on the extent to which young people had positive attitudes/ felt safe in dealing with and/or attending events in the 'other community'. At least some of the anecdotal comments in the monitoring and evaluation information gathered from participants would indicate that whilst they may not have had much 'in depth' contact with individuals from the 'other community' some viewed the PUL/ CNR divisions as more 'of their parent's generation' and were interested more in a broadly focused good relations and human rights debate, set in a wider global context. Given this, it is likely that some of the participants may already have had positive attitudes in dealing with individuals from a different community background, that the camp programme was able to further build on, rather than starting from a low base.

Finally looking at indicators (10) and (6) in Table 2.3, the percentage of young people who would now consider taking part in other cross community activities and those who would join new groups/activities (following the camp), the percentages across funded camps averages 98% and 85% respectively.

In relation to the first indicator, it is clear that almost all participants would take part in other cross-community activities, and in relation to the second it is less clear, in that at the time of completing the evaluation forms, participants may not be aware/ may still be exploring other new groups/ activities for them that would follow-on from their camp experience. In effect performance against this indicator (6) needs to be measured against a longer-time trajectory. A couple of the funded camps commented in their evaluation returns that it was impossible to report accurately on this indicator at this point. That said, there are examples of where young people had already identified follow-up groups and activities for them to connect to, post camp, as illustrated by some of the impacts reported in the text box overleaf.

"Taking part in the programme has made me want to take part in other things, I have never really left the house much and this has helped my confidence"

"An additional, highly positive legacy of the camp was that many of the young people expressed a desire to further the group's contact and impact by establishing their own cross-community, creative, Teenage Club"

"39% of the young people were unattached young people who did not attend youth provision prior to the camp. Following the camp 13 young people along with others are now working with local volunteer and the EA with the hope of starting up youth provision/ a structured programme in their area"

"Participants had already pleaded with staff to keep the initiative active into the new year regardless of the funding situation as they group were willing to work on a number of fundraisers"

"Post camp two of the females and 1 male from Greenisland have recently become involved within the local youth centre and now sit on the committee. 6 of the young people from Carnlough have now gone on to get involved in further youth development projects with their EA Youth Worker and 2 of the young people from Larne have taken positions on the Larne Youth Council".

"85% of our participants said they would consider taking part in another summer camp, or youth activities taking place throughout the year if they were of a cross community nature"

Source: Camp visits/ moderation forms and Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports

3   GOOD RELATIONS CONTENT - CASE STUDIES OF FUNDED CAMPS

3.1   Introduction

The first criteria in the specification for the Summer Camp Pilot Programme 2015, as set out previously in Section 1, is that '*there must be a significant community/good relations element to the project [meaning individual camp programme] as a whole'*. Given that this central to the programme this section of the evaluation report aims to explore this in some detail to identify the range of camp programmes put in place and the varying types and approaches used in their delivery.

3.2   Overall Findings on Good Relations Content

A key aspect of the methodology for the evaluation was completion of moderation visits to all 101 funded camps (by EA/OFDFM/SIB). As per the format included at Appendix I the reporting format was centred on commenting on the quality of good relations work (with supporting evidence) and evidence of contribution to TBUC outcomes (i.e. our children and young people; our shared community; our safe community; and our cultural expression). Through this there is a wealth of information on the good relations work within the camp and associated early impacts recorded at the time of the moderation visits.

The evaluation team over and above conducting some of the moderation visits, have reviewed every moderation form with a view to trying to form an overall picture of performance across the camps. This was done through a 'traffic light system' with:-

- Green = excellent quality of good relations work;

- Amber = good quality of good relations work; and

- Red = poor quality of good relations work (i.e. where often the good relations work was light within the programme and/or a very small part of the programme of work).

At face value a 'traffic lighting' approach could be viewed as a 'blunt instrument' to summarise overall performance. However it is underpinned by a detailed and common format of moderation questions across the 101 funded camps and then subject to another layer of review by the evaluation team, both of which should reduce any subjectivity. The overall results of this are summarised in Table 3.1 overleaf.

Table 3.1: Overall Results of Traffic Light Analysis

	Rating	Number/ Percentage
	Green = excellent quality of good relations work	41%
	Amber = good quality of good relations work	39%
	Red = poor quality of good relations work (i.e. where often the good relations work was light within the programme and/or a small part of the programme of work).	21%

In the best cases (i.e. those categorised as 'green' above) the **good relations materials/content was highly challenging in terms of engaging with issues of difference** and the camp environment created a safe space for discussion of these issues. Some of these camps were held and drew from areas immediately characterised by a peace-line, where the legacy of the conflict remains very visible. In addition, in many of these camps, the participants would either have had no or limited contact/ awareness of each other prior to the camp, thereby creating the space for added value within the camp in terms of the depth of engagement and related outcomes. In these camps, in the main, the PUL/CNR balance was sufficient to enable quality community/ good relations debate and reflection. Perspectives on conflict that were developed through these camp discussions and reflections included personal conflict, community conflict and international conflict – plus generational differences in terms of attitudes to good relations issues. As previously detailed, in some cases young people were working to a contract they developed together (e.g. based on respect, tolerance and acceptance of others etc) which ensured their ownership of the process. Allied to this it is evident from the moderation visits to some of these camps that young people were equipped and able to articulate their 'good relations journey' in quite a mature way.

In the case of some of the camps categorised as 'amber' above the quality of the good relations content was good, but was constrained by the fact that there was an imbalance between PUL and CNR participants, meaning that the opportunity to build impact was more limited. Or in other cases the timing of the moderation visit may have not been optimal (e.g. too early in the camp programme, meaning that friendships and linkages were still embryonic) again meaning that the opportunity to capture impact was constrained to a degree.

In terms of the camps categorised as 'red' the good relations content was light / a small element of the camp programme. In some cases the underlying reason was a **wariness of dealing with perceived 'contentious' issues**, and uncertainty about 'how contentious' they were expected to be. Others cited a constraint in being able to be very ambitious/ contentious in their good relations content, given that the main camp was being implemented over the summer period with most potential for community tensions in the localities from where

the participants were recruited. This reinforces a need for any future programme to be marketed more as an 'all-year round' programme of intervention. Other camps did not comprehend fully the extent to which good relations content was a mandatory requirement of the pilot programme, which needs to be communicated to a greater degree in any future programme. Finally again the moderation visit could have been badly timed (i.e. too early in the camp programme) to observe good relations activity in action and related behaviours.

In terms of the models adopted in some cases good relations content was 'sewn seamlessly' into a general activity based camp programme, whilst others had a more definite structured balance between (physical) activity and workshop/ reflective sessions (e.g. evenings at residential camps). The use of sport and other interactive activity (e.g. creative role play and simulation, case studies, script writing, drama techniques, music and media production) has been effective in acting as a catalyst for good relations reflections, all underpinned by a focus on challenging stereotypes and increasing understanding of diversity. Some of the camp delivery incorporated a focus on **accredited qualifications** (e.g. OCN Level 1 or Level 2 in Equality and Diversity), particularly for peer educators. In most cases the work towards this accredited qualification would have been started at camp, but necessitated ongoing contact with participants after the camp activities, thus creating another mechanism to sustain contact between young people involved in the camp.

Set out at 3.3 to 3.6 below are four mini-case studies / 'vignettes' of funded camps showcasing their good relations work/ content – as a means of illustrating the various approaches to the same. These include camps from urban locations (involving interface areas) and more rural/ town locations (the JIMS Camp from the Mourne region and Cinemagic in the Portadown area).

3.3   PeacePlayers International – Northern Ireland (PPI-NI): Belfast Interface Games (Game of Three Halves Camps & Tournament): Strand 1 Camp

The camp recruited 149 participants aged 11-13, with the community background being 31% PUL; 60% CNR and 7% other. All participants were from Belfast, but from all parts of the city, North, West, South and East. Recruitment was from within the PPI-NI existing Belfast Interface League (BIL) programme (afterschool basketball and community relations programme). Young people were recruited as graduates of PPI-NI's primary school twinning programme (which twins controlled and maintained primary schools in interface areas) and also from community centres and youth groups that operate in interface areas across the city. Participants were recruited from 6 of the 10 most deprived wards of Northern Ireland and from those areas which continue to suffer most from the legacy of the conflict.

The pre-camp sessions were held across the city in June and included meetings, face-to-face and telephone/email conversations with parents. In terms of the main camp phase this encompassed 3-day camps where young people were coached in Gaelic football, rugby & soccer and took part in a 'fourth half' of community relations through sport activities and conversations facilitated by PPI-NI. The camp phase culminated in a Flagship Tournament on

the 30th July 2015 which, despite the rain, attracted over 20 parents who attended to cheer for their part of the city at Queens University Malone Playing Fields. Parents who attended the Flagship Tournament acknowledged and recognised that BIG was much more than and very different from traditional sports camps and supported their children in attending the BIG project as a community relations focused initiative. The tournament secured good media coverage in the Belfast Telegraph and BBC radio (Evening Extra).

Post camp activities involved c30 participants at the PPI-NI Strand 2 Leadership Development Camp at which they produced portfolios evidencing their learning in Understanding Diversity Through Sport (with 25 gaining OCN certification at Level One). Post camp activities have also included ongoing engagement with the camp participant pool as a whole through the BIL meetings held weekly across the city (thus integrating the camp participants into the 'all-year round' work of PPI-NI) as well as involvement in the Jingle Ball Tournament at Christmas attended by 190 young people.

In terms of the good relations content/ approaches the project created a unique opportunity for young people from historically divided areas to get to know each other. Through the initial contact, facilitated on the basketball court, Gaelic pitch, rugby field and soccer ground, participants were supported in establishing relationships as teammates. Many had the opportunity, perhaps for the first time, to play each of the three main sports (rugby, football and Gaelic football) and through this were encouraged to explore the different identities, cultures and traditions associated with these sports. In so doing, the project equipped the young participants with an increased awareness and understanding of issues of sectarianism within Northern Ireland. Then through the final '4th half' PPI-NI leveraged these relationships to facilitate integrated community relations through sport conversations and capacity building.

Ultimately participants developed more robust friendships and gained a respect not only for their new teammates, but through them for other people from a similar background to their new friends. It has given them the confidence to use these new skills and tools in challenging stereotypes, increasing understanding and developing positive relationships between young people from different backgrounds in their own areas through their continued involvement with BIL and with other community projects. The level of participation within this Strand 1 camp at 149 participants was well in excess of the Strand 2 levels (a minimum of 60). Thus it offered very good VFM for an investment of circa £6k by OFMDFM/EA which leveraged an additional £1,400 in match funding through donations and sponsorship secured from individual and corporate donors both locally and internationally.

3.4   JIMS Youth Centre: Strand 1 Camp

JIMS Youth Centre is dedicated to the well-being of the entire youth community of Kilkeel and seek to provide a safe and nurturing atmosphere where young people are encouraged in multiple aspects of their lives: mental, social, emotional, and spiritual. A key goal is to assist young people in developing family and Christian values, building self-esteem, and increasing leadership skills. JIMS Youth Centre would historically be seen as both a service provider to PUL young people and those from a Christian belief but also focuses on

providing opportunities to help bridge the divide between communities. Overall, the Youth Centre intends to be a place for young people to interact and build relationships with their peers as well as with positive role models.

The camp recruited 26 young people from the Kilkeel and greater Mourne area, with the community background being 42% PUL, 50% CNR and 7% other (2 BME participants).

The pre-camp phase involved 18 hours of face-to-face contact time split over 6 sessions. This included interactive and group work to explore current contentious issues in Kilkeel, terminology that included attitudes, stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination and identity through a flags and symbols workshop. The main camp phase was delivered in the October half-term and encompassed an educational visit that included an ex-political prisoner's tour of the Falls and Shankill areas of Belfast, delivered by Coiste na n-iarchimí and the Ex-Prisoners and Interpretive Centre respectively, followed by a social activity in the form of a boat tour hosted by the Lagan Boat Company. The camp then progressed into a two night residential camp at the EA Shannaghmore Outdoor Education Centre, entailing outdoor pursuit's activity and a media skills workshop which prepared the group for constructing a video/photography exhibition, a mid-programme review and a camp evaluation (led by peer educators). The post-camp stage involved four workshops facilitated by external organisations, from An Riocht GAA club, The Schomberg Society, the PSNI and the Orange Order. The workshops were arranged as all of the named organisations play a big part in the individual identities of the participants and their respective community backgrounds or are at the forefront of contentious issues that present within Kilkeel and the greater Mourne area. A community celebration event was scheduled as the project wound down in December though this has been rearranged to early March as a result of an extension in funding. The celebration event will include a showcase of photography and video captured by the participants and will reach out to parents and other service providers who are invited and attend.

There has been a 100% retention rate of participants within the programme over the pro-longed period of engagement over the last few months. A safe and inclusive environment was created that enabled young people to ask questions they either felt they could never before or they didn't have the platform for. As a result, young people were better informed about the culture of those from a different religious background but were also able to ask questions about aspects of their own culture that they didn't understand or agree with. The creation of this environment was formalised through a contract/ agreement between staff, peer educators and participants who helped establish positive mind sets and attitudes from the beginning while outlining what was expected of one another. Consequently a large group mentality developed and friendships began to build to the extent where young people who didn't know each other prior to the project began to connect with one another in their social lives away from the project. The peer educators played a big role in helping create this group mentality as participants looked to them as a small diverse group of people who had been through a similar process. Approximately 60% of participants have declared an interest in another project run by one of the partner organisations, with three previously unattached young people

participating in a different weekly project as a result of the relationship and rapport built up with staff. Almost half of this year's participants have declared an interest in fulfilling the role of a peer educator for next year's participants as they feel passionately about the role young people can play in peace building.

Overall the camp has entailed various approaches and models to good relations activity/ programming – all underpinned by challenging prejudice, discrimination and stereotypes. Participants have enrolled into an OCN Level 2 award qualification in diversity and good relations and the sessions at camp are the first building block of this.

Perhaps the greatest success of the project was found in the diverse group of young people recruited from within the PUL, CNR and BME communities – particularly the fact that young people from CNR backgrounds now feel comfortable enough to engage in a project hosted in JIMS Youth Centre and then get involved directly in ongoing project work. The full-time staff team was made up of two JNC qualified youth workers of different gender and from different religious backgrounds, whilst the peer educators maintained a 60-40% gender and religious background balance.

3.5   Cinemagic Musical Theatre Camp: Strand 2 Camp

The camp was a musical theatre camp held in Portadown Town Hall which recruited 33 participants (aged 11-16) plus 10 older volunteers (aged 17-19) with the community background being 50% PUL and 47% CNR and 3% Other. Participants were from a wide geographic area but with the largest group (13 participants) from the Portadown area. Participants were recruited through Cinemagic's own database and social media outlets. Cinemagic targeted participants and community groups from both sides of the community, inviting them to come along. A press release and flyers were distributed in supermarkets used by both sides of the community. Schools were also contacted in Portadown and its wider areas, offering information and the opportunity to talk to Cinemagic staff about further information regarding the project.

The pre-camp sessions were held in Portadown Town Hall and involved young people and their parents and provided an insight into the project. Parents were asked to complete a baseline questionnaire regarding their attitudes and experiences to date. Young people were introduced to a 'behind the scenes' camera crew and young people were given the opportunity to speak on camera and say why they wanted to be involved in the project. Staff and volunteers were introduced to the young people and some 'ice-breaker' exercises were undertaken to help the young people get to know and trust one another, as this was a key to the successful delivery of the project. The young people also began devising dramatic pieces which looked at War, Conflict and Identity. The drama facilitators encouraged discussion around the themes and all of the young people were given a chance to express their opinions and contribute. The main camp activities took place over two weekends and involved various masterclasses, seminars in drama, acting, singing and choreography. The group devised a 30 minute show based on the theme of war. The group felt affected by the war in Syria as well as the conflict in Northern Ireland. Following rehearsals, the young people performed the drama on the theme of war to the

general public and parents. The young people took part in a question and answer session at the end of the performance which allowed the audience to ask them about the themes, performance and project overall. A number of parents provided very positive feedback at the end.

Post camp activities involved young people regrouping to chat about the strengths and outcomes of the performance. The young people voted in an Oscar style competition and all were awarded with a prize. The young people were also invited to perform the drama at a World Premiere of a Christmas Star which is Northern Ireland's first Christmas feature film, made by young people for young people. All of the young people were excited to be invited to the Red Carpet event and the Premiere of the feature film. Since then, Cinemagic have been trying to offer new events to the young people as they have a real desire to continue working together. They attended the Cinemagic Festival Opening Screening of PAN together. Finally they performed as a group at the Summer Camps Reunion Event in the SSE Arena in February 2016.

In terms of good relations, observations of the young people's interactions evidenced that they had respect for each other and the leaders. They were all very happy to talk in a positive way about the process involved in agreeing idea's and a title for their production. The young people were given the opportunity to consider themes/scenarios and with their assistance agreed on the theme of 'war'. Discussions also touched on the refugee crisis around the world. War as a universal theme was considered within any society experiencing conflict and within a N.I context. Whilst a limited number of young people knew each other prior to the project commencing, most met for the first time through it and got to know each other. The young people clearly wanted to keep their friendships and relationships going post camp and have started up a social media 'Group Chat' site.

Ultimately the project helped foster respect and understanding and new friendships between the young people from different backgrounds. It provided the young people with the confidence to express their ideas and opinions with their new friends. The level of participation in this Strand 2 camp was 33 (excluding volunteers) and so was below the required 60 participants for a Strand 2 camp.

3.6 Rathcoole, Bawnmore Cross Community Shared Spaces Project: Strand 1 Camp

The camp recruited 16 participants aged 14-16; 8 from a PUL background; 7 from a CNR background and 1 other. Participants were all from the Rathcoole and wider North Belfast area. Recruitment of participants was through informal referral requests to specific school, youth and community providers, asking them to identify young people who could benefit from the project. The project area workers made contact with each young person referred and assessed their interest/suitability for the project.

Due to the tight timeframe in relation to funding confirmation, only one pre camp meeting was held. The project entailed a series of meetings and events including: An outdoor experiential learning camp at Bushmills Residential Centre (which included sessions to explore cultures), a tour of the new V36 site

at the Valley Leisure Centre (located between the two main communities) and a workshop to explore fears and expectations regarding the site including concerns over 'ownership' of the site (This included familiarisation with the site for the young people to help alleviate fears over territory and encourage shared usage of the site); attendance at an inter-agency meeting in Mossley Mill involving council officials and MLAs, where young people spoke about their vision for their communities and talked about shared space; access to the V36 site before its official launch where young people tested the facilities and took part in focussed group sessions supported by a community relations facilitator. After the opening of the V36 site, young people returned to complete a Dragons Den type session in relation to their vision and hopes for the site. Throughout these activities the feedback from young people was positive and illustrated the 'working together' ethos of the group. Through these activities, young people had the opportunity to explore, discuss, share experiences and reflect on issues relevant to them.

Post project activities included an evaluation meeting as well as a celebration event. The location of the events on the V36 site also helped promote the sustainability of the activity in terms of gaining experience of the new site and positive, non-confrontational experiences with people from different community backgrounds. Since the close of the project, the participants have been in contact with the youth workers involved to explore the possibility of forming a larger group; looking at how best to extend the reach of the project to a wider group such as through hosting a cross community meeting in the V36 facility.

In terms of good relations, the project has provided an opportunity for young people from different community backgrounds to come together and explore their visions for their communities, thoughts and concerns regarding the new V36 site and helped to allay those fears through multiple opportunities for young people to mix and build new relationships in a non-threatening, safe environment. The project had elements that looked at difference and identity and successfully built bonds between the young people involved. The level of participation in this Strand 1 camp was 16 and so was below the required 20 participants for Strand 1 camps.

3.7 Learning points on Good Relations Content

Reflecting across the above case studies, and more broadly on the discussions facilitated at focus groups with young people and the Shared Learning Fora with camp organisers, a number of key learning points have emerged:-

▪ It is important that the nature of the good relations content is not overly-prescribed i.e. young people should not feel that the content/ material is what 'adults expect them to say' but rather owned and developed by them;

▪ The development of a contract of agreement between staff, peer educators and participants has been a useful mechanism to frame development of good relations content/ debate within some of the funded camps and helped to create positive mind sets and attitudes around the same from the outset;

- Parental involvement in camps has been both an enabler/ benefit and a constraint in terms of the development of good relations programming within the camps. Young people in some cases were reflecting the fact that the traditional PUL/ CNR divisions in NI was a debate that was more 'of their parent's generation' and that they viewed good relations in a broader global context (e.g. inclusive also of racial equality issues). Thus parental attitudes could constrain the extent to which they were willing for their children to attend camp and the extent to which the impacts from camp could then be progressed further into the family/ community post camp. A key good practice point emanating from the pilot programme in this regard, is the importance of reaching out to parents at the pre-camp stage and ensuring that this phase of the programme clearly communicated the good relations focus/ intentions of the overall programme of activities. Early 'buy-in' from parents in this regard ensured continuing parental involvement throughout the camp programme and for actions to sustain impact thereafter. For instance in the case of PPI-NI Belfast Interface Games (profiled at 3.3 above) the camp organisers held briefing events across the city, that included meetings and face-to-face and telephone/email conversations with parents. Thus parents from the outset acknowledged and clearly recognised that the Belfast Interface Games was much more than and very different from traditional sports camps. They were acutely aware and supported their children in attending the BIG project as a community relations focused initiative. As a result parents have supported their children in cross community activity through their continued involvement with PPI-NI's Belfast Interface League on an all-year round basis;

- There has been no discernible difference as to whether it is better that the good relations content is 'sewn seamlessly' into a general activity based camp programme, or whether it is better to have a more definite structured balance between (physical) activity and workshop/ reflective sessions (e.g. evenings at residential camps). This is linked with the observation above that it is better not to be too prescriptive on the nature/ format of the good relations content;

- The value of leveraging aspects of the good relations content from existing practice – e.g. that developed under the [7]Community Relations, Equality& Diversity in Education Policy (CRED) - under the auspices of the Education Authority and/or accredited qualification frameworks (e.g. accredited qualifications (e.g. OCN Level 1 or Level 2 in Equality and Diversity). This has provided a lever to develop good relations material in the first instance, but importantly also offered a progression route for participants to continue on their good relations work e.g. through moving

---

7 The Department of Education, through its Community Relations, Equality and Diversity policy and strategy, aims to ensure that every child in Northern Ireland, in the age range 3 to 25 in the education and youth sectors, should grow into adulthood understanding and respecting the rights, equality and diversity of all and having the skills, attitudes and behaviours that enable them to value and respect difference and engage positively within it. http://www.belb.org.uk/Parents/cass_cred.asp?m=13

into mainstream youth work and and/or completing a formal good relations/ equality qualification; and

- Interest in further widening the good relations learning beyond the NI context, that could extend to actual delivery of some of some of the camp programme at venues external to NI e.g. in the Republic of Ireland or Great Britain. This view was also reinforced by the perceived shortage of good venues for the larger camp experience (i.e. 60 and above as per the Strand 2 concept) in NI.

The 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme secured the involvement of a wide range of groups and organisations, with differing levels of experience in good relations work. A minority of the funded camps were light on good relations content for the reasons cited previously. To this end a point of debate within the shared learning forums with camp organisers and focus groups with young people is whether in any future programme access to some support/ direction around good relations content would be useful. The independent survey completed by the evaluation team in February 2016, with funded camps also provided additional evidence on this point as per Table 3.1 and 3.2 below.

Table 3.1 Support/ Direction With Respect to Good Relations Content

E1: In hindsight do you feel that it would have been helpful to have had access to some support / direction around the development of good relations content within your camp programme?

Yes	No
Number/ % of respondents who answered this question	
19 (61.3%)	12 (38.7%)

Of the 31 respondents to this question, 19 (61.3%) felt that it would have been helpful to have had access to some support/ direction around the development of good relations content within the camp programme. Of the respondents who answered yes, the following table summarises their views on what form the support could take:

E2: If you answered 'Yes' to E1 above what form could this support take in a potential future programme? Please tick all that apply below.

Signposting to a range of age appropriate good relations materials	Access to a pool of good relations practitioners/ trainers	Other
Number/ % of respondents who answered this question		
16 (51.6%)	15 (48.3%)	5 (16.1%)

Of the 31 respondents to this question, the two most common responses were that signposting to a range of age appropriate good relations materials and access to a pool of good relations practitioners/ trainers would be the most appropriate form of support for a potential future programme.

The above reinforces the need for a **non-prescriptive 'light-touch' approach to providing direction and support on good relations content**, and only for those who need it in a future programme. This view was echoed in the

discussions at shared learning forums with camp organisers and focus groups with young people, which also highlighted that access to flexible menu of support options was what was needed, reflecting different needs in terms of the experience of the camp organisers; the age of the young people; and the context / community within which the camp was funded. A related point was that it was highlighted that the material must be practical in nature and not overly academic.

4   EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

4.1   Introduction

This section of the evaluation assesses the extent to which the expectations of the funder and partners have been met through the leadership, development and delivery of the pilot programme. The assessment is informed by the primary research and fieldwork referenced in Section 1 of the report including the independent E-Survey with funded camps, completed in February 2016 (which asked respondents to give their views on a range of questions in relation to the effectiveness of strategic leadership, management and monitoring arrangements).

4.2   Overall Findings on Leadership and Management Oversight

For the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme, strategic leadership and management resided with Programme Board/ OFMDFM. The Education Authority was responsible for operational administration of the programme including disbursement of money to funding camps and vouching/ verification of the same.

E-Survey respondents were asked to answer questions in relation to the role of each of these parties i.e. the Programme Board/OFMDFM and the EA. The results are summarised in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Strategic Leadership/ Management and Operational Administration

F1: How would you rate the strategic leadership/ management of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme by the Programme Board/OFMDFM?

	Number of Responses/ as a % of total
Excellent	7 (22.6%)
Good	18 (58.0%)
Neither/ Nor (I have no opinion on this)	4 (12.9%)
Poor	2 (6.5%)
Very Poor	0

F2: How would you rate the operational administration of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme by the Education Authority?

	Number of Responses/ as a % of total
Excellent	9 (29%)
Good	16 (51.6%)
Neither/ Nor (I have no opinion on this)	3 (9.7%)
Poor	3 (9.7%)
Very Poor	0

The most prevalent response was that the strategic leadership/ management of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme by the Programme Board/ OFMDFM was good, with the next most prevalent response being excellent. Similarly the most prevalent response was that the operational administration

of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme by the EA was good, with the next most prevalent response being excellent.

Overall, informed also by the wider programme of research and consultation detailed in Section 1, it is the view of the evaluation team that the **model of ownership residing with Programme Board/ OFMDFM and a single administrative body in the form of the EA has worked well.** In particular the partnership with the EA was critical to being able to mobilise against the timing constraints that prevailed for the 2015 pilot programme and in leveraging from:

- Established practices and protocols around safeguarding of young people;

- A network of existing groups that could be reached easily / quickly to facilitate applications;

- Having 'ready' mechanisms to disburse and account for funding (i.e. the framework of eligible categories of funding from Youth Service funded activity); and

- Linking groups where needed to good relations/ diversity material (e.g. from DE Community Relations, Equality and Diversity in Education policy and related training material).

It is also the view of the evaluation team that the [8]Co-Design Group has been effective in shaping workable proposals which has been important in helping to mainstream the impacts of the camps into the 'year round' work of funded groups, alongside building links/ minimising displacement with other initiatives (e.g. United Youth; DCAL Cross Community Sports Programme). The Youth Co-Design Team has also been an important structure set up to feed directly into the Co-Design Team meetings to ensure the views of young people were taken into consideration at all stages of development and implementation of the pilot programme.

Reflecting on all of the above, should the programme continue beyond the pilot phase, it is recommended that the same implementation model is in place i.e. strategic leadership and management should continue to reside with the Programme Board/ OFMDFM, with the EA responsible for operational administration of the programme. The co-design groups relating to stakeholders and young people should also remain.

4.3   Learning points (Management and Administration)

Set against all of the 'headline' positive points above, there have been some learning points that have emerged. The framework of eligible categories of funding from the **EA Youth Service funded activity was too rigid a model** for the summer camps programme. In particular the standard daily rate of £10/hr for youth worker input was a constraint in funded camps being able to access specialist expertise (e.g. from professionals in the creative industries or sports development sectors). The message for the future is that the summer camps

---

[8] The role of the Co-Design Team was to take into consideration the criteria provided by Ministers along with all feedback received during the co-design process and make recommendations on the outcomes, design/criteria and delivery model for the Summer Camps pilot programme to be put to Ministers for consideration.

should still continue to be youth worker led, but that there should be flexibility with a prescribed framework to also allow for an element of specialist input. This constraint in terms of daily rates/ eligible expenditure categories meant that in practice that some camps could not drawdown all of their funding award in practice, leading to a slight underspend.

In the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme the funding awards were all made upfront. This greatly aided the securing of venues for programme delivery, given the extreme time constraints that prevailed from award letters being issued on the 26th June and was important in being able to mobilise activity at all within the pilot programme. However with 100% of the award being made upfront OFMDFM/ EA had no leverage to mandate groups to complete Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports (some of which are still not submitted). In addition the process for vouching of expenditure has been fairly protracted and some of the vouching work by DE is still ongoing. For the future some form of **retention payment** should be considered (e.g. 20% would be consistent with comparable programmes).

The application process itself was implemented efficiently. The pilot programme was promoted as being 'open for applications' in April 2015, with the closing date for applications in mid-May 2015. 154 applications for support through the Summer Camp 2015 Pilot Programme were received in total and all applications were scored by Sub Regional Assessment Panels which were chaired by the EA. The Chairs of these Regional Panels presented their applications to a MultiAgency Assessment Board (MAAB), chaired by OFMDFM, on 20th May 2015. The MAAB made its decision regarding groups to be funded and EA staff carried out some final verification checks before awards were made. This whole process was turned around very efficiently and the fact that letters of offer did not reach funded groups until 26th June (i.e. a month later) was outside the control of the above structures, and linked to wider budgetary constraints entailed in the June 2015 Monitoring Round.

However the **application form itself could be improved and simplified** in a future potential programme. In the first instance there was little distinction between the Strand 1 and Strand 2 application forms, which has also played out in the fact that there has been limited distinction between the Strand 1 concept and the Strand 2 concept in practice. A single application form that has the flexibility to accommodate different scales of camp participation should be considered in future. Allied to this the application form and related guidance needs to be clearer that good relations programming is mandatory, at all three phases (i.e. pre and post camp as well as the main camp phase). The application form also needs to test the feasibility of intended recruitment mechanisms more clearly given that circa 35% of the funded camps did not keep within the 20% variance on PUL/CNR split and the guidance notes needs to clear on what exactly is permissible in this regard. Finally less use of jargon in the application form in that at least some of the funded groups did find it difficult to articulate intended outcomes aligned to T:BUC (i.e. our children and young people; our shared community; our safe community; our cultural expression).

4.4   Learning Points (Monitoring of Outcomes)

Respondents to the E-Survey were asked to rate the following aspects of the monitoring of the outcomes based approach aligned to the four outcomes of T:BUC (i.e. our children and young people; our shared community; our safe community; our cultural expression). The results are presented in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Ease of working to an Outcomes based Approach

C1: How did you find the following aspects of this approach?

Aspect of Measurement Approach	Not at all difficult	Neither Easy Nor Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Very Difficult	Extremely Difficult
	Number/ % of respondents who answered this question				
Identifying the T:BUC outcomes that your camp would contribute to in the application form	20 (64.5%)	4 (12.9%)	7 (22.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Measuring the difference the summer camps made to participants relative to each of the outcome areas	13 (42%)	3 (9.6%)	13 (42%)	2 (6.4%)	0 (0%)
Capturing evidence on outcomes for participants during the course of the camp to inform moderation visits	15 (48.3%)	7 (22.6%)	8 (25.8%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0%)
Reporting on outcomes for participants in your own camp progress and evaluation report	17 (54.8%)	4 (12.9%)	8 (25.8%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.2%)

As illustrated above, the majority of respondents found identifying the T:BUC outcomes that their camp contributed towards 'as not difficult at all' and the next most prevalent response was 'somewhat difficult'. Similarly the majority of respondents found measuring the difference the summer camps made to participants, relative to each outcome area, either 'not at all difficult' or 'somewhat difficult' to measure. The most common response for capturing evidence on outcomes for participants during the course of the camp programme to inform moderation visits was found to be 'not difficult at all', followed by 'somewhat difficult'. Reporting on outcomes for participants in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports was found to be 'not difficult at all' for the majority of respondents and the next most common response was 'somewhat difficult'. Overall these views would not suggest that a radically different approach is needed in

future. That said, respondents were asked for their ideas for improvements/ processes that could be put in place to measure outcomes within a potential future programme and a selected sample of comments/ suggestions are outlined in the text box below.

"Sample evaluation forms. Be clear from the start about what evaluation evidence is needed".

"Clearer indication of needing baseline measurement etc. Maybe some groups need support in how to do this".

"A clear baseline survey to be undertaken by all young people at the beginning and then reviewed at the end of the programme. This could also be completed by the community partners involved".

"We believe a fun interactive survey developed to capture the views of youths participating in future youth camps would provide OFMDFM with direct feedback on impact. An animated survey would capture the attention of participants and could be used as a tool at all camps and at all stages. This would also reduce the amount of time demanded from groups in management and administration of these tasks".

"Some training on how to measure these when evaluating the group work as when you are in a middle of a residential week or weekend and how these match up to the outcomes".

Some of the themes above relate to **baselining, simplification and creating a more interactive approach** to capturing progress against the T:BUC outcomes. It is view of the evaluation team that, to a degree, timing pressures were a constraint in the pilot programme in enabling groups to be upskilled in the process of measuring outcomes and in having the time for proper baselining (when much of the pre-camp activity was condensed/ rushed). However it is important that more time is invested in this in any future programme, with space for proper baselining to facilitate capture of 'before and after' attitudes amongst young people. As previously indicated in Section 2, much of the progress captured against the 'better off' indicators in the Report Card, whilst detailed is mainly retrospective.

A further point as detailed previously in Section 2, is that in the format of the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports that the key questions asked under each domain of the Report Card – (*How much did we do?; How well did we do it?; and Is anyone better off?*) differ in terms of their organisation under the three headings versus the information presented in the Report Card. In addition some of the key indicators in the third domain of the Report Card (See Table 1.2) have not been used in the data capture format in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports, including some that are linked to the Good Relations indicators (e.g. *% of children who think relations between Protestants and Catholics are better than they were five years ago and will be better in five years)*. This suggests that if the programme moves beyond the pilot phase that there is a need for alignment of what is currently captured under the key domains of the Report Card on a consistent basis and work to address gaps in the same (e.g. either through changing the questions to be covered in the Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms or by an additional participant survey done independently with camp participants to capture evidence against some of this).

5   ADDITIONALITY, LEVERAGE AND VFM

5.1   Introduction

This section of the evaluation assesses the value for money of the pilot programme including the extent to which funding has provided leverage of funding from other sources and to consider the overall additionality and added value.

5.2   Leverage of Funding

A key issue in terms of assessing value for money of the pilot programme and to aid in future planning is understanding what other investment was leveraged by the camp organisers. The E-Survey with funded camps implemented by the evaluation team asked respondents to confirm the total cost to deliver their camp and provide a breakdown of the main funding sources in the context of this overall cost. The number of respondents to this question was 31, which is circa one-third of the funded camps. The responses indicated that **all camps raised the requisite match funding of £10 per participant** and most through local community fund-raising including sponsorship rather than levying a parental fee. Review of the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports submitted to date also indicates that this was achieved in all cases. Assuming this prevailed across the programme for the c4200 participants this is a leverage of £42,000.

However **match funding from other sources appears to have been fairly limited.** Based on the E-Survey 7 out of 31 respondents to the question regarding match funding reported having raised match funding. Of these 7, only two related to amounts greater than £1,000. The reason for this is likely to relate to the limited timescale within which groups could seek and source match funding given the pressure to get the camps within the pilot programme 'up and running'.

Organisations that had parent international entities were able to quickly raise match funding. For instance the PPI-NI Game of Three Halves Camps & Tournament as per the case study at 3.3 secured £1,400 in match funding raised through donations and sponsorship secured from individual and corporate donors both locally and internationally through the fundraising efforts of their parent organisation PeacePlayers International based in Washington DC. Also Council funded camps (i.e. where the Council was the grant awardee) were better positioned to leverage match-funding quickly. For instance the All Mixed- Up Camp (Strand 2) delivered by the Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council, was awarded [9]£11,062 from the programme and matched this with £7,534 from the Causeway Coast and Glens Good Relations Programme.

Whilst the evidence would suggest that the leverage to date within the pilot programme has been limited, mainly due to timing constraints, the more important question at this point is what leverage can still be achieved to sustain the contact and impacts of the camp programmes. Discussions are ongoing within the Co-Design Group of stakeholders as to how Councils and other

---

[9] Although were only able to claim £8801 due to restrictions in the eligible expenditure categories/ headings.

partners can support additional follow-up support, to help mainstream the work of the camps into the 'all-year round' work of the groups. In many cases this is driven by a desire from young people to make this happen. For instance in respect of the JIMS Youth Camp (profiled as a case study at 3.4) participants pleaded with staff to keep the initiative active into 2016 regardless of the funding situation as they themselves were willing to work on a number of fundraisers. All of this suggests that the outcome on leverage linked to the 2015 pilot programme is not yet fully visible.

5.3   Additionality

An important consideration, again in assessing value-for-money of the pilot programme and for future planning, is consideration of additionality – i.e. what would have happened in the absence of the funding support from OFMDFM. The E-Survey with funded camps implemented by the evaluation team asked a question on additionality with the responses summarised in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1 Additionality

B1: Which one of the following statements best describes your view on the ability of your organisation to implement your camp in the absence of support from OFMDFM?

	Number of Responses/ as a % of total
The camp definitely would have gone ahead	1 (2.6%)
The camp probably would have gone ahead	0 (0%)
The camp would have gone ahead but on a reduced scale	6 (16.6%)
The camp would have gone ahead but at a later date	1 (3.2%)
The camp would have gone ahead but at a reduced scale and at a later date	3 (8.3%)
The camp would not have gone ahead at all	25 (69.3%)

The **majority (69.3%) of respondents felt that the camp would not have gone ahead at all** in the absence of funding support from OFMDFM i.e. indicating full additionality. The next most prevalent response (16.6%) was that the camp would have gone ahead but at a reduced scale i.e. partial additionality.

It is also relevant to note that during the course of moderation visits (by SIB/OFMDFM/ EA) young people were asked what they would be doing if not at the camp. This provides some perspective on participant additionality. Responses were consistently – 'don't know'; 'not much'; 'hanging about in the rain' etc. In a small number of cases responses included 'at risk of anti-social behaviour' (despite the Summer Camps 2015 Pilot Programme not being overtly focused on diversionary activity as a rationale).

A final perspective on additionality is the fact that the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme has made good inroads into reaching a constituency of need outside / detached from mainstream youth work. Furthermore in the main, the camps brought young people who otherwise would not engage (at all or in any depth) into a safe environment where controlled risk-taking enabled them to debate good relations issues in more depth than they would otherwise have the

opportunity to do so in their day-to-day lives. All of this is indicative of high levels of additionality.

5.4   Overall Value for Money

In considering Value for Money it is important to compare what was achieved with what was envisaged in the original business case[10] for the pilot programme. In terms of the cost of the pilot, the business case indicated that the cost of delivering the pilot would be £1.2m. It was envisaged that £1m of this would relate to delivery of the Summer Camps and the remaining £200k was to be retained by OFMDFM to be used for the advertising, branding and evaluation of the pilot programme. The expenditure position as at the end of December 2015 is summarised in the tables below.

Table 5.1: Expenditure

DE Expenditure (as at end December 2015)					
	Apr – June 2015	July - Sept 2015	Oct- Dec 2015	Jan - Mar 2016	**Totals**
Profile	£94,000	£472,000	£218,000	£161,000	£945,000
Actual	£94,000	£452,000	£208,000	£172,000	£926,000
Variance	£0	£20,000	£10,000	-£11,000	£19,000

Note: Figures received from Department of Education on 22 Dec 2015. Some camps have underspent and final claims for camps are still being received by Education Authority for the Camp and Post Camp phases.

OFMDFM Expenditure (as at end December 2015)					
	Apr – June 2015	July – Sept 2015	Oct- Dec 2015	Jan - Mar 2016	Totals
Profile	£10,000	£25,000	£25,000	£140,000	£200,000
Actual	£10,000	£25,000	£25,000	£0	£60,000
Variance	£0	£0	£0	£140,000	£140,000

Note: January – March underspend due to costs for Reunion Event and balance of evaluation payment. Expected to be largely incurred i.e. minimal underspend.

It is concluded that the Summer Camps 2015 Pilot Programme **has offered value-for-money** for the following reasons:-

- The expenditure has remained within the allocated budget for the pilot programme;

---

[10] Completed in March 2015

▪ The actual cost per participant has been reasonable at circa £285/ per participant (based on £1.2m/ 4200 participants), particularly considering that this has covered venue hire (including overnight residential accommodation in many instances); access to high quality sporting and creative sector facilities and resources; travel (to and from venues); entrances to third-party visitor / museum/ tourism venues included as part of the programme of activities; and significant input of professionals (from the youth sector; good relations practitioners; and other specialist inputs e.g. from the creative industry sector and sports development professionals);

▪ There has been strong performance against all of the three domains of the OBA Report Card and against all six outcome areas specified for the pilot programme, indicating solid contribution to the out-rolling of T:BUC from a strategic, policy and political context (the latter is considered further in Section 6.2 in the context of overall conclusions);

▪ The additionality of the pilot programme has been high; and

▪ The leverage, whilst modest outside participant match funding of £10, has the potential to increase further as efforts continue to mainstream the contact and impacts of the camps into the work of the funded groups on an 'all-year round' basis.

6 CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This final section of the evaluation report initially considers overall conclusions with respect to how the Summer Camps 2015 Pilot Programme has contributed to the out-rolling of T:BUC from a strategic, policy and political context. It does so with reference to the six specified outcomes for the pilot programme previously included in Table 1.1 that are aligned to the four priority areas of T:BUC (i.e. our children and young people; our shared community; our safe community; our cultural expression). Allied to this an overall recommendation is set out as to whether the pilot programme should be rolled out on a more permanent basis.

Thereafter it summarises some of the key learning points and associated development recommendations to inform and shape a more permanent intervention in 2016 and beyond.

6.2 Contribution to the out-rolling of *Together: Building a United Community*

Table 6.1 overleaf summarises the alignment of the six summer camp outcomes to the four priority areas in T:BUC. In overall terms the pilot programme has created much to build from in terms of moving to a coherent more fixed programme intervention from 2016 onwards and has **contributed strongly to 'living out' the priorities and values inherent in T:BUC.**

In the first instance there has been **strong interest in / demand** for the 'product'. The pilot programme has engaged c4200 young people from a 'standing start' with extreme time pressures prevailing to mobilise camps over the summer period, given that the award letters were only sent out to successful grant recipients on the 26th June 2015 – all of which is indicative of strong performance. The pilot programme has made good inroads into reaching new constituencies of interest (e.g. groups/ organisations that are new to / less experienced in good relations work and young people not involved in mainstream youth work) and has been delivered NI wide. The geographical reach has included urban and rural communities, prominent interface locations, and some of the most deprived neighbourhoods in NI. There has been some 'ripple' effect on an intergenerational basis, through active involvement of parents in the programme of camp activities (although this has not been universal and has been both a benefit and constraint). Work is ongoing to mainstream the camp programmes and the contact between young people into the 'year-round' work of the organisations, and therefore the overall legacy of the pilot programme is yet to be fully visible.

All of the above reach has **helped to promote the T:BUC in a political context**. T:BUC has been a key building block in the implementation of the Programme for Government 2011-2015 reflecting the Executive's commitment to improving community relations and building a united and shared society in NI. Some of the young people at individual camps took the initiative to engage

with local politicians. For instance the young people participating in the Craigavon Central Summer Camp (that drew on rural and urban communities on both sides of the community in the Craigavon area) organised a 6k Peace Walk with elected members and the Lord Mayor of Armagh, Banbridge & Craigavon Council as part of their post camp programme of activities. During planning for the event conversations took place about why young people would engage in a Peace Walk and what the key messages were that they wished to convey to local politicians, drawing on their experiences of the camp programme. During the course of Shared Learning Forum discussions with stakeholders and young people, it was however highlighted that more traction might have been gained in terms of promoting T:BUC in a political context, had there been more ministerial involvement (e.g. more visits to camps) during the implementation phase. Since these views were expressed the Reunion Event has been delivered which was headlined by the OFMDFM Junior Ministers, and was an important endorsement/ recognition of the work of the young people in advancing the priorities and values inherent in T:BUC.

Table 6.1 Alignment of Summer Camp Outcomes to T:BUC Priorities

T:BUC Priority	Summer Camps Outcomes
Our Children & Young People: Improving attitudes & building a community where young people can play a full and active role in building good relations	✓ Positive attitudinal change towards people from different backgrounds
	✓ Sustained contact & friendships developed between young people from different backgrounds
Our Shared Community: A community where division doesn't restrict life opportunities & all areas are open and accessible to everyone	✓ Young people are more positive about shared activities (e.g. education, leisure)
	✓ Better recognition of the role young people play in peace building
Our Safe Community: A community where everyone feels safe to move around & are not inhibited by fears	✓ Projects create a safe environment for young people and enable sharing of experiences, skills and facilities
Our Cultural Expression: A community which promotes mutual respect and understanding. Diversity is perceived as a strength & cultural expression is positively celebrated and non-threatening	✓ Young people have a better understanding and respect for cultural differences

Turning to the first priority area of T:BUC (Our Children and Young People) and the two associated outcomes in Table 6.1 above, the pilot programme has in the main created the opportunity for young people from different backgrounds who otherwise would not engage (at all or in any depth) to come together to debate good relations issues. This has helped to **build positive attitudinal change** towards people from different backgrounds (Outcome 1 in Table 6.1). As detailed in Section 2, at least some of these participants may already have had positive attitudes in dealing with individuals from a different community

background, that the camp programme was able to further build on, rather than starting from a low base. In addition the positive attitudinal change includes but is typically wider than traditional PUL/ CNR divisions, being framed in a were interested more in a broadly focused good relations and human rights debate, set in a wider global context. Early indications (as per the evidence included in Section 2) are that **contact and friendships have been maintained** between young people from different backgrounds (as per Outcome 2 in Table 6.1 above) although longevity of measurement is key to informing this more fully in future. The potential also exists for the work and impacts of the camps to be mainstreamed into the work of funded groups on an 'all year round' basis, and there is stakeholder support for the same (e.g. via Councils). This will further help to sustain contact and friendships developed to date and needs to be tracked going forward.

Turning to the second priority area of T:BUC (Our Children and Young People) and the two associated outcomes in Table 6.1 above, the pilot programme has **helped to inspire young people to recognise the role they can play as peace-builders in society** more widely (Outcome 4 in Table 6.1 above). Across the 101 funded camps this has been achieved to different degrees, in some cases the good relations content might have been insufficient (in content or quality) to inspire the young people or there may have been constraints in terms of the PUL/ CNR balance. However there many excellent examples (evident in some of the quotations in Section 2 and case studies in Section 3) where the camp programme has inspired young people to embark on a progression route (some with accreditation) onto mainstream youth and/or community relations work. It is clear however that **this ambition will need ongoing nurturing and support** in that at least some of the young people commented that they did not know where to go outside of their camp group to help make a wider change or what help is out there. This was linked to concerns about overcoming the barriers than can still remain from attitudes in their family and their peers in the community about building a shared society in NI. Linking the legacy of the camp programme to the ongoing work of the organisations on a 'year-round' basis is a necessary first step in this regard.

In terms of Outcome 3 in Table 6.1 above again the evaluation evidence (drawing on some of the 'better off' indicators captured in Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms and reported in Section 2) indicates that the **young people are more positive about shared activities**, albeit that this has been mainly measured retrospectively rather than through capture of 'before and after' attitudes. The residential camps entailing shared accommodation, chores and activity groups (relative to day camps) have facilitated much more depth in terms of shared experiences and associated relationship development. It is important to note that the informed captured through the Camp Evaluation and Progress Reports are centred more on the attitudes of young people to shared activities at camp and within the camp group (post camp), rather than wider attitudes to sharing in society (e.g. the % who prefer to live in a mixed religion neighbourhood and the % who prefer a mixed religion school) some of which were included in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 previously (i.e. the Outcome Table and Report Card) and are derived from some of the good relations indications linked to T:BUC. Within a future programme it is suggested that attitudes to some of these wider societal metrics need to also be captured.

Turning to the third priority area of T:BUC (Our Safe Community) and the associated outcome (Outcome 5) in Table 6.1 above, the pilot programme has **created a safe environment for young people and enable sharing of experiences, skills and facilities,** where risks have been controlled. This is mainly down to skills and experience of camp organisers in creating the right conditions for this and in no small way also to the positive attitude amongst young people to reinforce this environment created initially by camp organisers.

Finally turning to the fourth priority are of T:BUC (Our Cultural Expression) the pilot programme has helped young people to have a **better understanding of and respect for cultural differences.** In the main camps have enabled young people to talk openly about their culture and to feel that their cultural background is respected by others. That said, a small number of anecdotal comments from young people captured in monitoring and evaluation returns, indicate that they would only feel able to talk openly about their culture, in a safe and controlled environment like a camp where there has been trust created in the shared space and a bond of trust with adults facilitating and leading in the space (e.g. where they had unlimited support from their own youth leader and peer support workers). This would indicate that while the camp programme has developed momentum in this regard, sustaining it externally in wider community settings post camp, will require ongoing linkage and support in many cases – reinforcing the point again about integrating the work of summer camps into the 'year-round' work of funded groups.

Reflecting on all of the above and the VFM conclusion highlighted in Section 5, **it is recommended that pilot programme is rolled out on a more permanent basis.** The key learning points and associated development recommendations to inform and shape a more permanent intervention in 2016 and beyond are detailed below.

6.3   Summary of Lessons Learned From the Pilot Phase

Drawing on the content of the preceding sections and all of the research and consultation that has underpinned the same, the key 'lessons learned' can be summarised as follows:-

- There was an opportunity **'spread the net'** more to less experienced groups including those that might have partnered with more experienced groups as part of the Strand 2 concept (timing worked against this in 2015);

- Keeping within the **20% variance** between PUL/ CNR participation was difficult in some geographies / localities – more time and mechanisms for partnering were needed. In addition some groups failed to understand what was allowed in relation to this – more clarity was needed;

- The **good relations content** within the camp programmes has mainly been of a high quality in challenging stereotypes/ building respect for diversity and providing a range of perspectives on the conflict (e.g. personal/community/ inter-generational/ international). The observations of young people (through moderation visits etc) evidenced the maturity

of many of the reflections of young people on good relations issues and the effectiveness of interactive methods, including drama, creative role play and simulation, in acting as a catalyst for these reflections. A minority of the camps were 'light' on GR content and were unsure how much was sufficient and how 'contentious' they should be;

- The **residential camps have been particularly effective** in creating shared space and depth of engagement to achieve T:BUC related outcomes. Shared accommodation, chores and activity groups are all part of building shared space;

- There has been **effective leverage from existing good practice in the youth sector,** particularly use of existing peer leadership models to ensure skills development, empowerment, legacy and a clear progression route (some with accreditation) onto mainstream youth work;

- The **three stage model (pre/camp/post), is the right model**. However there is a need to ensure that the pre-camp is more than an induction and the post-camp is more than a celebration. Both needed more time/ sessions and GR content needs to be integral to both;

- **Eligible funding categories were too rigid** and more flexibility within a prescribed framework would have been helpful;

- The involvement of **young people from BME communities greatly added** to the good relations debate at camp and helped frame the learnings in relation to PUL/CNR divisions in a wider equality perspective;

- More **visits by politicians to the camps** could have helped raise the profile of the good relations focus/ T:BUC imperatives, rather than leaving this mostly to a future NI-wide celebration event;

- There have been some excellent mechanisms to secure parental involvement, but **young people can feel distanced from their parents and other adults** often 'outdated' views regarding community divisions and difference – parental involvement has been both an inhibitor and an outcome;

- The **concept of Strand 2 failed to materialise fully** and some Strand 1 camps achieved the participation and innovation of the Strand 2 concept (and offered very good VFM as a result);

- The potential exists for the work and impacts of the camps to be **mainstreamed into the work of funded groups on an 'all year round' basis,** and there is stakeholder support for the same (e.g. via Councils). Achieving this longevity of impact and mainstreaming of good practice is more easily achieved at a local level than NI wide level; and

- It would have been useful for camp organisers to have been introduced to monitoring metrics/ the format of the Camp Progress and Evaluation Forms earlier to **facilitate proper base-lining with young people** on

these metrics. The processes deployed within the pilot programme has largely been centred on the capturing performance against these metrics on completion of the camp programme (i.e. 'after' attitudes rather than 'before and after' attitudes').

6.4   Development Recommendations for 2016 and beyond

The development recommendations for a more permanent programme from 2016 onwards are listed below. These have been refined through discussion at sessions with the Co-Design Group and informed by the input of young people (at focus groups) and camp organisers (through Shared Learning Forums and the E-Survey, which asked them to record their top 3 areas for improvement – see Appendix III).

- **Regional promotional events** should be implemented to facilitate wider outreach, networking /partner development between groups and stakeholder involvement (all reinforced by a pro-active social media strategy);

- The 'end-to-end' process from promotion to award letters to successful grant awardees, needs to be much less compressed in 2016 and beyond. It is critical that **award letters can be issued in May (or before)** to facilitate recruitment in schools in the month of June;

- A **single strand with banded participation levels** should be implemented with associated maximum funding/ award levels as below:

  - Band 1: Minimum 20 participants. Maximum available award - £6,500

  - Band 2: Minimum 40 participants. Maximum available award - £13,000

  - Band 3: Minimum 60 participants. Maximum available award - £20,000

- More **flexibility on applicable daily rates** should be incorporated to allow for specialist input within a prescribed framework (£10/hr standard rate for youth worker; £25/hr specialist rate and above this top-up funding is needed by the camp organiser). A **retention payment** should be introduced (of 20%) to avoid some of the difficulties encountered with full up-front payment in 2015;

- The guidance needs to continue to state that **CNR/PUL communities must be represented at all camps** and a **20% variance** is allowed. A clear definition of what is permissible in this regard should also be incorporated to avoid some of the misinterpretations that arose in 2015. The application form needs to be adapted to more fully test the **feasibility of the intended recruitment mechanisms** to achieve this;

- There should be **signposting to a range of age-appropriate good relations materials** in a non-prescriptive way, reinforced through access to a **pool of good relations practitioners/ trainers** for the less

experienced groups. A clearer message is needed in terms of the good relations content/ focus being **mandatory;**

▪ The **model of pre camp/ camp/ post camp should continue**. The pre camp should be 2-3 sessions and must be a minimum of 10 hours face to face contact. For the post camp phase longevity over a period is needed, to sustain contact/ friendships/ learning and impact. This should be a minimum of 10 hours and over 3 sessions. Both phases need a demonstrable, substantive good relations element. Residential camps should be encouraged with flexibility to split a 5 day camp into 2 blocks;

▪ Whilst encouragement should be on camp delivery in NI, travel to and/or use of venues within the **Republic of Ireland and Great Britain** should be permitted, where it can be demonstrated that there is an added good relations benefit and/or that this would represent better value for money. It should be noted that camps must operate within a fixed budget and proposed travel outside NI must be affordable within these parameters;

▪ The **match-funding requirement of £10 per participant should remain.** With greater time and awareness of the concept of the camp programme the potential for match funding from other sources should increase, including in respect of support to mainstream the contact between young people and related impacts into the work of the funded groups on an 'all-year' round basis;

▪ Camps and follow-up work should not be **limited to the traditional summer period** (all year round). Linked to this the name 'summer camp' programme may need to be revisited; and

▪ Year 1 (i.e. 2016/17 post the pilot year) still needs **substantive monitoring and evaluation,** thereafter could progress into annual PPE and 3 year full evaluation cycle. Within this the framework of the six programme outcomes aligned to four priorities of T:BUC remains valid. However there is some work to do to ensure **consistent alignment of the indicators** in the three domains of the OBA Report Card between the Report Card and the format of the Camp Progress and Evaluation Reports and to address a few gaps between the two. Allied to this with more time available in a future (and less compression of the pre-camp phase) there is a need to facilitate proper baselining with young people and to build the capacity and awareness with funded groups as to the key metrics that they will need to report on in due course.

The above recommendations create a range of **changes** that will need to be progressed in the **application form and guidance notes** for 2016 and beyond. These include a single application form that is more streamlined linked to the concept of a single strand with banded participation levels; that tests the feasibility of intended mechanisms to achieve the target PUL/ CNR split; and that is clearer that good relations programming is mandatory, at all three phases (i.e. pre and post camp as well as the main camp phase). Finally less use of jargon in the application form is important in that at least some of the funded groups did find it difficult to articulate intended outcomes

aligned to T:BUC (i.e. our children and young people; our shared community; our safe community; our cultural expression).

Appendix I - Moderation Visit Form; Camp Progress and Evaluation Form and E-Survey

Together: Building a United Community
SUMMER CAMP PILOT 2015
MODERATION VISIT REPORT FORM: STRAND 1

Name of Group	
Date of visit	
Stage of visit -pre-camp/ camp/ post camp stage	
Residential or day camp	
Name of Visiting Officer	
Focus of the moderation visit	

Total programme hours	**Pre-camp**		**Camp**		**Post camp**		**Total**	
Have there been any amendments to the proposed project's times or dates								
If yes, please give details of why amendments were made								

	Total		
Total number of young people present on the day of the visit			

	11-13	**14-16**	**17-19**
Numbers of young people registered for the programme by age bracket			
	PUL	**CNR**	**Other**
Of those registered, please indicate religious affiliation/tradition			
	Paid	**Voluntary**	
Number of leaders involved in the programme			

Comments/observations on engagement of young people in the programme	
Summer camp outcomes	**Comments** **(For guidance refer to Appendix 1)**
1 **Our Children and Young People** Positive attitudinal change towards people from different backgrounds Sustained contact and friendships developed between young people from different backgrounds	
2 **Our Shared Community** Young people are more positive about shared activities (eg, education, leisure) Better recognition of the role young people play in peace building	
3 **Our Safe Community** Projects a safe environment for young people and enables sharing of experiences, skills and facilities	
4 **Our Cultural Expression** Young people have a better understanding and respect for cultural differences	
5 **Innovation** **FOR STRAND 2 GROUPS ONLY** Summer Camps reinforce quality standards and enable lower capacity groups to benefit from the experience; they should be collaborative and encourage skill transference.	
Please comment on the quality of the Good Relations work	

What evidence do you have to support this?

Is your budget on track? If no, what has changed?

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED WITH YOUNG PEOPLE

What have you been doing on the programme to date? What is planned?

How were you recruited?

Do you feel you were adequately informed and prepared for the camp experience – i.e. what was involved in relation to pre-camp learning and engagement?

What would you be doing if you were not on this programme?

Do you think the programme has led you to change your attitudes/behaviour towards others?

Do you intend / have you already been involved in any post camp engagement (e.g. local celebration events, shared learning and reflection after the camp, potential joint community projects etc) that will build on relationships developed at the camp longer term?

Have you any recommendations for future T:BUC programmes?

Signed: _____ **EA Official**

Date: _____

Signed: _____ **OFMDFM Official**

Date: _____

APPENDIX 1

Summer Camps Outcomes	Assessment criteria
Our Children and Young People Positive attitudinal change towards people from different backgrounds Sustained contact and friendships developed between young people from different backgrounds	The project specifically recruits and targets young people living in divided communities and/or young people who don't usually have the opportunity to interact with others from different backgrounds The project provides opportunities for friendships to develop at all stages of the Summer Camps' process and facilitates young people to maintain links after the project is completed.
Our Shared Community Young people are more positive about shared activities (eg, education, leisure) Better recognition of the role young people play in peace building	The project content and delivery reflects and represents the interests and needs of young people and provides opportunities for their voices to be heard throughout the project
Our Safe Community Projects a safe environment for young people and enables sharing of experiences, skills and facilities	The project represents value for money – project partners have an agreed purpose and commitment and the necessary qualifications, expertise and skills to deliver a high quality, responsive and safe experience for all those involved (to include risk assessment and mitigation, appropriate background checks and due diligence)
Our Cultural Expression Young people have a better understanding and respect for cultural differences	The project content and delivery is underpinned by peacebuilding, aimed at challenging stereotypes, increasing understanding and developing positive relationships between young people from different backgrounds
Innovation Summer Camps reinforce quality standards and enable lower capacity groups to benefit from the experience; they should be collaborative and encourage skill transference.	The project is innovative, ambitious and has the potential to provide learning and practice development for future Summer Camp programmes

Summer Camps Programme: 2015 Pilot – Evaluation and Progress Report

Lead Group/organisation			
Contact Name		**Contact number**	

Notes on Evaluation and Progress Report

The purpose of this evaluation/progress report is to demonstrate the following to the Education Authority and OFMdFM;
  i. *That you delivered your project in line with your application form/Letter of Offer*
  ii. *How the Summer Camps Outcomes were delivered by your project*
  iii. *How the views and attitudes of young people changed following their attendance at the camp. (You will need to establish the baseline position with your participants in advance of the camp. How this is done is up to each project.)*

If there is insufficient space for a particular answer then please attach additional sheets and clearly indicate what section the additional information relates to.

Section 1 – What did you do?

Please provide an outline of your camp including:
• **a description of the main activities you delivered at pre camp, camp and post camp**
• **dates of pre camp, camp and post camp**
• **venues used**
• **how you involved parents/guardians in the camp and at which stage**
• **Details of all organisations/groups involved in the project**

Section 2:   How much did you do?
Details of Programme Participants and Staffing

Number of young people	Female			Male	
	11-13	14-16	17-19		Total
Number of leaders (not participants)	Over 25 Yrs		U25 years		Total
	Paid	Voluntary	Paid	Voluntary	

Number of face-to-face hours with young people:				
	Pre Camp	Camp	Post Camp	Total
Total:				

Please provide details of where the Camp participants were from by local government wards?
e.g – Lisbellaw – 4 participants
    Tempo – 12 participants
    Ballinamallard – 4 participants

Did you recruit any of the following young people

Group	If yes please indicate number recruited
With a disability	
From a minority ethnic background	
Not attached to a youth group	
Excluded from school	
Other – Please Specify	

Section 3: How well did you do it?

Please provide the percentage of the total participants who are from Protestant/Unionist/Loyalist (PUL) and Catholic/Nationalist/Republican (CNR) community backgrounds. *You are allowed 20% variance between PUL & CNR communities:*

Total	% PUL	% CNR	% Other	Please explain "other"
				Unknown or unclear backgrounds
100%				

Please provide details on:
- **% young people who completed the project**
- **% of young people who enjoyed the project**
- **% of young people who felt camp environment was open and inclusive and enabled sharing of experiences, skills and facilities.**

You should also provide supporting narrative.

Section 4: Is anyone better off?

In this section we want to know how young people are better off having participated in a camp

In your response to this question, please provide details on:
- **% of young people who made new friends with people from different community backgrounds at the camp.**
- **% of young people who plan to stay in contact with friends made at the camp?**
- **% of young people who on completing the camp, feel more able to talk openly about their culture**
- **% of young people who now feel that young people in NI can make a big contribution in bringing the two main religious communities together over the years to come?**
- **% of young people who having attended the camp have personally benefitted from the experience (e.g. confidence, skills, participants). Please provide details on how young people have personally benefitted.**
- **% of young people, following attending the camp, will now join new groups/activities?**
- **% of young people who now feel safer attending events or activities in areas or facilities often associated with another religion or culture?**
- **% of young people who feel that their cultural background is respected by others?**
- **% of young people who feel more positive in dealing with those from a different community background**
- **% of young people who would now consider taking part in other cross community activities?**

You should also provide supporting narrative.

How did your project specifically recruit and target young people living in divided communities and/or young people who don't usually have the opportunity to interact with others from different backgrounds?

How did your project provide opportunities for friendships to develop at all stages of the Summer Camps process and what opportunities have been put in place to allow young people to maintain links after project?

Describe how the project content and delivery reflected and represented the interests and needs of young people. How did you allow the voices of young people to be heard through the project?

Describe how the project that was delivered;
- **was underpinned by peace-building,**
- **was aimed at challenging stereotypes, and**
- **worked towards increasing understanding and developing positive relationships between young people from different backgrounds.**

Section 4: Project Costs and Value for Money

You were required to provide match funding of £10 per participant. Please detail how this money was raised and how this match funding money was used.

Section 5:

Please add any other comments you feel are appropriate to this evaluation:

The information provided on this form may be made available to other departments/agencies for the purposes of preventing or detecting fraud.

Signed			
Position		Date	

Completed Reports should be returned to:

E-Survey Questionnaire

Covering Email with Survey Link

As you are aware the Strategic Investment Board (SIB) has been appointed to undertake an independent evaluation of the Summer Camp Pilot Programme 2015, with the Lead Evaluator being Stephanie Morrow of SIB.

The evaluation is tasked with capturing the performance, impact and key lessons emerging from the pilot programme in 2015, with a view to informing the business case for a potential future programme beyond the pilot phase.

We appreciate your input already to all of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms put in place by OFMDFM and the Education Authority during the course of the 2015 pilot programme (including the moderation visits, completion of your own camp progress and evaluation reports, input at Shared Learning Forum's etc). All of the material collated through these mechanisms has been very helpful in informing the evaluation and the co-design/ planning process led by OFMDFM and the Education Authority (EA) for a potential future programme beyond the pilot phase.

Attached is a final E-Survey, the purpose of which is to provide a mechanism independent of both OFMDFM and the EA on the 2015 pilot programme now that it is almost complete. Recognising that significant information has already been captured from your group/ organisation already, the survey is mainly focused on areas/ questions that have not extensively explored to date and/or where there are gaps in the evidence base to fully evaluate the pilot programme against the objectives and targets set for the same.

We greatly value your input and feedback. All of the information collected will be treated in strict confidence – no views will be attributed to any particular group/organisation with only aggregate findings will be included in the final evaluation report. The information will only be used to inform the final evaluation of the Summer Camp Pilot Programme 2015 and to inform the business case for a potential future programme beyond the pilot phase.

The survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. If you have any questions on the survey please contact – xxx

Together Building a United Community

Summer Camp Pilot Programme 2015

Survey of Funded Camps

Name of Lead Group/ Organisation	
Title of Funded Summer Camp	

A. *Funding Sources / Leverage*

A key issue in terms of assessing value-for-money of the pilot programme and for future planning is understanding what other investment was leveraged to deliver your camp.

A1: Please can you confirm the total cost to deliver your camp (inclusive of all activities and pre/camp/post phases of activity)?

Total Cost	

A2: Please can you provide a breakdown of the main funding sources for your camp in percentage terms (in the context of the total cost above?)

Funding Source	Percentage
A. Funding From OFMDFM	
B. Participant Match Funding (i.e. the £10 per participant)	
C. Other	

A3: In the context of (C) above please detail the key sources (e.g. own reserves, local authority/ Council, other named funders etc). Please list all that apply.

Other sources of funding/ funders	

B. *Additionality*

An important consideration, again in assessing value-for-money of the pilot programme and for future planning, is consideration of additionality – i.e. what would have happened in the absence of the funding support from OFMDFM.

B1: Which one of the following statements best describes your view on the ability of your organisation to implement your camp in the absence of support from OFMDFM?

	Tick one box only
The camp definitely would have gone ahead	
The camp probably would have gone ahead	
The camp would have gone ahead but on a reduced scale	
The camp would have gone ahead but at a later date	
The camp would have gone ahead but at a reduced scale and at a later date	
The camp would have gone ahead anyway	

C. Measuring Outcomes

In 2015, the monitoring of the Summer Camp Pilot Programme adopted an outcomes based approach aligned to the four outcomes of Together Building a United Community (i.e. our children and young people; our shared community; our safe community; our cultural expression).

C1: How did you find the following aspects of this approach? Please score each aspect from 1-5 where 1 = not at all difficult and 5 = extremely difficult

	Score 1-5
Identifying the T:BUC outcomes that your camp would contribute to in the application form	
Measuring the difference the summer camps made to participants relative to each of the outcome areas	
Capturing evidence on outcomes for participants during the course of the camp to inform moderation visits	
Reporting on outcomes for participants in your own camp progress and evaluation report	

C2: Have you any ideas/ suggestions for improvements / processes that could be put in place to measure outcomes within a potential future programme?

D. Follow Up Contact With Camp Participants

As the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme is coming to a close we are keen to understand what mechanisms have been/ are being put in place to maintain contact with the young people that participated in your camp.

D1: Please indicate all of the existing/ planned mechanisms to maintain contact with the young people that participated in your camp (please tick all that apply)

Funded post camp events	
Use of social media	
Linking the camp participants into the work of your organisation all year around	
Other (please specify)	

E. *Good Relations Content*

The 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme secured the involvement of a wide range of groups and organisations, with differing levels of experience and perspectives on good relations work. Allied to this there have been good opportunities to showcase much of the effective good relations work undertaken (e.g. in challenging stereotypes. building respect for diversity and providing a range of perspectives on the conflict in NI e.g. personal/community/ inter-generational/ international).

E1: In hindsight do you feel that it would have been helpful to have had access to some support / direction around the development of good relations content within your camp programme?

	Tick one box only
Yes	
No	

E2: If you answered 'Yes' to E1 above what form could this support take in a potential future programme? Please tick all that apply below.

Signposting to a range of age appropriate good relations materials	
Access to a pool of good relations	

practitioners/ trainers	
Other (please specify)	

F. *Effectiveness of Management and Administration*

For the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme, strategic leadership and management resided with Programme Board/ OFMDFM. The Education Authority was responsible for operational administration of the programme. In this context please answer the following questions:

F1: How would you rate the strategic leadership/ management of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme by the Programme Board/OFMDFM?

	Tick one box only
Excellent	
Good	
Neither/ Nor (I have no opinion on this)	
Poor	
Very Poor	

F2: How would you rate the operational administration of the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme by the Education Authority?

	Tick one box only
Excellent	
Good	
Neither/ Nor (I have no opinion on this)	
Poor	
Very Poor	

G. *Areas for Improvement*

Through the mechanism of the Shared Learning Forum's and Co-Design sessions with camp participants/ young people, there has been a wealth of information captured on what worked well in the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme and what areas might need to be changed/ improved within a potential future programme.

G1: In order to help prioritise some of the input in this area to date please detail below the top 3 areas (in order of priority) that you would like to see changed in a potential future programme:

	Areas for Improvement / Change
1	
2	
3	

H. *Any other observations / comments?*

Please use the space below to record any other observations/ comments you may have in relation to the 2015 Summer Camp Pilot Programme.

We greatly value your input and feedback. Thank You

Appendix II   List of Funded Camps

Region	Strand 1 0r 2?	Name of Group/Lead Organisation	Project Name
Belfast	Strand 1	New Lodge Arts	Acting Up' Summer Drama Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	Seaview Enterprises	Arsenal FC's 'Double Club' Playing Fair
Belfast	Strand 1	Ballynafeigh Community Development Association	BCDA Hero's Summer Camp 15
Belfast	Strand 1	Streetbeat Youth Project	Beat Retreat
Belfast	Strand 1	St Malachy's Youth Centre	Camp ABC
Belfast	Strand 1	An Droichead	Campa Samhraidh '15
Belfast	Strand 2	Cinemagic	Cinemagic Summer Camps 2015
Belfast	Strand 1	Clonard Monastery Youth Club	Clonard Hammer Academy Making Postive Steps (CHAMPS)
Belfast	Strand 2	Irish Football Association	Connecting communities through the Game of 3 Halves
Belfast	Strand 1	St Oliver Plunkett Football Club	Cross Community Multi-Sports Programme
Belfast	Strand 1	Clubs for Young People	CYP Adventure Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	Clubs for Young People	CYP Volunteer Summer Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group (SLIG)	Difference doesn't have to Equal Bad Relationships
Belfast	Strand 2	Charter for Northern Ireland	Diversionary United Programme
Belfast	Strand 1	East Belfast Area Youth Project	East Belfast United (Young Men's Group)
Belfast	Strand 2	Sport Changes Life Foundation (SCL)	eHoops
Belfast	Strand 1	Shankill United Football Club	Get Together this Summer Rising Star Soccer Academy Summer Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	New lodge Arts	Ideas Factory Summer Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	Ashton Community Trust (Newlodge Youth Centre)	Inner North Belfast Summer Booster School Programme
Belfast	Strand 1	The Terry Enright Foundation	Interface Together

Belfast	Strand 1	Lower Ormeau Residents' Action Group (LORAG)	Intergreat Summer Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	Mountainhill Youth Club	Leading Youth Forward
Belfast	Strand 1	Cliftonville Community Regeneration Forum	Moving Forward Together
Belfast	Strand 1	Falls Community Council AMPS Studio	My Understanding of Social Responsibility Inclusion and Citizenship (MUSIC)
Belfast	Strand 1	Peace Players International NI - (PPI-NI)	PPI-NI Belfast Interface Games (Game of Three Halves Camps and Tournament)
Belfast	Strand 2	Peace Players International NI - (PPI-NI)	PPI-NI Leadership Development Summer Camp
Belfast	Strand 2	Streetbeat Youth Project	Reaching Across Communities
Belfast	Strand 1	Arts for All	Sewing Good Relations
Belfast	Strand 1	Active Communities Network	Shared Summer Sports for all Sorts
Belfast	Strand 2	Ledley Hall Boys' and Girls' Club	Sharing Space, Integrating Communities
Belfast	Strand 1	North Belfast Area Project	SKY Camp
Belfast	Strand 1	East Belfast Area Youth Project	So Near, but Yet so Far CR Programme
Belfast	Strand 1	St Malachy's College	St Malachy's and Hazelwood Partnership
Belfast	Strand 1	Star Neighbourhood Centre	Starmount YEP
Belfast	Strand 1	South Belfast Area Project	The Identity Project
Belfast	Strand 1	Beyond Skin	The World - Our World - Real world
Belfast	Strand 1	Corpus Christi Youth Centre	Time to Change
Belfast	Strand 1	Forthspring Inter Community Group	Together: Faith and Community
Belfast	Strand 1	Manor Street Cliftonville Community Group	Two Sides One Camp
Belfast	Strand 2	Belfast City Council West Belfast DPCSP	West Belfast Summer Camp (Into the West)
Belfast	Strand 2	Youth Initiatives	YI Life Camp

Belfast	Strand 2	Ardoyne Youth Club	
North Eastern	Strand 1	Armoy Community Association	ABC- Armoy Boot Camp
North Eastern	Strand 1	Monkstown Boxing Club	Across the Ring Project
North Eastern	Strand 2	Causeway Coast & Glens Borough Council	All Mixed Up
North Eastern	Strand 1	Ballymena, Antrim and Moyle Area Youth Office	BAM Summer Camp
North Eastern	Strand 1	EA - North Eastern Region Youth Service Antrim Youth Office	Camp Culture
North Eastern	Strand 2	Camp Shamrock	Camp Shamrock
North Eastern	Strand 1	Coleraine Area Youth Office	CBM Summer Camp
North Eastern	Strand 1	NI Youth Forum	Fight For Peace
North Eastern	Strand 1	Corrymeela	Freestyle 11:13
North Eastern	Strand 1	Corrymeela	Freestyle 14:16
North Eastern	Strand 1	Loughgiel Community Youth Club	Good Relations Project
North Eastern	Strand 1	EA - North Eastern Region	Mid and East Antrim Coast Summer Camp
North Eastern	Strand 1	Muckamore Cricket and Lawn Tennis Club	Muckamore Community Sport Camp
North Eastern	Strand 1	Kells and Connor Youth	Pathfinders
North Eastern	Strand 1	EA - North Eastern Region	Peer Leadership for Summer Camp Initiative
North Eastern	Strand 1	Rathcoole Area Youth Project	Rathcoole Bawnmore Cross Community 'Shared Spaces'
South Eastern	Strand 2	Resurgam Youth Initiative	Creating Inclusive Communities
South Eastern	Strand 1	Downpatrick Community Collective	Downpatrick Community Youth Camp
South Eastern	Strand 2	Ards Rural Project	Epic
South Eastern	Strand 1	Ballymote Sports and wellbeing centre	From the Cradle to the Grave
South Eastern	Strand 1	Glebe House Harmony Trust	Hands across the Lough

South Eastern	Strand 1	Inclusion Unit	Making Waves 2015
South Eastern	Strand 1	Greater Dunmurry Positive Relationships Partner	Old Firm Alliance
South Eastern	Strand 2	EA South Eastern region	Youth Voices In Peace
South Eastern	Strand 1	Holywood Family Trust	ZONE Dealing With Difference Programme
Southern	Strand 1	Colette Ross, EA SR, Banbridge YRC	Bann Youth Camp
Southern	Strand 1	Wayne Morris, EA SR, Newry Area Youth Service	Building United Communities in South Armagh
Southern	Strand 2	Rab McGrogan, EA SR, Youth Service	Colour My World
Southern	Strand 1	Eithna McCracken, EA SR, Cookstown YRC	Cookstown Summer Peace Camp
Southern	Strand 2	Colette Murray, EA SR, Craigavon Area Youth Office	Craigavon Peace Camp
Southern	Strand 1	Anne Murphy, Laurencetown Summer Scheme	Empowering Volunteers to Make a Difference
Southern	Strand 1	Adrian Hutchinson, Taghnevan Youth Club	Lurgan Town Peace Camp
Southern	Strand 1	Mark McCann, Respect Project	Respect Summer Sport & Education Camp
Southern	Strand 2	Stephen Smith, Community Intercultural Programme	Youth Fusion
Southern	Strand 2	Godfrey McCartney, ABC	
Southern	Strand 1	JIMS Youth Centre	
Western	Strand 2	EA Western Region Strabane	BASE Camp (Belonging Accepting Supporting Equality)
Western	Strand 1	EA Youth Service Western Region	Bridges over the Roe
Western	Strand 1	Devenish Partnership Forum	Building Bridges
Western	Strand 1	Youth Sport Omagh	Cross Community Sports Camp
Western	Strand 1	The Nerve Centre	FabCamp!
Western	Strand 2	Fermanagh & Omagh District Council	Fermanagh & Omagh Youth Camps
Western	Strand 1	Stem Aware CIC	Innovate Camp 2015
Western	Strand 1	Omagh Boys & Girls Club	Keep on track

Western	Strand 1	Rochester's Amateur Boxing Club	Legenderry Boxing Camp 2015
Western	Strand 1	Greysteel Community Enterprise	New Friends Good Relations
Western	Strand 2	EA Youth Service	North West Peace Camp
Western	Strand 1	Cathedral Youth Club	Our Colourful History
Western	Strand 1	Longtower Youth Club	Our Shared Community
Western	Strand 1	Owenkillew Community Development Association	Owenkillew Summer Camp
Western	Strand 2	South West College	Peace Champions
Western	Strand 1	Verbal Arts Centre	Peace Correspondents
Western	Strand 1	Verbal Arts Centre	Reading Rooms: Pearl on the Foyle
Western	Strand 2	Roe Valley Residents Association	Same but Different Project
Western	Strand 1	REACH Across	Summer Activities & Integrated Learning (S.A.I.L)
Western	Strand 2	EA Western Region Inclusion Unit South West Division	Summer Camp - You, me…WE!
Western	Strand 1	EA Youth Service	SYNC - Rock Camp
Western	Strand 1	Irish Street Community Association	To be decided by the young people
Western	Strand 2	Derrylin O'Connells	Whose ball is it anyway?

Appendix III - Areas for Improvement Cited in the E-Survey

The E-Survey asked respondents the following question in relation to areas for improvement:

'G1: In order to help prioritise some of the input in this area to date please detail below the top 3 areas (in order of priority) that you would like to see changed in a potential future programme.'

The responses to this question (which were provided in 'free text') are summarised overleaf:

Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Longer time scale for programme	Flexibility around where to recruit young people from	Grater staff to young people ratios
2 part application process to include more input from young people	better lead in time from notice of funding to project beginning	Easier form to fill out
notification of funding much earlier	To include specific evidence based learning worksheets for all groups	To include methods to celebrate success from the camps to the respective wider community
REPONSES TO APPLICATION MADE QUICKER / SUCCCESFUL/UNSUCCESSFUL	Application Form (with fewer pages)	More time for notice of follow-u[p events
Make a Good Relations module specific to summer camp	Funding to be made available earlier than last year as a lot of facilities had already been booked by the time the letter of offer came through	One application per organisation
Provision of itemised receipts for expenditure.	Further freedom to use travel as part of the camp experience - Across the border, UK wide or a European experience	communication between funders and applicants
Applications to made available earlier than last year	Appropriate application of funds in line with programme	Higher rate facilitation costs
Different amounts of funding available i.e. funding to fit the programme as opposed to a programme to fit the funding	Efficient funding for Residential costs	more young people from Section 75 taking on a leadership role within camp, this cannot happen if we are counting
Deadlines for applications met	Inclusion of young people from Section 75 which are excluded from society	Catholics and Protestants. to be fully inclusive we need to stop counting percentages of groupings
Appropriate timing for release of funds	Increase amount of level one application	Management, administration, evaluation and advertising costs
less about Catholic/Protestant numbers - the 60/40 does not reflect the numbers living in the Derry area	Quicker response to smaller proposals	Our Cultural Expression
Timescale of application	Our Shared Community	Travel outside Northern Ireland
Earlier application opening	Programme Resources	Publicity that is current - meet up say at a place like Corrymeela
Application process completed before school term finishes.	Funding for preparation and recruitment purposes	scale
Our Children & Young People:	Access to practitioners particularly in rural areas	Earlier notification of funding.
Future Programme Funding	numbers to participate	camp extension funds - realistic numbers of young people coming together again.
Longer lead in time	Faster turn around on funding decisions - too tight in terms of receipt of funding and delivery	young people drop off.
Emphasis on real outcomes that are delivered - not something captured on paper	Longer-term commitment to fund 2 - 3 years – facilitating a progression for past participants, re-engaged as leaders in future camps.	more youth work approach and money to be spread out for more activities
time frame		Targeting of young people who will benefit most and then supporting them
The camps should be allowed to take place outside of NI	Shorter Application Form	
Continued focus on peace building and reconciliation outcomes.		
More time required for form	Shorter Application Form	
Earlier notification of funding allocated - this was very late	More straightforward form, very repetitive.	to future projects

and lead to difficulties getting venues etc booked.	Better evaluation process	More flexibility in how the funding is spent in order to be able to better respond to the needs of the group
More networking facilities among all the groups involved	the guidance notes should be more specific	
more time to plan	i.e. % of participants coming together	
Timescale	Programme Costs	More work at the start and more youth led, an idea of a youth council to inform the programme of their needs
wider age group 16-25 year olds	More sustained work with the client base	
small grants for peer educator training / steering groups	Pre camp was essential but time was short	
increased finances for paid coaches to deliver the best	much more guidance & signposting to relevant authorities	
Earlier access to application process	Earlier decision making in terms of successful applications	
Older age limit 16-25 year olds	More structure of what is needed in relation to trips etc	