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Summary

This report presents an evaluation of the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project. The evaluation was conducted in a 4-day workshop by the children and the caregivers who participated in the project.

The first two days of the workshop set the foundation for the evaluation by enhancing the participants understanding of the process of conducting an evaluation. Thereafter the participants applied what they had learnt to evaluating the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project, focusing on the processes and outcomes of the project.

Overall, the children and caregivers concluded that the project had achieved its main objective which was facilitating children’s inputs into the deliberations on the Children’s Bill. The project also resulted in significant personal growth for the children and the caregivers. The workshop participants also felt that the project had impacted on children and adults in their communities by raising awareness about children’s rights and the Children’s Bill.

However there were some shortcomings in the project. The participants identified lack of or little communication between the Children’s Institute and themselves and between the 4 provincial teams as the main weakness in the project. Media publication of the children’s stories and identities was mentioned as a negative unintended outcome of the project.

The main lessons from the project pertain to the management of future child participation projects, to ensure better communication amongst all participants and appropriate follow-up on implementing project action plans.

The workshop was itself a valuable exercise for the participants, all of whom had not previously been involved in evaluating a project.
Introduction

The Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project started in 2003 with the aim of facilitating children’s input into the final provisions of the Children’s Bill. The specific objectives of the project were to:

1. Understand the challenges faced by children
2. Inform the children about the provisions that currently exist in the Children’s Bill
3. Equip the children with skills to become advocates in their own lives
4. Implement an advocacy strategy that will enable the children’s views to be heard in the deliberations around the Children’s Bill

The Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project was initiated by the Children’s Institute (CI). It was linked to a broader Children’s Bill Project at the CI, which facilitates a national network of civil society organisations to participate in the Children’s Bill law-reform process.¹ Four non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working with children were approached to become partners in the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project. These were: OIL in the Western Cape; Zisize Trust in KwaZulu Natal (KZN); Samaritan Centre in Limpopo; and Naledi Lifeskills in the North West provinces. These partner organisations selected the children that participated in the project and provided an adult caregiver for the children in each provincial team.

Three children aged 11-17 years from each province were selected through detailed procedures that took into account ethical issues such as consent from the children and their guardians, anonymity, confidentiality and the responsibilities and support available for the children from both the CI and the NGOs involved. The project was scheduled to run from 2003-2006. However, the children’s Bill processes have continued into 2007 and the children have continued to participate with support from the CI.

During the project, the children made submissions to provincial and national parliament and conducted advocacy activities in their local communities. They also recruited other children in their communities to participate in and support their activities. The CI also held an annual workshop where the 12 children came together. Each workshop had a specific theme as follows:

- 2003: Introduction workshop: where the children and caregivers met each other and the facilitators
- 2004: Parliamentary hearings workshop: to introduce the children and caregivers to the Children’s Bill and the law reform process
- 2005: Activity evaluation workshop: to evaluate the activities that the children were conducting, develop action plans for future activities and further develop law reform literacy
- 2006: Project evaluation and closing workshop: to evaluate the project over the last 4 years

¹ For further details on this project see http://ci.org.za/site/frames.asp?section=lawreform
The focus of this report is the final workshop at which the children and caregivers evaluated the project. The report describes objectives of the workshop; provides descriptions of the procedures and activities employed; and the caregivers’ and children’s evaluation of the project. The lessons that can be drawn from both the workshop and critical reflections of the project from the CI staff that were involved in the project are also presented.

1. Overview of the workshop

From 4-7 December 2006, the CI held a workshop in Cape Town to evaluate the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project. The workshop was attended by 9 of the children, aged 14-19 years: 2 from Western Cape; 2 from Limpopo; 3 from KZN; 2 from North West; and the three caregivers from Limpopo, KZN and North West provinces. The Western Cape team did not have a caregiver as she had left the organisation through which the children were recruited shortly after the start of the project. The workshop was facilitated by Lizette Berry and Wanjurir Mukoma from the Children’s Institute and Gabriel Urgoiti, an independent consultant. The children facilitated most of the games and energisers and some of the sessions.

The workshop was guided by the following questions:

- What is evaluation?
- What are examples of how children experience evaluation in their everyday lives?
- Why do we evaluate?
- What do we need to evaluate in our project?
- What evaluation questions and indicators do we develop to evaluate the project?

Some of the workshop activities are described in detail in this report, so as to set the context for the evaluations that the participants provided. As much as possible, the children and caregivers presentations, discussions, evaluations and reports are presented as they wrote or said them. However in a few instances these have been edited for comprehension.

2. Workshop objectives

The workshop objectives were:

1. To obtain report-backs on the activities of each provincial team during the past year
2. For the participants to understand the meaning of evaluation why it was important to evaluate the project
3. To provide the opportunity to the youth to evaluate themselves and the project, focussing on processes and outcomes
4. To establish the caregivers perceptions of the impact of the project on the lives of the participating children, their communities, and on themselves
The workshop was designed to be a participatory process that allowed the children to be part of developing the evaluation agenda and as well as facilitating some of the activities. Day 1 was spent introducing the participants to the concept of evaluation and why it is important to evaluate. It was important to spend a fair amount of time on this as it would not have been possible for the participants to evaluate the project without a good understanding of what evaluation means. The purpose was therefore to demystify the concept so that the participants felt confident to undertake the task of evaluating the project. Some everyday life examples of evaluation were used to discuss how evaluation is conducted and sources of evaluation information.

On Day 2, the participants started to apply what they had learnt about evaluation to the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project. Individual drawings depicting their assessment of the project were used to facilitate the discussion. The participants identified areas of the project that they thought were necessary to evaluate and developed evaluation questions for each area. Days 3 and 4 were spent on answering these questions to provide an overall evaluation of the project from each provincial group. The caregivers participated in all the activities.
DAY 1: Understanding evaluation

1.1 Introductions and icebreaker

The workshop begun with introductions, icebreakers and setting of some ground rules. The facilitators and the group then agreed that everyone could use the language that they were most comfortable with. The caregivers agreed to provide the necessary translation. As some of the participants were already 18, there was a discussion as to how they would like to be referred to, children or youth. They agreed that both terms could be used during the workshop to accommodate everyone.

1.2 Reports from the provinces

Although within the provinces some of the children had been in contact, the whole group had not met since the activity evaluation workshop a year before. On Day 1, each group was therefore given the opportunity to report back on the activities that they had been involved in during the year. Their reports are presented below.

Limpopo

Activities and achievements:

- Participated by speaking about children’s rights at community meetings organised by ward councilors
- Continued to run support groups for orphaned and vulnerable children
- Participated in a soccer clubs tournament
- Continued to consult with stakeholders and groups of children about the Children’s Bill
- We have gained publicity as Dikwankwetla
- We are role models, we help other children with their problems, help others realise the importance of children’s rights
- We have a good relationship with stakeholders such as ward councilors
- We have made a mark in the province and they receive calls regarding our work and children’s rights.
- We made our submissions to the provincial parliamentary committee
- We think we will continue with what we’ve been doing even though this is the last workshop.

Difficulties and challenges:

- Difficulties in reaching many children because we could not meet regularly as we did not have money for transport
• We attended the hearings and made presentations but the chairperson of the Portfolio Committee has been appointed as Member of the Executive Council (MEC) for transport. We are therefore not sure that our submissions will make it to the provincial parliament
• Other people’s attitudes were a problem. We have to deal with people who do not want to hear about children’s rights

**Provincial hearings:**

The group narrated their experience of making a presentation to the Provincial Portfolio Committee on Health and Social Development\(^2\) in Dendron in Polokwane during the public hearings on the Children’s Amendment Bill.

• “At first we were not allowed by the parliamentary administrator to present because the Committee didn’t know about us. Lucy, (Senior Advocacy Co-ordinator of the Children’s Institute) insisted that we be allowed to present. Someone from the Department of Social Development who knew about Dikwankwetla informed the Chairperson and we were allowed to present. The submission was difficult for Xolani who presented because someone told him to face the camera when he was talking about his experience, which made him nervous. There were about 300-400 people at the hearings. The Chairperson was the only parliamentarian in the Committee, the others were councillors. The MP has now been appointed MEC for transport. We are worried that our submissions may not make it to Parliament.”

**KwaZulu-Natal**

**Activities and achievements:**

• We went to a community radio station and spoke about children’s rights and Dikwankwetla. We informed them about rights and responsibilities, for example, you can’t say you have a right to education whilst you’re not doing your homework or a right to play without doing your house chores.
• We have started an acting group and we plan to go school by school to talk about Dikwankwetla.
• We have formed a new Dikwankwetla group. Each one of us has a specific group of children. We gave each of them a Dikwankwetla T-shirt so they can be seen as members of Dikwankwetla. Some NGOs are helping us with the new group.
• We made submissions to the Committee on Social Welfare in Ulundi

\(^2\) The Portfolio Committee is part of the Limpopo Legislature, the hearings were held on the 15\(^{th}\) November 2006, in Dendron, a small town in the district of Capricorn, an hour’s drive from the provincial capital, Polokwane.
**Provincial hearings:**

The KZN group had also made submissions in their province. They narrated their experience.

- “During the journey to Ulundi we got stuck and so the boys and the other boys had to push the car. We were wearing our Dikwankwetla T-shirts and everyone was asking what Dikwankwetla is. We told them and they were all very impressed. We were surprised to find that Parliament has old buildings with cracked windows. There were 4 Members of Parliament, their legal adviser and 6 other people apart from us (Dikwankwetla). The social worker from Ingwavuma was also there. We went with someone from Zisize Educational Trust. The advisor went through the S76 in Zulu. We played the CD\(^3\) and gave the parliamentarians the CD. We also invited them to come to Ingwavuma. We also spoke about child slavery. The MPs said they would invite us to the provincial parliament to give the submission. The Chairperson gave us R100 which we used to buy ice-cream.”\(^4\)

**North West**

**Activities and achievements:**

- On 6 January 2006 we met other children from the province and spoke about Dikwankwetla and what we had been doing.
- On the 7\(^{th}\) of January we organised a door-to-door campaign in the Madibe village to inform children about drugs, rights and HIV. These children helped us to do the door to door campaign. We found many problems in the community including lack of food and lack of documentation – identity cards, birth certificates. We referred the problems to the Departments of Labor, Education, Home Affairs and Department of Social Development. Our aim was to organise a gathering for parents in the village. We talked about drugs, taking care of siblings, and child abuse.
- After the door to door campaign we held a meeting and invited the chairperson of the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) who talked about education. We also invited the Department of Transport, and the Departments of Home Affairs and Health because of the lack of documentation like birth certificates.
- We made T-shirts and school bags with a Dikwankwetla logo. We donated 100 school-bags to needy children.


• We had a campaign on school-fees exemption for schools around the area. The principals in the schools make the parents of these kids who don’t have money work in the school garden or clean the school toilets. We spoke to the principals about not doing so. We also met with school principals in Harrismith to talk about Dikwankwetla.

• One of us has been invited to be a speaker about children’s rights by a lady that is doing campaigns about children’s rights in the village. She was also invited to a 5-week workshop in Eduland on self development.

• Costs for our activities and transport were shared between Naledi and CI. Naledi paid for the T-shirts.

*The North West and Western Cape provincial hearings had not been conducted by the time the evaluation workshop was held.*

**Western Cape**

**Activities and achievements:**

The two remaining members of this group did not see each other the whole year but each did some work individually. They reported on these individual activities.

**Member 1**

• Did a lot of volunteer work in the HIV home for abandoned and abused children, did workshops, talked to the children about their problems, where they can go to, where they can get help and what they need to know in order to get help for themselves. I also raised funds and bought a stove for the home.

• I was part of a team to run for the Student Representative Council which requires a community project and a project within the school. I organised the matric project where I spoke about Dikwankwetla and what we do, and about the Bill. I was appointed deputy head student which is easier because I can connect with all the other schools. I have met with deputy head principal in middle school and have arranged a leadership workshop for 2007 of how Dikwankwetla and the learners can work together.

• I also spoke about Dikwankwetla at the Mzansi carnival.

**Member 2**

• I work with an NGO so I had access to 4 different schools where I talked about child abuse and drug use.

• Met once with Lucy from the CI regarding the submission.

• Went to Canada in September and talked about child abuse and structures that should be put in place and responsibility of adults.
Helped with the fires in Masiphumelele.

After the provincial reports, the objectives of the workshop were discussed and agreed upon by the facilitators and the participants. The next session was an introduction to the concept of evaluation. Most of Day 1 was spent on getting participants to understand evaluation. This was important in laying the foundation for evaluating the Dikwankwetla project.

1.3 What is evaluation?

1.3.1 Introduction to evaluation

In the first activity, participants were asked to write one word that came to mind when they thought of evaluation. The words that the group came up with included achievements; constructive criticism; checking; processing, scanning, designing, looking back, examination. These words showed that even though most of the participants had never before systematically evaluated a project, they had an understanding of the concept of evaluation. The subsequent discussions and activities were based upon unpacking these words and identifying the similarities in the words that the group came up with.

The next activity was on applying the concepts that the group identified to some real life situations.

Four newsprints, each with a topic written on it were placed in different parts of the room as far apart as possible. The topics were:

1. the workshop venue;
2. the breakfast we had this morning;
3. the icebreaker exercise we did earlier;
4. transport in the country.

Participants were asked to select one of the topics. Ten minutes were allocated for each group to evaluate the topic as fully as possible by writing down evaluation statements on the newsprint. When this task was completed, each group moved clockwise to the next topic underneath which the previous group had written some evaluation statements. Each group then had to consider the previous group’s evaluation statements carefully, and for each statement, write a question they thought the previous group might have asked to arrive at their evaluation statement. They were also asked to write other questions that could have been in the minds of the previous group. When this task was completed, the whole group went to one of the topics and the questions were read to the whole group. This continued until the group was finished with the four topics.

The facilitator then asked the group what they felt and learnt from the activity. The children discussed how they had arrived at the questions they developed based on another group’s statement. The facilitator explained that the purpose
of this exercise was for the participants to recognise that behind every evaluation statement, we all have assumptions, values and questions. There is a standard, an expectation or a set of values that we consciously or unconsciously are trying to reach. It is therefore important for people that are doing evaluation to be clear about the assumptions, values and standards which are setting for themselves. The group then discussed some assumptions that they make in their everyday lives such as assuming what country a person is from based upon the tone of their skin colour. The facilitator emphasised that the group should be careful not to base evaluation of the project on assumptions but on facts.

One of the children facilitated the next session on evaluating in our daily lives. The children listed the following as evaluations that they conduct in their lives and why:

- How I dress: you have to evaluate because you need to know whether it will be appropriate
- I evaluate how to do my hair
- I evaluate what clothes to wear depending on the weather
- I evaluate when and how to ask my mother something, depending on the mood she is in

The discussion on evaluation in daily life gave participants the assurance that evaluating the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project would not be a complicated task that they could not undertake. They concluded:

- Evaluation is something that we do aware and unaware
- Evaluation does not only have to be in a big research project where you plan, design etc.
- It is something that we do naturally and it is important that we don’t look at this task (evaluating the project) as a heavy task; it is something that we do all the time.
1.3.2 Why do we evaluate?

The participants brainstormed why it is important to conduct evaluations. They came up with the following:

- to make it better/improve it the next time
- to see what your weaknesses/strong points are – wrongs/rights
- to control ourselves – to help make decisions on specific issues
- for personal growth/development
- to keep us motivated – we find out about our achievements and our failures
- to see where we come from and where we are going
- to see if it was worth it spending time doing a particular thing, energy, human resources, funds, materials and also time of the people that have been impacted on by the project
- to see what went wrong
- to assess the impact – effect that it has on something (lives, communities, decision-makers, and children). How has this project changed the lives of the people involved in the project?

As evident from the statements above, the participants had an understanding of the purpose of evaluation and uses of evaluation results. Some of the statements they made on the uses of evaluation results led to discussions about the impact of the project. Some participants mentioned that it was difficult to say that the project alone had resulted in their and other children’s personal development as there were also other projects that impacted on them. The facilitator explained that the impact of the project on the lives of the children/communities will also vary, as it had not impacted on everyone in the same way.

The facilitator summarised the evaluation process as: gathering information from the right sources; making sense of the information (analysis); putting together the information; reporting the information; taking action based upon the results of the evaluation.

The facilitator explained that to evaluate the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project, the sources of information would be the participants in the room, bearing in mind that they all had different perceptions. The concept of monitoring was also introduced and explained, ending Day 1. The participants then evaluated the day’s activities.
1.4 Participants' evaluation of day 1

The “throw the ball” method was used to obtain the following feedback from participants on the activities of Day 1. A small ball is thrown around from one participant to the next. Only the person holding the ball is allowed to speak, and then throw the ball to someone else when finished.

Participants' feedback on Day 1

- today was good, it laid good foundations for the evaluation
- the facilitators are good, the workshop was helpful
- today was useful, it gave me a good idea of the rest of the workshop, it was worth it
- the workshop was great, useful
- laying the foundation was good – it was focused, was more efficient and did not waste time like we had before in other workshops
- it was great because I didn’t know what evaluation was, and now I know and will teach others
- I though it was good, I thought it would be difficult to have new facilitators (Wanjiru and Gabriel were not involved in the project from the start or the 3 previous workshops), but it was alright.
DAY 2: What should we evaluate?

Day 2 started with a re-cap from the participants’ of what they did and learnt the previous day. This was done using the ‘throwing the ball’ method. Most of the participants mentioned having learnt the meaning and definitions of evaluation as the most important lesson from the previous day.

The participants were then shown a sketch of a face profile of an old woman, which when viewed from different angles was also a face profile of a young lady. Each participant was asked to write what they saw in the sketch. The participants all saw different things in the sketches. The facilitator discussed the importance of this exercise in the context of the Dikwankwetla project. The aim was to get the participants to understand that perceptions play an important role in our lives, depending on factors such as our context, culture, beliefs and values. Thus, in evaluating Dikwankwetla, there were no right or wrong answers and everyone would view some aspects of the project differently. The facilitator summarised the importance of the exercise.

This exercise is important because:
- Things are not always as they seem
- We don't see things the same way
- You can interpret the same thing in different ways
- Different people can perceive the same event or situation in different ways.
- Sometimes you need to take a moment to step back and look at it again
- We should take this into consideration that we will have different opinions
- We might be thinking that we're doing everything the right way and other people might feel that its not right
- It's not about right or wrong it is the different ways in which we perceive things.

2.1 Evaluating the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project

2.1.1 Where we are coming from?

In the next activity, the participants were asked to individually draw a picture that told the story of the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project and what it meant to them. Each participant then explained their drawing to the group as presented below. The group was allowed to ask questions about each other’s drawings.

The aim of this exercise was to allow the participants to reflect on the project so far, and to enable others to understand it from the perspective of different participants.
2.1.2 The children’s drawings

**Xolani:** “Light represents the light of success. The children are now coping with their problems and problems of other children.”

**Jack:** “The picture has a road as a centre of the whole drawing because as we said yesterday this has been a journey. The road has all our names and represents the journey that we have been through. At the start of the road is the mountain and a boat ‘coz we met in Hout Bay for the first time. Then parliament represents our submission. The sun for me represents what we’ve done in this project will lead other people and our selves will bring hope to their lives. Palm tree represents the Palm House guest house where had our last workshop”

**Vuyo:** “This is a home and there’s a boy working in the garden and he didn’t go to school because he didn’t know that he had the right to education. The Dikwankwetla group we went and gave a talk and he now knew he had the right to school and so he went to school and now my second picture is in a school and there’re children celebrating the right to education and the 3rd picture are children with a billboard celebrating the right to education. Some children do not believe that it’s worth it going to school.”

**Nandi:** “There’s a road showing that since we started, we come from far, different provinces and as we went along we learnt how to share with each other from different provinces, walked this journey together.”

**Tsepho:** “At the top is parliament because in the first workshop we leant a lot about things that they do in the parliament about the Children’s Bill and children’s rights. The other is a body map that has everything about our community where we have problems like drug abuse and alcohol. Then the home where I live, the shop and church and graveyards, because in 2001 I lost my great-grandmother and in 2003 my mom and uncle. And then over here are flowers just to say that Dikwankwetla was a success. We learnt a lot. We come from different communities and had the opportunity to come together and we learnt about children’s rights.”

---

5 Pseudonyms have been used for the children and caregivers.
Henry: “I’ve drawn two roads. On top of the tree, people were trying to see what was on top of the tree but they were just walking around. Inside the tree is a symbol ‘Dikwankwetla children’s action’. It helped me a lot although there were circumstances and problems but it was good – problems like losing my parent although my father was a terrible person to me it was still terrible to lose him. The project helped me to be brave. Everyone’s trying to reach on top of the tree that’s where Dikwankwetla is. The tree provides shade to people and that’s what the project represents to me.”

Uyazi: “I have a Dikwankwetla flower. When I was in this group I was not thinking it will be a success and that’s why I drew all these small flowers to represent that. When I was here I didn’t know how to talk about my mom because I was very young and about getting abused and I learnt on this project how I can talk about it. This flower the bigger one means that you’re now growing up you are now getting successful – Dikwankwetla is growing up. The biggest flower shows Dikwankwetla that we’re a group. It’s a journey of growth from the small flower, bigger and biggest; it represents growth of Dikwankwetla group. The project helped me a lot to talk about personal issues.”

Jane: “Before we became a group we were all little caterpillars doing our own business. The Cocoon represents the CI which gave us what we needed and motivated us. Then we started breaking out of the CI to become our own groups. Although the CI are still there to help us and support us we have formed on our own what we want Dikwankwetla to be. The trail represents the communication problems, the things that we did that we may not do again like people who want to be Dikwankwetla but are not. The bee is all the other people that supported us and the people we helped with rights and responsibilities. In the butterfly the colour red represents the other people who helped us so in our wings we have a touch of red representing those people who helped us. It also represents peace and happiness which is what we’ve done and those we influenced the most. From the Cape Town people for example, it wasn’t hard but I think it would have been easier if we had a
caregiver because it was very hard for the CI to communicate with us and with the other groups and us communicating between ourselves. Just the small things that could’ve encouraged us. The bumble bee is the caregivers, the people that sponsored the bags, the ministers, the people who listened to our submissions and came back and said thank you.”

Beauty: “The little house is where we started we were still young. The road that goes up to the mountain, there are some obstacles in the road that we had during our journey. Like when we told people what we were doing, the negative response that we got. The dark clouds represent some of the obstacles like the time when we had to do the provincial hearings and it didn’t happen because the dates had changed. Then there were this shining moments represented by the star like going to parliament and now we’re at the top of the mountain. The obstacles were things from people outside the project – e.g. the door-to door campaign.”

2.1.3 The caregivers’ drawings

Siphokazi: “The flowers in front of the house show how attractive this project was to the children because of the demand for this service. But that was the CI’s initiative when they invited us to bring children who are from difficult circumstances. I took that as a strong foundation that we got from the CI. The bricks were the projects that we ran like the children’s rights awareness, the children’s Bill etc. In between the bricks was the support that we go from the CI. At times we do communicate although on a small scale. We communicated with them where we got stuck. The roofing – the children who were going to be in this house, the group, they were protected- they knew their rights and assisted other children with their rights. Although there was bad weather at times, we were protected by the resources that we had around us. The door is open because the project was open to all the children. The windows were other resources that came in to assist like from DSD, Education Department, the parliamentarians etc. The flowers represent the development that this group went through. They developed so much that as Nandi said when we started we didn’t know that we going to have this project. They were so quiet and now hey have developed so much that Xolani can stand and say I will speak to represent the group. These children are stars. The big tree is my personal growth I learnt a lot from this project. When I came here I thought I was bringing children that were from difficult circumstances. The knowledge I brought here and how I’ve grown to me was my foundation. When they talk about children’s rights in my province they always call me. There were weeds around the flowers but we always tried through the workshops and through consulting to remove the weeds that were trying to become a problem to the children. We have the house but no furniture yet which means we still need more knowledge. The children are running projects and hero books⁶ and what protects these children is the strength they got from the CI and the workshops.”

⁶ A “hero book” is a document and process in which the child is the author, illustrator, main character and editor. It is a form of memory work designed to give them power over a specific challenge in their life
Noma: “I was trying to show where the project started, by involving people from different provinces and deep rural areas. The selection involved more than one province. This is the flight. The modern house unlike the huts in the corner is when they flew to the city. You can see in their faces that they were not sure what’s going on. They had handouts and they learnt. They went back to their provinces. These are other kids that were then involved in this. The big eye and everyone holding this big eye bravely and happily and with their own big eyes showing that this project was an eye-opener. Everyone now knows what it is, what is going on and they’re enthusiastic and can even tell other kids. By involving more kids it means that the few that were trained here they took this and spread it to others. To me as the carer I’ve learnt a lot and even I’ve entered this in my CV. Working on the children’s Bill to tell the truth I didn’t know about all the steps that need to be taken. Going to parliament to me it was something else. I didn’t know that as I am I can go there. I thought that it was for very high people to go to parliament. It has made me know that it’s a matter of organising, negotiating and talking and you can be there. Even in my area now I know that it doesn’t have to be an adult who can go to the municipality to raise issues. I now encourage children to go to these places and ask and say what they think. When we started and they said of parliament I thought why didn’t they tell us we should have brought the brilliant children? But when the children got there I realised that it doesn’t mean that if you have experienced difficulties in your life you can’t stand up for your rights. We’re copying what we’re doing here and now in our province we don’t have a problem to start the project and do it step by step and not rushing to the conclusion. The steps we’ve been taking since we started they’ve made me realise you must do something step by step. In now 5 schools we’ve formed the groups, 10 per school and they are also heroes that are going to help us as a project. Now the carers we didn’t even know each other but now if we have a problem I can phone either of them.”

Ayanda: “This little shrub is Dikwankwetla before, when we started we had no idea about what does going to happen. We had problems not only the kids but also the caregivers then we shared our problems, we never thought that we’d be one. We didn’t have the name Dikwankwetla. The roots of the shrub says that even though we had small and didn’t know what the future would
hold for us, these roots say to me that we were willing to learn and to change whatever attitudes. Some of us had attitudes towards certain things. I remember when we the carers met we were gossiping about the CI. These people made us bring children who have problems and we know that children who have problems cannot participate in parliament, why didn’t they tell us to bring children who are from model C who can communicate etc. It was such a learning curve. These are the things that say to me we come from far. The water I which the roots are represents the CI. We were drawing everything from the CI – our transport, food, etc from the beginning of the project to the end we have been drawing strength from the CI and they have taught us a lot of things including with our personal growth. The ground represents the firmness of the project. We’ve come from different NGOs and we got support from these NGOs. The big tree shows that we have grown and the roots are much deeper. The fruits say that we came here talking about the Bill, the S75 is now an Act, it’s the fruits, were’ no longer talking about the Bill but amendment. The other fruits are the work that we’ve done in our different provinces. The project has made us caregivers activists.”

2.1.4 Photo-history

The facilitators put together a slide show of various photographs taken during the period of the project. After presentations of the drawings, the photographs were shown in order to further help the participants to remember some of the projects’ moments, activities, places and people.

The participants mentioned various things, activities, people, places and feelings that the photos helped them to remember:

- Sharing, getting to know each other
- Hard work, and lots of fun
- Good techniques used to enable speaking about deep issues, they used techniques that were light and safe (body mapping)
- Parliament
- The enjoyment
- Teamwork
- The impact of other people – how they influenced us
- The hero-book experience
- Happy feelings, happy times
- We were well cared for

The participants were asked to write two words depicting what the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project meant to them:
2.2 What should we evaluate?

In the activity that followed, the participants were reminded of the objectives of the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project. The children were then asked to brainstorm aspects of the project that they wanted to evaluate.

They listed the following 10 areas:

1. Communication between the participants and the CI and between the provincial teams
2. Awareness raised by the project regarding children’s rights
3. Facilitation of previous workshops by the CI and workshop methodology
4. The impact of parliamentary submissions and the process of making the submissions
5. Changes that occurred in the participants’ lives and in the lives of others
6. The value of the criteria that the CI employed to select project participants
7. The impact of making the hero books and how these have helped the participants and others
8. The consent procedures employed by the CI
9. Who is Dikwankwetla now? Looking at the way forward for the project.
10. The name of the project
2.3 What evaluation questions do we ask?

After listing the 10 areas above, the children were reminded of the process of developing evaluation questions as they had done on Day 1 with evaluating some everyday things. Their next activity was to develop evaluation questions for each of the 10 areas they had listed. This activity was conducted separately for each provincial team as the activities in each province differed based upon the circumstances of the communities in which the children lived. Nevertheless, there were many similarities in the evaluation questions that each team posed. Each provincial team was assisted by their caregivers mainly with translating the questions to English. As the Western Cape team did not have a caregiver present, they were assisted by the workshop facilitators. The 3 caregivers also worked as a group and participated in the same activities on Day 4. Each provincial team presented their questions to the group.

The children and caregivers posed the following evaluation questions. The caregivers’ questions are at the bottom of the lists in italics.

1. Communication between the CI and the participants and between the provincial teams
   - Was there any communication between the groups (provinces)?
   - Why was there no communication between the groups (provincial teams)?
   - Would a structured communication have been more beneficial?
   - How did we communicate with the CI and what made it easier to do so?
   - Why was communication sometimes difficult?
   - How was communication with the CI?

2. Awareness of children’s rights
   - Was it worth it doing the awareness campaign?
   - Did the project increase awareness about children’s rights?
   - Were we able to change the concept that people had about children’s rights?
   - How did the people in your area know about the draft of the Children’s Bill?
   - How did you manage to reach all the people in your area?
   - Are you satisfied that everyone you talked to got to understand the Bill?
   - Were we realistic about the number of people that we wanted to reach?
   - Were the parliamentarians in your province aware of Dikwankwetla?
3. Facilitation of previous workshops and workshop methodology

- Did the workshops help us?
- Was time management in previous workshops effective?
- How did the workshop methodology help to achieve our goals and tasks?
- How did the workshops help the participants?
- Are we satisfied with the way the workshops were conducted?
- Were we able to cover all the aspects of the Bill in 3 days?
- How did you feel about the time that was allocated for the workshops?

4. Parliamentary submissions

- What made us confident to present our submissions in parliament?
- What did we gain from making presentations in parliament?
- Did our submissions make any difference?
- How was the experience of making submissions and being in parliament?
- How did the Dikwankwetla submissions influence the passing of the Section 75 of the Children’s Bill?
- What was the reaction of the parliamentarians?
- Were the children well prepared for the submissions? How involved were the caregivers in the whole Children’s Bill process?

5. Changes in the lives of the participants and others

- What have we gained from this project and have we developed in any way?
- Are you able to express your opinions and ideas more freely than before the project?
- What did the project bring into our lives and the lives of others with whom we interacted?
- What do people in our community think about the children’s rights as opposed to parents’ rights?
- Did the project change people’s lives in our community?
- What changes did we make in other children’s lives?
- How has this project changed/affected your view on responsibilities?
- What made you confident to share your personal stories with others?
6. The selection of project participants from different provinces

- Was it worth it choosing children from different provinces?
- Did this selection make the submissions more balanced?
- How did our different experiences make Dikwankwetla a success?
- How did the selection criteria benefit the provinces?
- How has working with a diverse group of people helped achieved the projects' goals?
- How do our different cultures and backgrounds affect communication with each other?
- Did we encounter problems regarding language and cultural differences? How did this affect the process?
- Was the selection of different groups valuable?

7. Making the hero books

- Did the hero books help us and other children?
- How did the process of making hero books bring healing to our lives?
- Was it easy to give consent to others about our hero books?
- How were parliamentarians influenced by our hero books?
- Did you share the skills of making the hero books with other children?
- Do you think hero books are useful to other children? How?
- How was the experience of using hero books and body maps with other people?

8. The consent procedures in the project

- What were the outcomes of letting others read our hero books?
- Who signed the consent forms?
- How did the media treat the information they got from us?
- How did the media reports affect us as Dikwankwetla?
- How was the process of consent implemented by the CI?

9. Who is Dikwankwetla now?

- Has Dikwankwetla achieved its main objectives?
- What made the project unique and identifiable?
- Who is Dikwankwetla now and where do we go from here?
- Should we end or continue with the project?
- Was it worth it being part of the project?
- How do you feel about the name of the project?
10. The name of the project

- Why did we choose the name Dikwankwetla?
- Should we change the name of the project because there's a political party by the name of Dikwankwetla?
- What are other people saying about the name of our project?
- Did the name make our project unique?

2.4 Participants’ evaluation of day 2

Day 2 ended with the participants’ evaluation of the activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ feedback on Day 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It wasn’t as bad as rumour said it was going to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was interesting to develop the questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was good to see other groups’ questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For the caregivers it was a bit difficult to difficult and not to tell the children what to ask so you keep probing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAY 3: Answering the evaluation questions

Day 3 began with the facilitators checking with each group where they were at with developing their evaluation questions. Some of the groups had completed this task while others had not. Each group had to complete their set of questions before proceeding to the day’s main activity, which was answering the evaluation questions.

3.1 Answering the evaluation questions

In order to provide their overall evaluation of the project, the participants answered the questions that they posed. All the groups chose to do this by identifying the strengths/ successes and weaknesses/ challenges in each of the 10 areas that they identified as important to evaluate. In some instances, the participants articulated the strengths and weaknesses by providing their perceptions of the projects’ impacts and also raising some of the challenges that they encountered. Some of the areas identified as strengths are therefore subjective evaluations of the impact of the project. The participants spent most of Days 3 and 4 of the workshop working in their provincial teams on this task. If individual participants had different answers to any of the questions, all the answers were included. The caregivers group completed the same task on Day 4.

Each group presented their answers which generated further questions and discussions with the larger group.
The participants’ answers to the evaluation questions they posed are summarised in the table on the next few pages. The strengths and weaknesses are presented separately for each province as there were some areas and issues that were province-specific. However there were also many overlaps. The blank boxes are areas where the groups did not provide any responses because they did not think that there were any strengths or weaknesses in these areas.
## TABLE 1: Participants’ evaluation of the Dikwankweta – Children in Action Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.         | Communication between the participants and between the participants and the CI | • It was difficult for the children to contact each other because we did not have contact details; some provinces have bad network coverage, no internet access and some children have no phones  
• It is expensive to communicate by phone; finances was a big problem with regard to communication with individual provinces  
• We feel that we were neglected by the CI in that we were not contacted or informed about the progress of the Bill and our work  
• We did not know what other provinces were doing  
• We didn’t communicate well with each other in the Western Cape team  
• At times we were not available for tele-conferences because of school  
• We do not have cell phones and transport money  
• Sometimes the poor children wanted us to bring food so our caregiver sometimes organised food parcels  
• CI communicated well with us by phone, email and newsletters  
• CI’s idea of communicating with a group leader in each province was very good because the group leader had access to email and a cell phone  
• CI’s idea of teleconferences for the groups was good but it only started this year (2006)  
• Our phone network was poor so we sometimes did not get the information in time  
• Our caregiver used to forget to tell us some things  
• We could not communicate with the Western Cape Province because we were not doing the same things and could not share ideas |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We communicated well with Limpopo and North West province</td>
<td>because they are urban-based and we do our work in deep rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was difficult to communicate easily in the province because we attend different schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers</td>
<td>We were able to communicate easily by phone, letters and email</td>
<td>There was a time when the CI was quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI also visited some provinces and gave us support</td>
<td>Sometimes we could not contact the CI because we had no airtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We did not communicate with the Western Cape because we thought as they were close to the CI they would get support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We communicated with other provinces only when there was a problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI always complained about the budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We were promised cameras to capture the work in the provinces – this never happened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Awareness raised by the project regarding children’s rights

| Western Cape | We as Dikwankwetla were heard by the people. They were informed/educated about rights and responsibilities | We were not realistic about the number of people that we wanted to reach as we were idealistic and got carried away. We reached less people than we expected |
|             | We were heard by a small portion of our community | There were some negative responses from people who didn’t want to hear about rights e.g. people did not want to listen to children |
|             | More children and youth are aware of their rights | Poor planning of campaigns and the way we carried out the campaign was also poor. We don’t have experience in this area and weren’t guided so we should think about it better. We had this hype from the workshops but no support and good planning on how to do it |
|             | Tried to create opportunities to get basic needs met. 2 years ago we ran a big campaign as Dikwankwetla to get pens and books and we got over 1000 of these. | |
| Limpopo     | We recruited other children to help us | There was a lot of negative attitude from adults in rural areas |
|             | We informed a lot of schools and groups about children’s rights | We didn’t have enough material like booklets for awareness activities |
|             | Most of the children who were not attending school because of not having | Transport was a problem so we could not reach all the children we |
### Focus Area: North West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School fees or children who were working for a living went back to school because of our campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adults started calling us for their meetings to inform them about children’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It helped a lot of children in the village to know about their rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We were able to change parents’ concepts about children’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We helped many people to get IDs and birth certificates from the Department of Home Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was difficult to change people’s ideas about children’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We had to travel a lot and that cost a lot of money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Focus Area: KZN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• People became aware of Dikwankwetla though radio programmes where we were invited to talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People in our area knew about the submissions through having meetings with the parents and youth and also in church services and youth celebration day (June 16th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We think parliamentarians in our province were aware of Dikwankwetla because we did write letters to them although they did not respond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There wasn’t sufficient time to do all our awareness raising activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People were resistant to change even though they heard about children’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some parents still don’t want to hear about children’s rights because they think the rights overpower them and make children disrespect them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Focus Area: Caregivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We were able to organise for members of Dikwankwetla to present about children’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We took part in the local presentations and gave the children support where needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The leaflet from the CI was used a lot for awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People started talking about children’s rights and were asking questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is now a high demand for the service (Children’s rights awareness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We have formed groups in schools and in communities that are trained to help other children understand their rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People phoned for help, to ask caregivers or the children to speak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Different groups, community members and organisations asked for our help in dealing with children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes had problems with transport and materials which made us not reach as many target groups as we wished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural constraints, especially in rural areas, people don’t want to hear about children’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area</td>
<td>Strengths/successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Facilitation of previous workshops by the CI and workshop methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>• The hero books, body maps and other similar activities helped us to focus on the issues and made it easier to share personal stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The provinces made plans of action but the CI did not follow-up and support these plans adequately – perception of varied support from province to province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>• The facilitation motivated us to be able to teach and inform other children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The workshops were exciting because of all the different activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The workshops made us confident to speak in front of groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We got on a flight for the first time and stayed in good hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The parliamentary process was explained clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We were able to understand children’s rights and the procedures/steps taken for the Bill to become an Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We were allowed to use any language to communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We got stationary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>• We gained a lot of knowledge, self-confidence and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Now we don’t spend a lot of time translating as some of our members got familiar and understood English as it was the language used mostly in the workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>• Everyone had certain tasks to perform which means the facilitators’ planning was efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers</td>
<td>• The handouts we received were perfect because they were relevant to our needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well planned, suitable venues and skilled facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate time for outings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Transport to the workshops was well organised</td>
<td>• Not all the correct people heard us or agreed with what we were saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caregivers have a deeper understanding of the Bill.</td>
<td>• Some of the things we said ended up in the wrong space like articles in the media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We felt that we were participating, we were also helping the children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The impact of parliamentary submissions and the process of making the submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Cape</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Our submissions made a difference and were heard by parliamentarians</td>
<td>• It was difficult to get time for submission to the local public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because Dikwankwetla was mentioned in magazines, articles on the internet and quoted by parliamentarians(^7)</td>
<td>• It is difficult to get hold of parliamentarians to invite them to visit our project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our submissions were appreciated because a few parliamentarians came up and thanked us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limpopo</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Our submissions influenced the passing of Section 75 of the Children’s Bill</td>
<td>• Some of the parliamentarians thought the CI told us what to say in our speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We felt very important to be in parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was a process of personal growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North West</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We were nervous but it was an experience of a lifetime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KZN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We managed to make our submissions even though the committee was made up of only adults with no youth representatives</td>
<td>• Even after the workshops with the CI, we were still nervous to speak in parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The preparation with the CI was very helpful and the workshops made us sure of what we were doing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The first objective of the project was to convey the message to the members of parliament. That goal was reached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a positive impact because Section 75 is now an Act and we were part of it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) The Minister of Social Development, Dr Zola Skweyiya, quoted Dikwankwetla in his keynote address at the South African launch of Unicef’s the ‘State of the world’s children report 2006’ in Cape Town, 6 February 2006.
## Focus area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The MPs were influenced by children because they responded well</td>
<td>• Some of the parliamentarians were defensive in their responses. They felt that the kids were attacking them. The caregivers felt that they needed to protect the children in this context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• After our submissions the chairperson said “The Nation has spoken”. We think that influenced the passing of Section 75 of the Bill</td>
<td>• The provincial parliamentarians were not very clued up about the Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All the preparations that were done by the CI, including venue, time and date and workshops made it easier to make our submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caregivers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The children were well prepared and guided by the CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The response was good because even the chairperson said “the Nation has spoken”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The caregivers were invited to observe the debate about Section 75 of the Bill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some of the parliamentarians were touched by the children’s submissions to the extent of crying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Changes that occurred in the participants’ lives and in the lives of others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Cape</th>
<th>Limpopo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The skills learnt at the workshops enabled us to equip others to make a difference in their own lives: hero books made us aware of our strengths and to help others do the same</td>
<td>• We can now talk openly with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We are now more independent and aware of our rights</td>
<td>• We managed to help other children who were involved in crime to look for alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We can now cope with our own problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We are now well known in our communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We met other children and shared our knowledge and experience with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We can speak in public and address children, adults and authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We know our rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area</td>
<td>Strengths/successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>• A lot of people attended our campaigns and listened to what we had to say to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children who knew nothing now know their rights and can express their feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adults are now enlightened and know about children’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>• We now know children’s rights under Section 75 and Section 76 of the Bill and we can protect ourselves from any kind of abuse and we know where to report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We are now more confident to assist others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We are now confident to share our personal experiences with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting other children who also have problems helped us to accept that having problems is part of life because others too have got problems and not only you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers</td>
<td>• The project has inspired us to become activists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We gained a lot of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most of the children are opening up and becoming heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the schools have started respecting children’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dropouts are back to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the families (children and parents) have reconciled because they now understand each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It has helped some of the authorities to have a better understanding of children’s problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus area

#### 6. The value of the criteria that the CI employed to select project participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>• Having people from different backgrounds and provinces formed a diverse group and informed decisions that were representative of as many people as possible and will apply to more people</td>
<td>• Communication was sometimes a problem due to different languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>• The selection criteria formed a national group which is good for sharing</td>
<td>• Communication was sometimes difficult due to language differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| North West       | • Our different experiences made the project bigger and more successful because of our different backgrounds which were put together to form one solid powerful group  
                   • One group would have dealt only with certain issues from their own experiences but with different provinces we got to deal with different issues | • At first it was not easy. Our cultures and backgrounds are different in some way that it was difficult to interact because one had to be careful not to offend others |
| KZN              | • It made it possible to share ideas and opinions  
                   • We represent and share the backgrounds of all children in South Africa  
                   • It was a strength to be able to work with different people  
                   • The Bill was more balanced because of the different ideas from different cultures and backgrounds | • There was poor communication with different people                                      |
| Caregivers       | • The group represented most cultures and backgrounds  
                   • We formed a strong bond between provinces  
                   • Sharing ideas and experiences  
                   • Learning from each other  
                   • Selection of children was good – the children have a rich background  
                   • The selection of organisations who are dealing with children who are experiencing difficulties  
                   • detailed selection criteria that were sent to the caregivers  | • Language was a barrier, because the children want to speak English because they don’t want to be looked down on. They then struggle to communicate and this takes a lot of time. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>The impact of making the Hero books and how these have helped the participants and others</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Western Cape | • Other people feel inspired and motivated by our personal stories  
• Helping others develop their own hero books encourages them to realise their strengths | • Some people in the group might feel vulnerable as they feel they do not have the resources and support to achieve their goals |
| Limpopo | • Hero books helped other children to admit that they have problems and feel free to express them and believe that they can overcome their problems  
• The hero books and body maps helped us and other children to cope with our problems | • It was difficult to show our hero books to other children who know us |
| North West | • It allowed us to express ourselves and to be open about our problems  
• Hero books are powerful tools to help us get our issue through in a positive way  
• Our new groups are half way with their hero books. We were able to help them because they got to realise that they were not the ones experiencing such a problem, someone else was going through the same experience | • All of us could not finish our hero books in our province because it becomes difficult to do so while helping others to complete their hero books |
| KZN | • The hero books influenced the Bill because parliamentarians read them  
• We were able to express our feelings and our thoughts which made us feel healed after keeping silent with our problems  
• The hero books made those who read them know what is going on outside  
• We taught children in our province how to make their own hero books for personal growth  
• The outcome of letting others read out hero books is that some other children started disclosing their problems as they have seen that we also share our personal experiences | |
| Caregivers | • It was easy for us to teach others  
• A very powerful tool to use: It helped us to identify most of the children’s | • Only KZN did a hero book. We did not know why this happened – we were told we would all get to do it at some point. |
### Focus area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs; it helps us to identify problems we were unaware of</td>
<td>• Needs a lot of stationary that we did not have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It helped the children to express themselves</td>
<td>• Lack of resources like cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other countries are interested in the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project through reading the hero books. The caregivers were invited to Uganda to attend a conference on children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Someone from Ingwavuma went to Kenya and said they were so excited to read a hero-book from Ingwavuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8. The consent procedures employed by the Children’s Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We did not give consent to our names/stories being published in the distorted manner it occurred in the newspaper</td>
<td>• We did not give consent to our names/stories being published in the distorted manner it occurred in the newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We should have realised that the media will find a way to publish an interesting story</td>
<td>• We should have realised that the media will find a way to publish an interesting story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We should rethink how we facilitate the consent process</td>
<td>• We should rethink how we facilitate the consent process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We don’t think consent given would have made a difference to the way a person felt when their story was distorted in the media</td>
<td>• We don’t think consent given would have made a difference to the way a person felt when their story was distorted in the media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>• Happy with the consent process the CI used</td>
<td>• We did not give consent anywhere for the media to use our names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The media used our stories for their advantage without changing our names</td>
<td>• The media used our stories for their advantage without changing our names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>• Our guardians and parents signed the consent forms for us to participate in the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was brave of us to let people read our hero books in order to overcome their problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area</td>
<td>Strengths/successes</td>
<td>Weaknesses/challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Who is Dikwankwetla now? Looking at the way forward for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Western Cape | • We have grown and mature as individuals and as a group  
• We reached our personal and provincial goals  
• It was worth the time and effort as we are more equipped for life | • We did not spend enough time together  
• We did not do enough projects together with other provinces  
• In our plans we said that we were going to involve other children. The CI thought that this was great, but when it came to implementation they didn't support us. |
| Limpopo | • We can become a big movement  
• Our strength is that we are a group that is doing different activities established through the project, such as traditional dance groups | • The workshops only happened once a year  
• We feel that we should have met twice a year |
| North West | • We have achieved our goals  
• Dikwankwetla means “heroes”. Not only as heroes to ourselves but also heroes to other children | • We are confused with the political party |
| KZN | • Dikwankwetla are heroes/children in action who have achieve their goals although we are still waiting for the results of the s76 of the Bill  
• Because of the confidence we have gained, we are going to continue to do more campaigns in our province because we still want to share the skills and knowledge with other children | |
<p>| Caregivers | • Many more children in the different provinces have joined the project | • Focus of the project in provinces was not clear to caregivers. Caregivers thought that they needed to involve other children, but it seemed that CI didn't want this. The caregivers’ thought this was because of the lack of funds. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Strengths/successes</th>
<th>Weaknesses/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The name of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>• It is an attractive and encouraging word</td>
<td>• It is the name of a political party that we knew of. We disregarded this as irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Limpopo | • The name means ‘Hero’ which is representative of who we are | • There is a political party by the same name  
• Some people in the community thought we were representing the political party |
| North West | • It helped us to have an identity | • The name has political connotations but only in KZN  
• It causes confusion between us and the political party |
| KZN | • We were able to name of our project so that people know we exist | • We did not consider the name of the political party |
| Caregivers | • The children liked the name | • We were not allowed (by the CI facilitators) to comment on the naming of the project |
As can be seen from the table above, the children from the 4 provinces had very similar views about the project and some few differences due the circumstances in their communities. The children and caregivers’ evaluations of the project are discussed further later in the report. In the next section, the activities for the rest of Day 3 and Day 4 are presented.

3.2 Consent procedures for use of the hero books

At a previous workshop, the children had developed hero books. The hero books were a means for the children to express themselves and were also intended as advocacy tools on the Children's Bill. Prior to the evaluation workshop, one of the children had raised concerns about the use of her hero book for advocacy purposes. She made it clear that she did not want the CI or anyone else using her Hero book in public as she considered it a personal diary and had continued to keep a hero book since joining the project. This prompted the workshop facilitators to include in the Day 2 schedule a slot for a discussion about the children's consent to the CI for the use of their hero books for advocacy purposes.

One of the facilitators reminded the group of the consent procedures that had been followed at the first workshop where the children begun developing their hero books. Some of the children mentioned that they were promised by the facilitators that pseudonyms would be used in the hero books but it appeared that this had not been done. Others were okay with using their real names, but only the first name, while some did not remember what they consented to at the time. Three issues were noted to guide the discussion and ensure that the children understood what they were consenting to:

1. Do you want to use your real name?
2. Do you agree that the CI can use your hero book for advocacy processes? (possible ways in which the CI could use the books were explained)
3. The CI has no control once your hero book is in the public domain.

As the books had been in the possession of the CI, they were returned to the children and they were given until Day 3 to decide whether or not the CI could use them.

Five children gave consent for their hero books to be used as they were, but with only first names; two consented to the use of their hero books but with pseudonyms; of the other 2, one requested that her mother’s photo be taken off and the other did not want any of the photos to be used.

This was the last activity for Day 3.
DAY 4: Answering the evaluation questions

On the last day of the workshop the children and caregiver groups continued to present their evaluation of Dikwankwetla as shown earlier in the table. As available funding to the CI for the project was ending in December 2006, the group also discussed how they would take forward the activities that they had begun. The discussions from the answers provided in the table above and the groups' plans for their activities are presented in the following sections.

4.1 Project successes

Overall, the children and caregivers all felt that the project had been successful in achieving its objectives. As aptly summarised by the KZN group:

“The first objective of the project was to convey the message to the MPs – this goal was reached – the message was children’s rights and parents rights and responsibilities”

In summary, the participants views were that despite some challenges, the project had achieved many successes, both at personal level, in the communities in which they live, and at national level through the submissions that they made to inform the provisions of the Children’s Bill.

Two of the most often mentioned success of the project that were personal growth for both the children and caregivers, and the signing of the Children’s Bill into an Act which they viewed as a major group achievement as they were part of the process. On the personal level, some of the participants mentioned that through their involvement in the project, they had developed better English language and communication skills, an increased sense of confidence in the knowledge that despite their difficult circumstances they had a role to play to promote children’s rights; knowledge that their circumstances were not unique to those of many other children; and that the project had made it possible for them to speak about their problems and to seek solutions for these. The majority of the children also viewed themselves as role models for other children in their schools and communities where they were sharing the skills that they had acquired from the project. The process of making the hero books was viewed by many of the children as a useful way of reflecting on their problems. Some of the children have continued to make their hero books as it is for them a continuous therapeutic process.

While the children acknowledged that the submissions to parliament would not have been possible without the CI’s guidance, they also took ownership of the submissions which they said were to a great extent their own work. Making the submissions made them feel that they had contributed to something of national significance:

“It felt very important to be in parliament …we managed to make our submissions although the committee was made up of adults only and no youth representatives…the preparation with the CI was very
helpful... parliamentarians mentioned our work and this makes us feel we have made an impact”

As is evident from the table presented earlier, the groups encountered and addressed many issues that influenced the focus of their submissions. The groups in KZN, Limpopo and North West in particular encountered abused children, children that did not have birth certificates, food or did not attend school. The children did not only raise awareness about these issues but also took measures to address them. In the North West for example, having found that many children did not have birth certificates, the group invited a Home Affairs official to the village to attend to the problem. When people attending one their campaign on children’s rights said they did not have food, the group donated seeds for them to start their own gardens. Thus, with the help of the caregivers and NGOs involved, the children went beyond what was anticipated at the start of the project.

The participants were confident that their activities had increased awareness around children’s rights in their communities. In particular, their perception was that many children and adults in their communities knew little or nothing about children’s rights or the Children’s Bill prior to the activities that they conducted such as door-to-door campaigns. In KZN, the team felt that they had reached a large number of the community as their activities were broadcast on the local radio station where they were also invited to an interview. In each of the provinces, the children had recruited other children to assist with their activities. These children also referred to themselves as “Dikwankwetla”. In Limpopo, the caregiver reported that some of the “new Dikwankwetlas”, as they referred to themselves, were keen to attend the evaluation workshop in Cape Town as they felt that they too were a part of and the future of the project since some the “older Dikwankwetlas” had turned 18 years old and were no longer children.

While the project was initiated by the CI, it was clear in the children’s and caregivers’ presentations at the workshop that the three NGOs involved in Limpopo (The Samaritan Centre), North West (Naledi Lifeskills) and KZN (Zisize Trust) had supported the children financially and in terms of time and other resources. As a result of their project activities, some of the children had also been invited to various workshops and events to speak on children’s rights.

For the caregivers, the project inspired them to become activists for children’s rights. It also challenged them to be more accommodating of children’s opinions and to recognise that every child has the potential to excel. The caregivers explained that when they were invited into the project by the CI, they were asked to specifically select children living in difficult circumstances in the context of HIV/AIDS. At the first workshop, they all doubted that the children they had selected could communicate in the workshop, let alone make presentations to parliament and conduct other activities as expected by the CI. However although there were communication challenges in the beginning as all the children from Limpopo, KZN and North West did not speak good English, they all grew in confidence and excelled in all their
activities. The caregivers found these achievements by the children from rural areas an encouraging outcome of the project. Through their work on the project, the caregivers are now recognised within their provinces and nationally as champions for children’s rights. As a result they have been invited to local and international meetings pertaining to children’s rights.

4.2 Challenges

The sometimes sporadic communication between the CI and the participants particularly in the 2nd and 3rd years of the project was identified as one of the main shortcomings. The participants felt that the long periods of silence from the CI sometimes left them in limbo and unsupported in their activities. There were also weaknesses in communication within the provinces mainly due to a lack of financial resources for transport and cell phone credit. Some of the children were in the same province but lived far from each other and therefore required transport money when they had to meet. Another weakness was the lack of communication between the provinces throughout the project, as they only met at the annual workshops. The CI should have played a key role in ensuring that communication was regular not just between the provinces and the CI but also between and within provinces through allocation of a budget for this.

The Western Cape team in particular felt unsupported by the CI. Their caregiver had left her job at the organisation through which they were recruited soon after the start of the project. The two team members felt that they could have achieved more if they worked as a team, but they lacked someone to coordinate their activities and to support their initiatives.

The children mentioned resistance from adults who did not want to hear about children’s rights as one of the major challenges they encountered in their advocacy and community awareness activities.

The caregivers expressed disappointment that the CI did not follow through on some of their promises: “we were promised cameras to capture the work in the provinces but this never happened”.

4.3 The way forward

The children and the caregivers discussed the way forward for the project. They all concluded that they would continue with their local activities with or without support from the CI. In Limpopo, KZN and North West the project still had the support of the 3 NGOs involved. The groups had also formed relationships with other NGOs, social workers and community leaders and they would continue to work together with them. In the Western Cape, one of the youth was already employed by an NGO working with young people and would therefore continue with children’s rights and Children’s Amendment Bill activities within this organisation. The other was involved in various volunteer programmes and activities through her school.
The group also discussed whether or not they would keep the name Dikwankwetla. Some argued for changing the name because of they were mistaken for representatives of a political party of the same name which was particularly present in KZN and Limpopo. Others wanted to drop the word “Dikwankwetla” and call the project “Children in Action” while some did not see any reason to change the name as they were already identified as Dikwankwetla in their communities and had printed T-shirts and school bags bearing the name. In the end, the group opted to take a vote amongst them and the caregivers, which ended in 9 yes votes to keep the name, and 3 no votes to change the name. The group agreed to keep the name as “Dikwankwetla – Children in Action” in the meantime as they were not sure what direction the project would take if the CI was no longer involved.

4.4 Evaluation of the workshop

The last activity was the children and caregivers’ evaluation of the workshop.

“I have never in my life attended a workshop where I just evaluated. In other workshops we just fill in forms as we walk out but this one was so detailed and I have learnt so much” Caregiver

One of the children facilitated the last activity which was an evaluation of the workshop by posing the following questions to the group:

- What did you find most useful in this workshop?
- What did you like the most in this workshop?
- What did you not like in this workshop?
- What have you learnt in this workshop?

Each participant responded individually by writing their responses on colour coded papers for each question. They cut the papers into various shapes and stuck them responses on one sheet.

All the participants found everything in the workshop very useful. None of the participants had previously been involved in a project evaluation and it was for most of them a new concept that they learnt during the workshop. In the beginning some of the children were apprehensive about their ability to evaluate the project but in the end concluded that “It wasn’t as bad as rumour said it was going to be”.

The participants most appreciated having been given the opportunity to evaluate the project, and in particular being part of the process of developing the evaluation agenda.
Some of the responses to evaluating the workshop included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most useful/most liked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The method used to explain the tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The exercise on strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The process of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coming up with evaluation questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The drawings about Dikwankwetla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The facilitation method used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The absence of some of the other CI staff that facilitated the previous workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Things learnt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• got ideas on how to run a workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We do evaluation in our daily lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that evaluation is a process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ice-breakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideas on how to do evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation should have been done yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This was the best workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The facilitators were very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The activities were very useful and we didn’t waste time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following section, lessons from the project are presented.

**Lessons learnt**

This section draws from the evaluation workshop, as well as a one-day critical reflection workshop attended by the CI staff who were involved in various capacities in the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project. The critical reflection workshop was held prior to the evaluation workshop. The emergent issues from both workshops with regard to the impact of the project were similar in many respects. The CI team also expressed that the project was a journey of growth for all the people that were involved. However, there were some specific lessons in terms of managing and co-ordinating child participation projects. These are presented below.

**Project processes**

☐ Through this project there was increased awareness and recognition about the difficulties experienced in realising children’s right to participate meaningfully in the adult world. This should be taken into account when
initiating projects that involve children’s participation. Places such as parliament for example are not child-friendly or conducive to enhancing children’s participation.

- The CI staff recognised that it is important to work with adult stakeholders (caregivers) to prepare the terrain for children’s participation. The caregivers in the Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project were central to the successes of the project.

- Strong partnerships should be created and maintained with the organisations providing caregivers or adults with responsibilities within the project. This will ensure that there is a possibility for the partnership to continue in the event that the designated caregiver leaves the organisation.

- Constant and consistent communication with the project participants is critical to achieving the intended objectives. Communication is not only providing information and decisions but requires that the children are involved in setting agendas and decision making. An adequate budget allocation is required to do this successfully.

- Plans that are agreed upon between the adults and the children must be followed through with allocation of resources and appropriate action. Unfulfilled promises can strain relationships and hamper project activities.

- An important lesson from the project was that consent is not a once-off activity. Consent should be regularly reviewed, particularly where children’s personal stories are concerned and where children need protection like ensuring that the media does not use their personal stories in a manner that would have negative impact on the children. It is important to ensure that all the children understand the consent process and the implications of consenting or not. This should be ongoing as the project progresses as children may change their views depending on their circumstances and as they grow older.

**Project management**

- Within the CI, there was recognition from the staff involved that different expectations and assumptions within the project team regarding the processes and outcomes of the project can result in poor communication, tension and conflict. These expectations and assumptions should be discussed early in the project so as not to hamper project activities.

- The CI consists of individuals from many different disciplines. The Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project team for example consisted of individuals with backgrounds in Social Science, Law, Political Science and others. This is strength as it allows for robust intellectual discussions, variety of opinions and different schools of thought. However, it can also result in tension if the project team does not have a common
understanding of the meaning of children's participation and how this should be practiced.

☐ The terms of reference, roles and responsibilities for the project team and external participants must be clearly defined at the start of the project. These should be supported by efficient management of the project.

Conclusion

The Dikwankwetla – Children in Action Project achieved its objectives. The project set out to facilitate children’s inputs into the Children’s Bill, equip the children with basic literacy in law reform, and provide opportunities for the children to become self advocates in the Children’s Bill process. The project achieved much more than that as is evident in the children’s and caregivers evaluations presented in this report. The extent of personal growth for children, caregivers and the CI project team was unanticipated. The emergence of “new Dikwankwetlas” in the provinces is evidence of the influence that the children’s work has had in their communities. The support from the caregivers and the local NGOs were important in achieving the project objectives.

The future challenge for the project will be whether and how to keep the activities that have been initiated in the provinces going and to maintain the momentum for child participation and children’s rights that this group of children have initiated in their respective communities. The children’s and caregivers’ evaluations presented in this report provide useful information for the CI with regard to future projects that may involve child participation. The Children’s Institute’s continued involvement in the children’s activities will be considered in future planning of children’s participation in other spheres of our work. As the Children’s Amendment Bill process has continued into 2007, the CI will continue to support the children in making their submissions.