

CHAPTER 4

PROGRAMME EVALUATION RESEARCH AND THE COMMUNITY-BASED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMME (CBPWP)

4.1. INTRODUCTION

As the aim of this study is to evaluate the impact of the CBPWP on rural communities, this chapter will define and describe programme evaluation research in the first section. It will explain the two types of evaluation research, namely; the formative and summative evaluation research. The chapter will also discuss the process of programme evaluation research through a model derived from De Vos (1998).

The second section of this chapter describes what the Community Based Public Works Programme (CBPWP) is all about. Six objectives of the CBPWP as well as its process will be discussed in detail.

4.2. PROGRAMME EVALUATION RESEARCH

Programme evaluation research was defined by Monette, Sullivan and DeJong (1994:313) as “a means of supplying valid and reliable evidence regarding the operation of social programs or clinical practices - how they are planned, how well they operate, and how effectively they achieve their goals.”

According to Mark (1996:230), programme evaluation is “ a type of research that uses established social science research methods to evaluate the success or effect of a social service program.”

Usually when a programme has taken place or it is in operation, its recipients, managers and funding institutions need to know whether it is beneficial to the

communities, if it is effective and efficient, and if it is well planned towards achieving the intended goals. Programme evaluation research provides those with interest in the programme with information regarding the extent of intervention, the effectiveness of the programme, its efficiency, whether goals are met and information regarding what has led a programme to a success or failure.

Programme evaluation research could be viewed as a tool used by managers to improve their programmes and thereby making appropriate decisions.

4.2.1. TYPES OF PROGRAMME EVALUATION RESEARCH

There are two types of programme evaluation research, namely; formative and summative evaluation research.

4.2.1.1. FORMATIVE EVALUATION RESEARCH

Royse (1991:197) identifies formative evaluation as a type of programme evaluation research which focuses on improving programmes. Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:48) add that “evaluation designed to promote the effectiveness of a programme is called formative research.” This type of evaluation research is therefore a good tool for managers when they make decisions for improving the effectiveness of their programmes.

4.2.1.2. SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RESEARCH

Summative evaluation research is defined by Monette, Sullivan & DeJong, (1994:316) as “assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and the extent to which the outcomes of the project are generalizable to other settings and populations.”

For Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:51), “summative evaluations set out to determine the extent to which programmes meet their specified aims and objectives.”

Assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of an intervention is termed outcome or impact assessment.

Impact evaluation research is therefore a type of summative evaluation research which some authors maintain it interchangeably means summative research (compare Royse, 1991:198; De Vos, 1998:373-375). In this study, impact evaluation shall also be applied as meaning outcome or effectiveness of a programme (compare Royse, 1991:198; De Vos, 1998:373-375).

Impact analysis is a type of evaluation research that asks "How effective is the program in meeting its goals, relative to the total amount of need?" (Mark, 1996:233).

De Vos (1998:374) says impact assessment is a type of evaluation research that "gauges the extent to which a programme causes change in the desired direction".

In this study, impact assessment will be applied in measuring the success or failure of the Community Based Public Work Programme (CBPWP) on empowering rural communities.

An important aspect to be mentioned in this section, is that impact assessment may use experimental or quasi-experimental designs and aims at gathering hard evidence that could be used to demonstrate the worth of a program (Royse, 1991:198). This aspect is supported by Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:51) who maintain that "experimentation compares the treatment group with a no treatment group to see whether the treatment has caused any positive change in the former." A researcher is therefore compelled to utilise either the experimental or the quasi-experimental design if he /she is conducting the impact assessment research.

Monette, Sullivan and DeJong (1994:261) explain that the experimental design is made up of equal number of respondents in both the experimental and in the control

groups, and that the design is the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design with random assignment . For the researcher it was impractical in this study to randomly assign respondents in the true experimental design due to ethical considerations, and as a result, the quasi-experimental design namely the comparison post-test only design was chosen. Monette *et al* (1994:264) state there are “problems which are an inability to assign people randomly to conditions or the difficulty of creating a true control group with which to compare the experimental groups.”

4.2.2. THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION RESEARCH

Programme evaluation research follows a series of steps. Different authors propagate for different models to be followed, (compare De Vos, 1998:368; Tripodi, 1983:2-3; Monette, Sullivan & DeJong, 1994:32; Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:51-53). This study has selected a model contributed by De Vos (1998), simply because it is simplified and easy to conduct.

De Vos' model is made up of the following steps:

1. What is to be evaluated
2. Identify the consumers of research
3. Co-operation of staff
4. Specify programme objectives
5. Specify evaluation objectives
6. Choose variables
7. Choose research design

8. Implement measurement
9. Analyse/interpret findings
10. Report/implement results (De Vos, 1998:368).

4.2.2.1. DETERMINE WHAT IS TO BE EVALUATED

A researcher should consider the focus of his/her project and “determine the level of knowledge desired” (Tripodi, 1983:2). Although this is not a step on its own, it is important that a researcher consider issues like the type of evaluation research to be conducted, financial implications, the respondents and the beneficiaries of his/her project before starting with the project. According to Mason and Bramble (1989:389), need assessment enable the evaluators to obtain the evaluation results.

In this study, the impact of the CBPWP on rural communities will be evaluated.

4.2.2.2. IDENTIFY THE “CONSUMERS” OF RESEARCH

Who is to benefit from the findings of the research project is a question that needs to be satisfied. In most projects, communities, managers of the funding institutions and the social work practitioners are the beneficiaries of evaluation research projects. Mason and Bramble (1989:388) maintain that five groups of people affected by evaluation are as follows:

- * *sponsors*:- are agencies which authorise the evaluation
- * *the client*:- those who request the evaluation
- * *the participants*:- individuals whom the evaluator works with during the evaluation project

- * *the stake holders*:- those who have the most interest in the evaluation results
- * *the audience*:- those who might want to emulate the programme in other settings in future

This study has the quality of benefiting the researcher, the respondents, the funding institution, Public Works in this regard, the communities and the social work profession.

4.2.2.3. OBTAIN THE COOPERATION AND SUPPORT OF THE SERVICE GIVERS AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNED

De Vos (1998:380) warns that programme evaluation research is associated with “negativism and sabotage by staff” and as such researchers need to develop a good relationship with the funding institutions and those communities they are to research about.

Permission to conduct the study on the CBPWP was obtained from Public Works, Northern Province.

4.2.3.4. SPECIFY PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES CLEARLY AND IN MEASURABLE TERMS

Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:51) advise that “to translate the aims and objectives into observable changes which can be measured in the target community” is an important step in programme evaluation research. Objectives need not be stated in general statements but in “precisely worded statement of desired changes in behaviour” (De Vos,1998:281). Objectives are more important in programme evaluation research because they state exactly what will be accomplished and by whom (Mason & Bramble, 1989:389).

Objectives of the CBPWP will be listed and conceptualized accordingly in the

forthcoming chapter.

4.2.2.5. SPECIFY OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS ITSELF

Specify whether the study is a formative or summative type research. According to Mason and Bramble (1989:396), the formative evaluation has to do with the process of the programme, whilst on the other hand the summative evaluation concerns the effectiveness and efficiency of a programme.

As already discussed, this study will be conducted in the context of summative evaluation research because it sets out to determine the extent to which the CBPWP meets its specific aims and objectives.

4.2.2.6. CHOOSE VARIABLES THAT CAN BE MEASURED TO REFLECT DESIRED OUTCOMES

Not all variables are relevant in reflecting the desired outcomes of the research project, and as such, the researcher should “decide on the use of those variables that provide the best measures for the research” (Tripodi, 1983:3). In this regard, only information regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the CBPWP was selected.

In this study, the six objectives of the CBPWP were selected as the best measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the programme.

4.2.2.7. CHOOSE AN APPROPRIATE RESEARCH DESIGN

A researcher has to choose the best research design which can effectively “compare the group that received the “treatment” with a similar group that did not receive the “treatment” (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:52). Researchers might either choose a post-test only or a pre-test/post-test design.

The comparison post-test only design was selected for this study.

4.2.2.8. IMPLEMENT MEASUREMENT

Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:52) and Tripodi (1983:3) begin this step by constructing the instrument of measurement. This means the decision to use either questionnaires or interviews or observation and/or focus group interviews. Data gathering process takes place during this step.

This study will utilize the focus group interviews as the method of data collection.

4.2.2.9. ANALYSE AND INTERPRET THE FINDINGS

The researcher organises and analyses data that was collected during the previous step, by transcribing or transforming it into a format that allows statistical manipulation (Arkava & Lane, 1983:28). The researcher makes his/her findings explain the community condition. Mason and Bramble (1989:389) advise that in order for an evaluator to get the results, he/she should "systematically analyse what already exists regarding the objectives and to compare that with what should exist to attain them."

The coding procedures will be utilized to reduce data before they were interpreted.

4.2.2.10. REPORT AND IMPLEMENT THE RESULTS

Reporting back is an important step of programme evaluation research as it involves presenting "the findings to those responsible for the intervention, the participants and any other interested groups" (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:53). Dissemination of evaluation research findings is an ethic listed by Strydom in De Vos (1998:32). Mason and Bramble (1989:411) explain it by mentioning that "relevant and accurate

information should be made available to persons who need it, and providing this information is often the responsibility of the evaluator.”

The results and findings of this study will be disseminated through both this research report and an article which will be included in an academic journal.

The next section explains what the CBPWP is, its six objectives and process.

4.3. COMMUNITY-BASED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMME (CBPWP)

This section defines the CBPWP, and describes its objectives and process.

4.3.1. WHAT IS CBPWP?

The Community Based Public Works Programme (CBPWP) is an element of the National Public Works Programme (NPWP) which has been developed by the South African Government in its venture to alleviate unemployment and poverty within the marginalized communities.

The *Community Based Public Works Programme (1996:6)* states that the National Public Works Programme (NPWP) was introduced by the Government in 1994 with an objective "to promote labour intensive methods of delivery in the State capital and maintenance programmes/projects." The NPWP then introduced its sub-programme, namely; the Community-Based Public Works Programme (CBPWP) to concentrate on projects that were short-term and manageable by the communities.

The *Community Based Public Works Programme (1996:185)* further mentions that NPWP is "an integral component of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP)". The CBPWP is a learning by doing method through which rural communities become capacitated whilst implementing their programmes. *Community Based Public Works Programme (1996:7)* states that one of the objectives of the CBPWP is promoting community development through their involvement in the

project implementation. The *White Paper on Public Works (1997:15)* adds that “the implementation of the CBPWP has been a learning process.”

The Government utilises the CBPWP to provide communities with infrastructure which are to be constructed by communities themselves through increased labour intensive methods. The *White Paper on Public Works (1997:11)* states that the CBPWP is about “empowering communities through providing job opportunities, transferring skills and creating community assets in a manner which builds communities’ capacity to manage their own affairs.” The CBPWP is about the implementation of policy which is directed at empowering communities in order to address their predicament.

The next section discusses the objectives of the CBPWP.

4.3.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE CBPWP

This section outlines a discussion of the six objectives of the CBPWP, namely; strong community participation, labour intensive methods of construction, education and training, management and maintenance of the assets once they are completed, targeting the most needy within communities and sources of funding.

4.3.2.1. STRONG COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The first objective of the CBPWP is strong community participation.

Community involvement is a strong motivation in order for the communities to receive funding from the CBPWP. The community as a whole is expected to actively participate in all the processes of the project from its conception to its completion.

The community should elect a steering committee which is its mouthpiece. Through the steering committee, community decides what it wants to construct, those who will be employed and how much they will be paid. According to Musandiwa

(1997:13), “community members and groupings shall have an opportunity to be represented on and participate in the decision making process and in arranging the implementation operation and administration of the project.”

Strong community participation is an important requirement in the community development school of thoughts and is supported by other authors (compare Horton, 1992:13; *White Paper on Local Government*, 1998:75). A community project is meant for the whole community and as such every sector of that community which has an interest in it should be afforded an access to it.

For Musandiwa (1997:2), those who should participate in the CBPWP projects include the provincial Public Works Department, regions of the Public Works, line departments, Transitional Local Councils (TLC's), communities, representative committees, social and technical consultants and the training agents. Community involvement according to Musandiwa (1997:5), empowers community members, has long-term sustainability, has the “people first” approach and ensures project ownership by the communities.

The Minister for Public Works Mr Radebe, in the foreword of *The National Public Works Programme (1994:i)* mentioned “the NPWP is a people-centred and people-driven programme. Communities themselves will be directly involved in deciding which projects they need.” If communities were afforded this opportunity of prioritising their projects, they then feel respected by the funding agency and thereafter regard the projects as their own. Communities will in turn maintain, and of utmost importance, protect the projects from being vandalised.

4.3.2.2. LABOUR-INTENSIVE METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION

The second objective of the CBPWP, labour intensive methods of construction, has the aim of creating as many jobs as possible. This is achievable if machines are replaced by people coupled with the consideration that the standard and quality of the project being constructed is not lowered.

Communities are required to maximise the use of local material as well. This means that when the project is being constructed, the local companies, especially the small and medium entrepreneurs (SMME's) will be indirectly financially boosted and hence the creation of more jobs in the community is achieved. *The White Paper on Public Works (1997:15)* mentions that "materials required for CBPWP projects are often manufactured at a considerable distance from the location of projects." This practice guard against problems of transportation, shortage of storing facilities within communities, and of prejudicing small businesses that are nearer to the projects by buying from far away.

Preference should be given to engage more people. One concrete mixing machine, for example, could be replaced by at least six individuals who could manually produce quality mortar at a required time frame.

4.3.2.3. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The third objective of the CBPWP is education and training which serves the purpose of capacity building (Cheetham, Fuller, Mclvor & Petch, 1992:6; Nkuhlu, 1994:6). The policy of the CBPWP is to develop the human resources within communities.

Through the involvement of community members in community projects, community organisations, participants and the entire community can obtain the technical management skills which they will utilise in future. Technical management skills obtained should include, for example, bookkeeping, supervisory, bricklaying, carpentry, stone pitching, kerb laying, concrete mixing, shuttering and fixing, plumbing, electric wiring, meeting management and project management.

The CBPWP makes a budget allocation for training and education.

4.3.2.4. MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE ASSET ONCE IT IS COMPLETED

The fourth objective of the CBPWP is the management and maintenance of the asset by the end-user after it is completed.

End-users are the provincial government departments and/or institutions which have interests in the projects.

Communities should have plans and funds in place for the maintenance and management of the assets after their completion. Ownership of the assets should be ascertained before the actual construction starts. According to the *White Paper on Public Works (1997:15)*, "although assets created through public works programmes are ultimately supposed to be maintained by line function departments, it has never been clear who actually assumes responsibility for maintaining the finished assets and many assets run the risk of falling into disrepair."

This objective involves the co-ordination of different programmes among line government departments. This means that when the CBPWP, for instance, intends building a preschool for a certain community, the line department, that is the Department of Education in this regard, should be contacted so that it will utilise the asset after its completion.

In his opening of Parliament speech, South African President Mbeki (*Mbeki: Opening of Parliament, 1999:9*) said "the Government is now in a position to implement a rural development programme for the integrated development of the rural areas. This will bring together all government departments and all spheres of government, including the traditional leaders. The integration we seek must, for instance, ensure that when a clinic is built, there must be a road to access it. It must be electrified and supplied with water."

4.3.2.5. TARGETING THE MOST NEEDY WITHIN A COMMUNITY

The fifth objective of the CBPWP is the targeting of the most needy within a community. CBPWP intends to bring resources to those sectors of the society which were previously marginalized. These include the rural poor communities, women, the disabled and the youths. This objective caters for those individuals who do not have other sources of income.

The most needy within the communities are women who head families as well as women, the youth and the disabled who were not employed before. CBPWP projects pay wages lower than those of the normal work so that people who can get money elsewhere are not attracted to these projects.

4.3.2.6. SOURCES OF FUNDING

The sixth objective of the CBPWP is sources of funding which is an important consideration in the CBPWP. *The Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:41)* states that “CBPWP wants to give money to communities who cannot get money from other sources”. But communities should also contribute a certain amount which shall be supplemented by the CBPWP to make the whole project possible.

Musandiwa (1997:6) stipulates that the CBPWP funds should be composed of the following categories:

- * Grant funding from the community empowerment programme (CBPWP)
- * Community collection
- * Others

The process of obtaining project funding by convincing the funding institution through the collection of contributions is termed leveraging. Rubin and Rubin (1992:394) defined leveraging as “a means by which a group obtains contributions from organisation members to convince potential donors of larger grants that a project is worth their investment.” Lombard (1991:156) support public contributions by stating that, “it stands to reason that fund raising is an important part of community empowerment programme.”

Leveraging, according to Musandiwa (1997:10), reduces dependency on the part of the communities and it further encourages their sustainable development.

Successful CBPWP should enhance community ownership of projects through the involvement of grassroots in the programmes, alleviate poverty through the creation of job opportunities, increase the capacity building of communities through education and training, assist communities with the maintenance and management of their completed projects and encourage communities to contribute certain resources towards the implementation of their projects. CBPWP projects should be directed towards the rightful recipients, who are the most needy, women, the youth and the disabled.

The final section of this chapter discusses the eight components of the CBPWP process, namely;

- * Policy and programme development.
- * Project facilitation.
- * Identification.
- * Project planning and appraisal
- * Financing.
- * Implementation.
- * Evaluation.

- * Ongoing administration and maintenance of the project asset.

4.3.3. THE PROCESS OF THE CBPWP

The *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:16)* maintains that the CBPWP is aligned to the principles of Project Cycle Management (PCM) which divide it into eight phases namely: policy and programme development, project facilitation, identification, project planning and appraisal, financing, implementation, evaluation and ongoing administration and maintenance of the project asset.

Each phase will be discussed in detail.

4.3.3.1. POLICY AND PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT

The first phase of the CBPWP process to be discussed is policy and programme development.

The *Community-Based Public Programme (1996:17)* maintains that “before any programme can be implemented, principles, policies, criteria and guidelines had to be developed.” This is done by the National Department of Public Works, and as a consequence, provincial administration does not have the responsibility of formulating policies. Provinces that are required to implement policies, review them and make inputs and recommendations, and if necessary they identify some of the specifications that will not be applicable in their areas of operation.

The CBPWP entails guidelines that community empowerment projects have to include in order to be assisted by the programme. The guidelines are as follows:

- * Citizenry participation
- * Labour intensive construction methods

- * Education and training of community members
- * Administration and maintenance of the assets after their completion
- * Targeting the most needy in the community
- * Short-term planning projects.

The *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:21)* categorises projects into three categories, namely the starter, the extension and the major projects.

Starter projects are mostly funded by the CBPWP because they entail, developments that are initiated by the community, are small and simple, and require maximum facilitation, training and technical assistance. These projects embody all the guidelines of the CBPWP that were mentioned above. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:22)* states that the "starter projects will be supported in order for the communities to organise and give developmental capacity around the starter project."

The second type of projects are the extension projects, in which communities have gathered some experience on management and implementation because the projects require only upgrading. An example of an extension project is when the CBPWP assists a community with the construction of an additional ward of a particular health centre.

The third type of projects are major projects. These require huge sums of funds to construct, they are technically and administratively too sophisticated, they are mostly of long-term, they may not require labour intensive methods of construction and even when they employ a number of people, they lack adequate educational and training opportunities for them. These projects are not funded by the CBPWP.

4.3.3.2. PROJECT FACILITATION

The second phase of the CBPWP process is the project facilitation which entails knowledge dissemination about the project to communities and project managers. Communities, through the facilitation of the community worker, are enabled to understand the CBPWP requirements, their need to participate in the programme, and how they may be linked to it. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:17)* explains that “the objective of the project facilitation phase is to initiate the process of capacity building and empowerment through knowledge infusion in communities early enough in order to enhance the ability of communities to realise the importance of participation in projects and the responsibilities that go with it.”

The *White Paper on Public Works (1997:16)* states that “the DPW will establish project facilitation processes prior to the commencement and during the implementation of projects” (abbreviation DPW stands for the Department of Public Works). Facilitation aims at bringing communities and their immediate stakeholders together for a common goal.

4.3.3.3. IDENTIFICATION

The third phase of the CBPWP process is identification. During the identification phase, the CBPWP is introduced to the communities through a number of methods, ranging from meetings, radio, television, magazines and newspapers. Community workers under the CBPWP distribute pamphlets, caps and T-shirts bearing advertisement of the programme, render workshops to the communities and some enter and explain the nature of the programme to communities, as a way of making it known to them.

Communities are invited to lodge applications for funding from the programme. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:18)* sums the phase with the statement “the objective of the identification phase is to identify projects and to determine whether a project qualifies for the

programme and can therefore be approved to go ahead with a feasibility study and a project planning process.”

It has been noted in the first phase of the CBPWP process that projects that qualify for CBPWP funding need to have maximum facilitation, training and technical assistance, are small, were initiated by communities, are of short-term nature, employ within communities and are implementable by the communities.

The CBPWP guidelines have six prerequisites which community projects need to satisfy in order to qualify for the programme funding, namely; strong community participation, labour intensive methods of construction, education and training, management and maintenance of the assets once they are completed, targeting the most needy within a community and sources of funding.

Communities are supplied with application forms and guidelines for making an application. The application form intends to determine whether applicants qualify for the guidelines, criteria and specifications of the CBPWP.

The qualifying communities are immediately informed of the actual budget and any other necessary special inclusions. The CBPWP releases a small amount of funds for the planning process.

4.3.3.4. PROJECT PLANNING AND APPRAISAL

The fourth phase of the CBPWP process is project planning and appraisal which entails working out what to do before the actual action is taken.

It is during this phase that communities explore the range of problems and their alternative solutions and agreement on the goals community members want to achieve. Planning calls for the need to put tasks in priority order.

Communities that were selected for funding are directed to sign the contract with the CBPWP so that their funds for the planning process could be released into their bank accounts. Communities are required also to enter contracts with their technical support systems.

Technical support entails the project design, planning, administration and other technical work. Technical consultants for the CBPWP projects need to consider the labour intensive method of construction requirement of the programme when designing their plans. Their plans need to be appropriate, simple and implementable by the unskilled people. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:89)* states that "an organisation (or individuals) may be appreciated to assist the community with the planning and implementation of the project."

Communities may also contract with the social consultants who will assist them with the project management, community organisation and training. The social consultant are required to transfer project management experience and skills to the community.

This transfer of skills, attitudes and experience is what is termed capacity building which is defined as "the creation of necessary skills and attitudes within the communities to effectively deal with and be involved in decisions on issues that affect them directly or indirectly. It is achieved through various means, chief amongst which is education (both formal and informal) and training" (*Community-Based Public Works Programme, 1996:94*). Capacity building is an interaction between the community and the community empowerment project throughout the project's lifespan. Communities are enabled to run their project's management, financial and administration. This process is possible through training.

Members receive the technical, administrative and the improved life skill training. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:95)* adds that it "is preferable that training should be certified thus better enabling trainees to

find employment in the job market. On graduation the training institutions present trainees with the certificates.”

Community organisations are facilitated into the monitoring and reporting of the physical progress of their project. Community-Based Organisation is better known as the steering committees. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:94)* supports their formation by stating that “to be able to receive public funds a legal entity must be established to contract and take responsibility for the project.” Community-Based representative structures are formed mostly for enabling a community to enter into a contract to receive Government funds. Members of this structure are held accountable to the broader community and they serve the interest of that community rather than of individuals.

A community-based organisation should be highly inclusive, this meaning that they should represent all the community sectors which have interest in the project. Community-based organisations are elected by the broader community. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:101)* outlines the characteristics of the steering committees or the non-government organisations (NGO's) as follows.

- (i) they are established to serve and promote the interest of the entire community or the public at large. They are not meant for groups within the community or for a few numbers of individuals.
- (ii) they are established to improve the socio-economic nature of a community.
- (iii) most of these bodies, if not all, are exempted from income taxation, donations, and estate duty and stamp duties.
- (iv) these bodies are non-profit oriented and as such funds expended to them should only be concentrated toward the construction of their projects.

- (v) they have the legal personality, meaning that their assets and debts are held separately from those of its members or office bearers.

In order to indicate its legitimate existence, each community-based organisation (CBO) need to be in possession of a written constitution. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:105)* defines a constitution as "a set of principles agreed upon by any committee, such as a community development committee." A constitution embodies certain rules that guide the CBO to run its matters efficiently and effectively. A constitution is a tool of resolving disputes that will erupt during the project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

During this phase of the CBPWP process, a number of preparatory documents are required from the community. Only four supportive documents, namely; the project description, business plan, project implementation programme and the budget sheet will be briefly explained here.

- * The project description:- details administrative information, need (problem), organisational information, planning and factors that concern the sustainability of the project.
- * Project Business Plan:- details the planned activities with regard to the project management, training, employment, and equipment and materials.
- * Project Implementation Programme:- is explained by *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:29)* as a "schedule of work that needs to be implemented at different stages of the project".
- * Project Budget Sheet:- is a format which is used to estimate the budget.

4.3.3.5. FINANCING

The fifth phase of the CBPWP process is called financing. It is short-living and involves both the community and the CBPWP representation who enter into a legal binding concerning the funding of the programme.

The legal binding is called a grant agreement or the project contract which specifies who the legal office bearers are, when did they receive funds and how much the programme is to cost during its implementation phase. The project contract is a document that, after being signed, enables the CBPWP to release funding towards the community.

Usually community-based organisations and their bookkeepers are, during this phase of CBPWP process, skilful in financial management for receiving and paying out funds. Community-based organisations and their immediate project bookkeepers have received training with regard to the proper control of their funds. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:112)* defines bookkeeping as "keeping a record of money, we need to keep records of all the money we collect and all the money we spend." These records about the income, expenditure and balance is necessarily needed by the community at large, the CBPWP and also by the CBO itself. If the records obtained from the community indicate that the money is utilised safely and properly for the benefit of the community project, then the CBPWP will release further allocations towards that community's bank account.

Some financial management records for the CBPWP are as follows:

- * a cash-book which has columns and rows for all the incomes received, expenditures incurred and the balance thereof.
- * the task wage register which is a time register of all the persons working on the projects, their rates and their signatures when they receive salaries.

* the tool and equipment register includes the number and types of all the tools and equipment that were purchased for the construction of the CBPWP project.

4.3.3.6. IMPLEMENTATION

The sixth phase of the CBPWP process is implementation.

The Community Based Public Works Programme (1996:19) summarises the phase by the statement which reads: “The objective of the implementation phase is for the project to execute its project plan and achieve the desired results. The objective for the CBPWP is to monitor progress.”

This is the most demanding phase of the CBPWP process. It involves a lot of funds and is concerned with the implementation and completion of the asset. The CBO is responsible and accountable for the project and it supervises the controlled and proper utilisation of funds.

According to Musandiwa (1997:3), the CBPWP budget could be divided as follows:

- Wages
- Materials
- Committee overheads
- Training
- Social consultants
- Technical consultants
- Departmental costs

A CBPWP document that secures further funding on the part of the community project is an evaluative one, called a progress report. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:33)* defines evaluation as “analysis of results and the impact of the projects during or after implementation with a view to possible corrective action and/or training of recommendations for the

guidance of similar projects will be developed once the progress reporting detailed above has been implemented." Progress reports are compiled by the CBPWP officials monthly.

4.3.3.7. EVALUATION

The seventh phase of the CBPWP process is evaluation.

Evaluation usually takes place during and after the completion of the projects. During this phase the CBPWP evaluates if its funds were accordingly utilised by the community as specified into their business plan and contract. *Community-Based Public Works Programme (1996:19)* sums the objective of the phase as "to measure whether the chosen project approach is achieving the desired result and impact."

The *White Paper on Public Works (1997:16)* states the importance of monitoring and evaluation as "monitoring and evaluation procedures must become an integral part of the programme at all stages of its development and implementation."

This phase is of utmost importance as it informs the CBPWP whether the programme should go on or be terminated.

4.3.3.8. ONGOING ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PROJECT ASSET

The eighth phase of the CBPWP process is ongoing administration and maintenance of the project assets and is concerned with the future administration and the maintenance of a community asset by the end-user, i.e. government department and/or the non-governmental institution. This saves communities from constructing white elephants within their areas. White elephants are projects which after completion lay unutilised by the community.

The *White Paper on Public Works (1997:15)* has warned that failure to ensure the ongoing administration and maintenance of the assets after they were completed is risky as some assets may run the risk of falling into disrepair.

4.4. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, summative evaluation was mentioned as a type of programme evaluation research which is concerned with the assessment of the impact of programmes on communities. According to De Vos (1998), outcome or impact analysis research was mentioned as meaning summative evaluation. This study focused discussions on the impact analysis research.

This chapter again detailed discussions on what CBPWP is all about, its objectives and the process.

The next chapter discusses the empirical findings of the study.