**Household Food Security Programme (HFSP) Pilot Final Evaluation**

The key findings are:

**Partnerships and collaborative relationships**The successful implementation of the HFSP rested on the partnerships and collaborative arrangements established between stakeholders. The only formal partnership that existed in the HFSP was between UNISA and Saide; all other partnerships with NGOs and local government were informal. Each member of the partnership had an important role to play in the HFSP. A formal partnership was effectively established during the course of the HFSP between UNISA and Saide. The informal partnerships between the programme and NGOs effectively served to recruit students and promoters.

**Programme design and delivery**The multifaceted HFSP was made up of several design and delivery features including; curriculum; promoters; promoter training; students; face-to-face sessions; community activities; and communication. The curriculum was designed around a set of carefully selected outcomes that were aligned to international developments in the field of nutrition and food security. Promoters ran face-to-face sessions with students, provided important feedback to the course writers and managers, and facilitated student action in households. The HFSP design included promoters and students meeting in a series of face-to-face sessions to go through the learning materials together. An important part of the design was the community activities that each student had to perform as they completed their portfolio tasks. Communication in Pilot 1 was smooth as the small numbers meant that direct contact was possible with each promoter. However, communication became more complex in Pilot 2 with the extended number of promoters. Evaluation findings show that promoter training did not provide the promoters with sufficient insights into the content of the course and on how to deliver it appropriately to the students.

**Programme effectiveness**When the HFSP was designed a particular type of student was envisaged; as was a particular group of experienced and competent promoters who could facilitate the course through the effective use of the learning materials developed for the HFSP curriculum. But the reality was that the students and promoters active on the course had different, and not always relevant, sets of skills and competencies. Programme managers worked extremely hard and were dedicated to the HFSP. But logistical challenges around the delivery of programme materials, and the impact this had on the programme were not effectively dealt with.

**Community engagement**The pilot programme had to ensure that community development was integrated into the academic programme. This requirement impacted on several parts of the HFSP namely: partnerships; community monitoring; learning materials; and community engagement tasks.

**Sustainability**In order for the HFSP to be sustainable, three elements need to be in place. There needs to be a relevant curriculum that is implemented through a rigorous management and implementation structure; both these elements need to address the educational needs of an appropriate target group. Given this framework, certain conditions need to be in place to maximise the effect of the programme and to ensure some level of sustainability. These conditions include: formal and informal partnerships; student and promoter recruitment; monitoring; funding; and the further development of the HFSP model.

Details of the evaluation activities were outlined in [vol.17 no. 4 2011](http://www.saide.org.za/resources/newsletters/Vol_17_no.4_2011/Content/HFS%20Evaluation%20Methods.htm) of the Saide newsletter.