

Supplementary memorandum submitted by Graeme Tiffany on behalf of The Federation for Detached Youth Work

I viewed with interest the proceedings of the Inquiry into services for young people on the 26th of January 2011. Please allow me to make a few comments:

- There can be little doubt that universal youth services act in a preventative way and that they head off the need for targeted, more expensive, services. This can be described as Targeting through Universalism (Tiffany, 2007), in which, for example, street-based youth workers or those working with Looked After Children, can identify which young people will benefit from further support and can give it without stigmatisation.
- *It is* a good question to ask to what extent universal services actually do work with the most marginalised. Many do not but this is why the Youth Service is and needs to be a broad church, with low threshold, street-based services as part of the mix.
- The committee should ask deeper questions about social disengagement; doubtless they will find many drivers outside the control of the youth service, which is why it is a bit rich to suggest the Youth Service should be accountable, almost in its entirety, for NEETs etc. You will find that many of the experiences young people have are not inclusive and provoke disengagement. It is not a coincidence that many young people disengaged from school are involved in youth services. They embrace whole-heartedly the more inclusive pedagogies deprived of them at school. My own view is that the school of the future will draw much more heavily on informal, non-formal and community education pedagogies, and will be all the better for it (more inclusive and effective in its mission).
- Following on, the NCS is welcomed by youth workers. But we have reasonable concerns about its accessibility and have confidence in arguing that some young people will need support both before and after their NCS experience if they are to get the best out of it. This is why my colleagues made a case for the NCS to be built on existing services.
- Concern for social mixing, much needed in the context of polarised institutions and communities (and likely to be exacerbated through school choice and the degradation of an historical commitment to the Common School) is a related issue. Rather than ‘driving a wedge’ (Youth Crime Action Plan) between pro and anti-social peers youth work seeks to employ the former as a positive influence on the latter. Hence, the need for training in, amongst other things, group work methodologies. This emphasis on pro-social interventions needs to be seen in sharp contrast to the degradation of community caused by a surfeit of interventions such as the (now thankfully discredited) ASBO and Curfews that were part of a social policy agenda that had all the hallmarks of being anti-social itself. Academics from the world of geography have provided powerful evidence to this effect. One of the significant contributions youth work makes it to organise experiences for young people with others who are different from themselves. In this sense it perhaps makes a more profound contribution to social cohesion than many formal institutions.
- The sticking point is invariably who the youth service is for. Politicians and policy makers have an ear for resources benefiting those who most need them. And so they should. But in explaining youth work we are at pains to resist talking up the ‘problem of youth’. As Fiona Blacke says, this is a deliberate educational process. Which is why we always try to articulate and promote it in positive terms (and fear a problematising narrative accordingly).

· In the same vein, it becomes attractive to talk about getting young people off the street. I shall be having words with my colleagues for intimating that this is what youth work does! Those, like myself, who work in the context of the street argue strongly that many of the more negative behaviours we witness in young people are a direct result of their criminalisation for being in the street. We seek a more enlightened dialogue about how the state sees the street and its potential for being a positive place of learning; something that would happen if we adults took our responsibility for the socialisation of all our children more seriously. The effective personal and social education of young people necessitates learning in spaces other than the home and the school (where they are invariably subject to control and have limited opportunities to learn through their guided experience of autonomy and democracy – which strikes me as as good a definition of youth work as you could have).

· Financing of youth services is problematic and desperately in need of a more enlightened approach. The pre-prescription of outcomes, although advanced, (if it continues) could see youth work being youth work only in name. The very reason it is accessible, inclusive and of interest to young people (especially those marginalised) is that it negotiates with young people what these outcomes might be and is prepared to take the risk of commitment to an uncertain process (which is essential if it is to be democratic). The continued pre-prescription of outcomes and some aspects of payment by results appear not to be able to see the wood for the trees. Which is why relevance to young people informs youth work to the nth degree; the work is young person-centred, unlike school, for a jolly good reason. And yet this appreciation of what is relevant to young people enables us to cultivate interest and engagement in the things they might not have considered relevant when we first work with them (such as learning about healthy behaviours etc.). Many a teacher could benefit from this kind of approach. Pedagogically we see our roles as supporting inquiry into their wants (expressed needs). Through dialogue we can negotiate an agreed series of more substantive needs to be worked toward. But dialogue means we must, as youth workers, put ourselves in the position of being co-learners in this process and responsive to what young people say. Which is precisely why oppressive levels of pre-prescription can really mess things up. We say, ‘outcomes are what comes out’.

· Awareness is needed of the relationship between schools and youth services; there are times when the provision of ‘alternative curriculum’ programmes represents a hole in the ground for schools to despatch their ‘unteachables’. Which is why I would take issue with the evidence given of “managed moves” {from school}. What is this if not exclusion? The progressive agenda is in many senses a merger of non-formal and formal educational experiences thereby retaining young people in school.

· Competitive commissioning regimes add to the mix and lead to, at best, ‘weakly collaborative partnerships’ (findings of the Nuffield Review). Which is ironic when we all know strong partnerships help young people the most. Let us be very clear that regular changes in contracting arrangements always cause disruption and fracture the very relationships on which all good youth work is predicated.

· A model in which professionally trained workers are sidelined also risks being a false economy. Each one plays a powerful role in catalysing, developing and supporting volunteerism in the community. They are the backbone of any Big Society.

· Funding directed at those projects that can show higher levels of young person involvement and participation might, like so much in youth work since a pre-scribed outcomes culture came to it, be profoundly counter-productive. From the now fabled ‘bus journey certificate’ to street workers

targeting easier young people to work with because of oppressive targets (see Tiffany, 2009, 'The Pistachio Effect' – in which the social exclusion of the most marginalised is exacerbated by workers engaging those easier to work with) performativity is rife. The danger is setting these parameters for funding will see services cherry pick the most articulate and, as a consequence, take their eye off those for whom a developmental process (with higher order participation as an aim) is needed. These young people need to learn the skills of participation through the experience of it. A further irony is that where more confident young people are involved in decision-making systems they will be making pronouncements on the lives of others of whom they have little or no experience. It is these young people we need to get into decision-making systems; and it is then that we get services meeting their needs. The economic benefits of this are obvious; where service actually meet needs money is well spent. Different methodologies, such as Community Philosophy, are needed, rather than the councils and parliaments that they judge are alien to them.

- Of course youth work needs statistical data but, as was said in the inquiry, this takes investment, not least giving part-time workers the time to record (and hopefully reflect on) their practice. As was said by a committee member, there is the 'danger of drowning in a sea of measurement'.

- Of course youth workers recognise that they need to demonstrate and give evidence of impact. But to avoid youth work becoming formalised to such a degree that it ceases to become youth work we must invest in the development of evaluation systems that are sympathetic to its pedagogies. Without this the work will inevitably fall foul of a shift toward more instrumentalised interventions, thereby depriving many young people of perhaps their only experience of learning in a democratic framework and alienating many at the same time (especially those marginalised). Talk of best practice has a similar tyrannical ring. If youth work is to do what it says on the tin we need a system devoted to good local practice. It is what works there and for those young people that really works. Any standardisation of intervention is doomed to dissuade many from engagement with it. As one of the witnesses said, 'there is no universal matrix'; nor can there be in youth work. The litmus test is always 'does the young person benefit?'; which is why they have to be at the heart of evaluation processes. Descriptive accounts are the basis of this; only they are able to capture the subtlety of good youth work. Young people have shown they are only too happy to be involved in this process and that they learn through so-doing. There are several academic institutions who are working on these social impact tools (a number quoted at committee). They must be further explored and disseminated. Sometimes I think of youth workers as being a bit like vicars; how could you judge if a vicar was doing a good job without asking their parishioners?

- Finally, Fiona Blacke quoted an executive of PWC who had experienced first hand the work of detached youth workers in Leeds. I am a director of that organisation and I interviewed him. I contributed his testimony as part of a submission from the Federation for Detached Youth Work. I would urge you to read our expanded report and, in particular, that interview. It speak volumes about the importance of promoting a wider understanding of what youth work is and how it can be accountable for the investment in it.

- Please do not hesitate to contact me, particularly about detached and street-based youth work which, by definition, aims at supporting the marginalised young people and those who, for a variety of reasons, are not accessing wider opportunities in the youth service – a concern for which I recognise in the questioning of the committee.

January 2011

Further Written Evidence Submitted by Children’s Workforce Development Council

At the Select Committee hearing on 30 March, CWDC and other witnesses gave evidence about the young people’s workforce and the CWDC funded Progress project. The project was mentioned several times by witnesses. Select Committee officials invited CWDC to send information about the outputs and outcomes of the project and to make a further point about data collation for the workforce.

The Progress project

This project ran from February 2010 to end March 2011 – comprising a lengthy period of capacity building and planning and an offer of 25,000 training places to the voluntary sector, which were taken up in Q3 & 4 of 2010-11. The overall project cost £4.05M, which mainly subsidised the offer of accredited training units at QCF levels 2 and 3. The following five priority training areas were covered:

1. Facilitating learning and development of young people;
2. Safeguarding the health and welfare of young people;
3. Maintaining health and safety in the workplace;
4. Promoting access to information and support;
5. Promoting equality and the valuing of diversity.

Demand exceeded supply and CWDC endorsed funding for additional places. By the end of the project 27,883 training units had been subsidised, benefiting an estimated 9,000 learners across England. The following tables show the take-up of training by region, level and priority area:

Table 1: Summary of local and national unit delivery at levels 2 and 2

Total unit allocations	% delivered at level 2	% delivered at level 3
27,883	67%	33%

The majority of units delivered were at level two. This trend was consistent throughout the project and confirmed the prediction of a greater demand for entry-level training within the young people’s workforce, reflecting the high proportion of volunteers in the voluntary sector and the need to fill gaps in skills and knowledge.

Table 2: Summary of unit delivery by priority area (PA) at levels 2 and 3¹

	%PA1	%PA2	%PA3	%PA4	%PA5
Level 2	33	15	26	16	9
Level 3	32	18	14	15	21
Totals	32	17	20	16	15

Many units fell under more than one priority area and weighted figures in the more generic priority area 1.

The project focused on accredited units so that learners could, over time, build up their learning into recognised qualifications. Analysis of units taken show the most popular qualification frameworks at Level 2 were:

¹ Figures subject to rounding

- Award in Emergency First Aid at Work;
- Award in Community Sports Leadership;
- Award/Certificate in Youth Work Practice;
- Award, Certificate and Diplomas in Progression frameworks;
- Certificate in Peer Mentoring.

At Level 3 the four most popular frameworks were:

- Award and Certificate in Working with Vulnerable Young People;
- Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector;
- Certificate in Assessing Vocational Achievement;
- Diploma for the Children and Young People's workforce.

The popularity of learning and development qualifications suggests that some organisations are working towards building their infrastructure to deliver and assess their own training programmes. This would be a more cost effective approach to the funding of training for individual organisations.

The project built the capacity of the voluntary sector to run its own accredited training in future, funding accreditation bursaries of £1000 for 30 voluntary organisations to run accredited training.

From April 2011 CWDC is unable to offer further funding for this project.

Data collation on the young people's workforce

The Committee and witnesses also referred to CWDC's publications *A Picture Worth Millions: State of the Young People's Workforce*. CWDC has not been remitted to produce any further updates of these data collations. The Committee may wish to consider the value of such reports for enquiries such as these and for workforce planning in general.

05/2011

Written Evidence Submitted by Mr Keith Jones

Dear Mr Stuart

I watched with interest (and some concern) the Education Committees call for evidence on Wednesday 26 January and felt that little was said that provided any real defence for the need of a universal youth work offer that has been a lifeline to so many young people for so long. For that reason I felt must write and give a practitioners point of view. I write to you also as a concerned parent, a worried grandparent and as an active member in my own local community. I write in the hope that you will consider, very carefully, the plight facing the countries young people and the impact potential of your quest for `hard evidence` may have on recommendations you may conclude regarding spend on youth work and associated services for children, young people and their families.

For too long now I have been more than a little disturbed by the heavy emphasis and imposition of the outcome and `purpose-driven` approaches to youth work which are clearly at odds with the needs of the majority of young people and their communities. In my opinion, current guidance flies in the face of, what to me, youth work hopes to and can achieve. Indeed current practice is seeing more and more youth workers spending increasing amounts of their time servicing the needs of databases rather than those they are there to support.

I am perturbed by the production-line approach that has been wilfully adopted as the `way forward`; and by the disproportionate use and costly micro-management and tracking of young people's personal development that cannot be at all accurately be measured by the current set of expensive, labour intensive tools and monitoring systems foisted upon workers in the field in the name of accountability with the mantra "we have to be demonstrating value for money"

With the best part of thirty years of community and youth work experience behind me, (and reluctantly approaching retirement) I have had the privilege during my calling, of working with so many young people, some briefly, others for extended periods, some quite `needy`, some less so, but thankfully most are now leading stable and happy lives; and when the time is right, they tell us we helped.

Meeting with many of them later in life, all speak appreciatively of the, caring and interested adult during their formative years and of the time spent with us; `youth workers`. Here I would like share with you some, albeit anecdotal, evidence in the hope that you might gain a deeper understanding of what it is exactly you are asking for.

Recently we opened a new facility for young people and invited older members who had been involved in shaping the services provided, to come along and share in their/our achievement in bringing the project to fruition; here is what one of them wrote after the event. And I could share with you many, many more.

"Yesterday was a historic moment for everyone, past, present, and future, whoever has or ever will be involved with the work that TCR does. To see such incredible hopes develop over so many years, and finally come to fruition yesterday w...as incredibly moving and I can't praise everyone enough. Joe - You are an utter inspiration to me. I have you and TCR to thank for my own personal career path, and if I can inspire just a single person half as much as you have me, and the many others across the dale, then I'll be a very happy girl.
Thanks Joe :) x"

Whilst the above relates to a project I worked in and tells of young people and families I have worked with, I know that `youth workers` across the country and in your very own constituency have similar and indeed more remarkable stories to tell. And it's a fair bet that each day a youth worker somewhere will meet up with a young person and reminisce; with the ubiquitous lump in the throat moment that accompanies such occasions.

So what's my point? Given the comments from the young person above, my point is this 1. I didn't plan it. 2. I couldn't measure it 3. I cannot put a figure on the eventual outcomes for the young person concerned or the savings made to society because of my influence. 4. There is no accredited or recorded outcome; apart from what you read above; and here is the rub, that `process` took ten years!

You see the thing is it happens (youth work) in spite of strategy not because of it, it comes about not because of national benchmarks or agencies but local intervention dealing with local need. It takes place in real places with real people, not names or numbers in a database. There is no coercion or hidden agenda; it starts from where young people are in their lives. The very essence of the process is that young people come to youth work voluntarily and informal education takes place (education by stealth) or not, as the case may be. However it must not be understated that an essential element of youth work is that it is open to all and inclusive and that young people's association with all their peers is vitally important if one does not want to divide communities.

Obviously this `process` does not fit with current thinking and micro-management model, but the evidence is quite clear, it works, and what works is youth work. It is a formidable tool that, if we are not careful, could soon be lost simply because it is misunderstood (or misrepresented) and cannot be immediately measured in any meaningful way that satisfies the accountants and number crunchers.

Therefore I pose a few questions to you as an elected member to consider. When you are asking for `robust evidence` about how the impact of youth work can be measured consider this. As a member of parliament you are there to represent and ensure that your constituents receive the best possible outcomes, right?

As such, you would feel duty bound to intervene if one (or more) of your constituents had a problem. So let's say a family has experienced a housing issue that had not been resolved via normal channels so they call you in to help. Let us assume, as we would expect from our MP's, you do your duty and the problem is taken care of and the family you assisted are housed, their children go to the local school, they find work and live happily ever after, (Ok its simplified but you get the picture) I'm sure you will have examples of this and similar problems where your support was required.

Remembering also that you are there for ALL your constituents and you do not just target those with problems, indeed in doing your job well, you will have avoided some members of your community from finding themselves in a negative situation in the first place, Yes? But how do you know who they are and how much you have assisted; and ultimately how much money was saved by your intervention, could you tell me? I would be interested to see your `robust` evidence.

Now, let's say you were not there to take on that family's issue, what would be the implications and outcomes for that family? Could you demonstrate `robustly` how your involvement had a social and cost benefit? What might have happened? Homelessness, need to claim benefits, cost of support from social services, mental health issues that would arise etc, etc the list goes on. How would you put a figure on it? And can you tell me how many you have helped who did not go on to require more intense and costly support, just because you are there doing the work you do, therefore saving the country money in the long term?

So the six million dollar question is, what evidence do your constituents, as tax payers, have that YOU provide value for money?
What would your `robust evidence` look like? Not so easy is it?

The reality is that as a constituent I have to have faith that having you in your role as our paid MP that you provide a cost effective benefit to me and our community, and that really is, that's all there is... (Unless you know something I don't?) As a constituent I may well be able to read on a government website how much you spent on your lunch, but would it tell me how cost effective you have been? No! It wouldn't, and most of us (despite all the expenses commotion) have positive experiences of dealings with our MP or councillor.

I fully appreciate that these are challenging times but (and time will tell this story) cuts to Youth Services are most defiantly not a way to make savings in real terms. Reducing any support to children and young people will be catastrophic in your own community and we will all pay a heavy price for a long time to come. The price we pay will obviously not be confined to the public purse, it will, by default, reduce the number of young people able to achieve their full potential and create a generation with lower aspirations bringing with them to the heart of our communities all the problems associated

with picking up the pieces of their difficult position that they have in no way contributed to. And please also note that youth services are not an area that communities are requesting cut backs and savings to be made, in fact quite the opposite is true.

It's a fact (measurable or not) that having universal access to a wide choice of age-appropriate services helps to ensure that young people feel valued and will (if investment is made) play their part, now and in the future and leading to visible and effective involvement in their communities that we can all benefit from. The truth is; we really do need them to do this, we cannot afford not too!

So I humbly request that, when asking for `evidence` remember that the questions about youth work arise solely because `youth work` seems less serious than mainstream education. Somehow a seemingly puritanical view has set in that seems to suggest that unless something has an immediate and quantifiable benefit somehow it is of little value. As they say, you will end up "knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing"

My view would be that you take this view at your peril; MP's will be next, some would say this line has already started with the call for a reduction in the number of MP's. Apparently someone did some `robust` evidence based research and found that "the House of Commons could do the job that it does with 10% fewer MPs without any trouble at all."
Now where have I heard that before?

So, your task should you choose to accept it is "do not let either of those cuts happen" Be part of the solution, not a creator of the problem, and make no mistake, young people need you now; probably more than they have ever needed you before.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I would very much welcome your feedback and comment. And you have my word that I will feed your responses back to the young people. At the very least the ones I work with, the thing is, will I be telling them you are on their side?

Yours sincerely

Mr Keith Jones

PLEASE NOTE

The opinions expressed in this correspondence are my own and do not necessarily express the views of my employer or any group I am personally associated with

April 2011

Written Evidence Submitted by Andrew Moreman

As a Youth Worker now entering my 20th year in the profession I was dismayed to hear of your comments at the Select Committee regarding the inability of some in the sector to 'explain the difference you make'.

I am aware that the select committee will receive a lot of evidence which takes time to collate and wade through. As I work for a large provider of Youth Services I made a written submission to the committee, I should be clear that the requests for evidence did not ask for evidence of how previous outcomes for young people could be demonstrated and as such the critique you've made seems somewhat unusual and possibly unfair in light of this. Nevertheless within our submission I included written comments from young people telling exactly what the impact of youth work had been on their lives.

I should point out that in order to get these comments from young people and their own evaluations of the services we provide we spent £178 setting up an online survey which nearly 1200 young people responded to, it may not be as scientific as some of the evaluation methods referred to by some of the oral presenters at the committee but it has the major advantage of being almost £2m cheaper!

As I was at a meeting last night where young people presented their views on some local provision I thought I would share just a couple of their comments (they gave me permission to do so) so that you could be reassured of the value of this work in the lives of young people.

These young people all attend one of our youth clubs which opens four nights a week in one of the more isolated wards we support and I've copied from their presentation :

Young man, 18:

"The Service is very important to me I started attending when I was 12 and I was not a very nice young person, I am now 18!

Youth Workers have helped me develop as a person and learn to be respectful, accepting others and their life choices. I have a good laugh!"

Young woman 16:

"Before I started attending I was really shy and would not talk to anyone without having known them a long time. It took me a long time to get the confidence to say hello.

The closeness and "family" like feel not only between the young people but also the support from the staff helped me out of my shell and feel comfortable within the group.

I have been at for a few years and I'm now open to trying new things. I even went to Paris (for a performance) and had a speaking part!!

Now I feel confident enough to talk and interact with people. I have been able to go to job interviews, sing in front of people and I now have a place I can be myself without worrying. THANK YOU EVERYONE."

As I'm sure you can imagine I could supply you with many of these stories, along with countless facts and figures about the number of people who attend our services, what they gain from doing so etc.

I trust you will find these stories useful when deciding how best to support young people through youth work. I believe we face a time of enormous pressures for young people - high unemployment, the loss of EMA, the high cost of University, the loss of local support through a range of reducing service all give young people significant challenges to respond

to. During this time the resilience that informal education and youth work activities can bring out in a young person must be more important than ever (and of course as a preventative activity are a fraction of the cost of other services).

I wish you and your colleagues all the best during the committee's deliberations and am more than happy to contribute further or answer any questions you may have if you would find that helpful.

April 2011

Written Evidence Submitted by Mike Amos-Simpson

I recently became aware of the inquiry into services for young people and have followed matters to date with interest. I have had a particular interest in the NCS as it is a scheme with very close similarities to a programme I developed 11 years ago and ran for 9 years.

I have attached copies of independent research based on that programme and hope it may be of use towards your inquiries. There are several findings from my experience that seem of particular relevance to discussions during the meetings shown on the Parliament TV including that we quickly reached a point at which the programme was delivered by young people. Another critical point was the essential role of involving local adults in supporting young people that we found to often be more beneficial than involvement by professional workers.

I have shared these reports with Craig Morley and Jon Yates at The Challenge Network and I met with both of these earlier in the week having offered to share my learning from having previously set up a similar programme albeit on a smaller scale than the NCS. A very significant learning from the Young Movers programme was the movement toward involving young people in the delivery of the programme. This was significant both in improving the quality of the programme itself, and in reducing costs. This being largely due to the need to offer simpler activities more relevant to what young people could replicate beyond their initial involvement in the programme.

Given the very detailed scrutiny being given towards funding for youth services I was surprised to hear that this aspect of being able to structure the programme in such a way would only be of interest if there were concern for the budget and as this was not the case it was not currently a concern. I trust that this isn't in fact the case and that the reasons given were a simplification, however I do hope those involved in developing the NCS will be given at least equal scrutiny in relation to the true value of the scheme.

I wish you success in moving provision for young people forward. It is a sector in great need of reform for many years and I hope the current inquiries focus on the potential for reform in a positive sense.

1st April 2011

Footnote Annex not published

Written Evidence submitted by Nick Hindley

I have just watched a video of the meeting you had recently with representatives from Scouts including Meg who is a great ambassador for the movement. I am a scout leader in Cambridge and have been in Scouting since the age of 7.

I know many people who have been helped by Scouts and their lives and the lives of those around them are better for their involvement. I do believe in the big community and feel that the Scouts offers a marvellous platform from which many benefits can flow into and across the community. As a multi-faith movement we are ideally positioned to help encourage people to deal with each other on the basis of the massive areas that unite us rather than the possible fractionalisation of communities into religious cliques.

I do not think we need lots of direct funding from government as we raise a lot of money ourselves, the 26th does this through marquee and minibus hire, entertainment shows etc. we are going to Guernsey this year for our two regular two week annual camp, the cost of which will be £270.00 per person. Every member of the troop who wants to go will go as we raise funds for this reason. We do not seek funding from outside and so guarantee the widest possible access to all.

We do need a government that looks carefully at the impact of decisions that affect Scout troops like the recent debates we have had locally about industrial level waste disposal charges and a proposed water run off charge, both of which would have seriously eaten into our fundraised money. These indirect costs, if not managed, could easily bring an end to some troops and so also the opportunities they offer to young people. I am pleased to see the changes you are making to the CRB process for parents as many have been put off by the paperwork.

We have a large number of young leaders who help with beavers (6-7's) and cubs (8-10's) as well as now helping me to run the Scout Programme and they are contributing to the big community, developing key skills for study and work and enjoying themselves. I have calculated that the time they give to Scouts each year equates to around £5,000 that they would otherwise be able to earn in a paid role. For many this is a significant choice to make as they prepare to go to university and need every penny.

I wish you every success with your committee's work and would like to offer you further input and contribution from the operational end of a remarkable voluntary organisation.

1st April 2011

Written Evidence Submitted by Integrated Youth Support Service, London Borough of Hounslow

Written submissions are invited, addressing the following points:

- The relationship between universal and targeted services for young people;

It is imperative that there is access for young people to both Universal and Targeted Services. This not only gives young people a degree of choice, in relation to being able to come into contact with good role models and have their needs identified in an arena that does not label them. But also allows them to receive initial support and be able to be sign posted or referred as and if the issues require it. This will also include young people who want to engage as providers rather than consumers, and not just look at a deficit model of young people's engagement. Targeted services have a part to play in the development of young people who identify or are identified as needing additional support. This is not new to the youth service environment, but additional funding and properly supported workers allow for a better service to assist young people in participating in the development of a progressive life plan.

It is important to distinguish those young people who require additional support from a targeted service to those that require universal access and one should not replace the other.

- How services for young people can meet the Government's priorities for volunteering, including the role of National Citizen Service;

Many young people are involved in volunteering across the UK and in particular we have a well focussed youth and adult volunteering programme in Hounslow, that supports the work we undertake with young people. The mapping of youth volunteering is problematic because of the constant changing of the third sector organisations accrediting the volunteers and supporting them. There needs to be a national database of volunteers, where the volunteering is taking place, the rewards process and trigger points, and a national recognition process. Young people need to be involved in the planning, organisation, administration and delivery of such programmes and evaluate their effectiveness. Currently with NCS and other programmes it does feel that there is a considerable amount of tripping over each other to provide accredited programmes. It is important that young people from all demographics are listened to so that the final outcome/programme is successful in its up take

In Hounslow we have had a number of our full time paid staff access youth work careers through their beginnings in volunteering with us, this is

important in an area such as West London due to housing and living costs and we have been unsuccessful in the past in relation to getting people to move from other areas of the country to this area, as the cost has been prohibitive. The 'grow your own' programme, therefore enabled local young people to train, gain experience and then subsequently become paid staff in a service they know and understand in an area they know and understand and enables the demographic of an area to be more relevantly reflected.

- Which young people access services, what they want from those services and their role in shaping provision;

Young people from all demographics of life engage with Hounslow's youth service. Some seek assistance in planning for the next stage of life, education, relationships, specific issues, leisure, etc.

What most young people want is to be able to engage with adults that they can trust. Adults who will not judge them, adults who will help them to establish a sense of purpose and direction, adults who will praise them for their achievements even if it is not totally successful. This should be a parent, but not all young people are in that position and even if they have such parents, they do not always recognise the benefits of what they have.

The Youth Service in Hounslow does work with many very vulnerable young people, those at risk from many issues that life deals them currently. The staff members are skilled at mediation and advocacy and support young people in a number of arenas in a non-judgemental way that enables the young person to grow and develop rather than be judged and labelled.

Young people should be and are involved in decision making regarding their futures and their communities and we have a number of examples that demonstrate this. A real strength of the staff team has been to promote cohesion and respect and share lives with others.

- The relative roles of the voluntary, community, statutory and private sectors in providing services for young people;

We all have a part to play, but the understanding of social structure and intervention is best placed in the realm of the youth work sector. Personal development has been the key to producing valuable and effective citizens. The voluntary sector and youth services have been key to this, however the private sector has been key in providing additional funding for activities and social development that supports the LA.

However mutually supportive the relationship is, often the third sector or in the case of this Borough, small voluntary and community sector organisations need the support of the LA Youth Services who support through the capacity building and training that is on offer to them and continue to make an impact on their organisation.

- The training and workforce development needs of the sector;

It is important that there is a positive development plan for all staff. Those employed in a full time capacity should have a professional qualification as defined by the NYA with relevant experience across the sector. If line managing others they should also have and be availed of managerial qualifications and experience.

Part time or support youth workers should be qualified as defined by the NYA and given the opportunity to advance to a professional qualification. The provision of a part time training courses run via a university that allows for the attainment of the full time equivalent degrees should be available.

The opportunity to build training consortia's between a number of local authorities can be a possible way of sharing resources. This will need better and more constructive ways of working, planning and implementing. There is no need for more external companies to offer such, as they tend to be costly and not always locally relevant. This can be achieved with the various training sectors involved in the youth training and development departments that we have at present.

The impact of public sector spending cuts on funding and commissioning of services, including how available resources can best be maximised, and whether payment by results is desirable and achievable;

The Service has had significant cuts since 2006, and over 17 staff have left the Connexions and Youth Service since then, the direct effect has undoubtedly been on administration and management but the most profound impact has been on the front line staff, now having to undertake administrative and other tasks on instead of the administrators thus taking them away from front line delivery. The effect being front line delivery is affected. Uncertainty of planning for the out of school provision, both evenings, weekends and during holiday times has also had an impact to often paralyse staff, with no discernable funds and no consistency of approach the work is much more ad hoc and means the experience to young people is being compromised. It would be worth making more use of the closure times of schools to maximise available space and reduce capital expenditure but often this too is costly and problematic as it is often a new experience for schools to keep the young people 'on board'

whereas in the past they may have been discussing their exclusion and therefore not able to return to school at other times.

- How local government structures and statutory frameworks impact on service provision; and
- How the value and effectiveness of services should be assessed.

It is difficult to discuss local structures at present as we are in a transition period and awaiting change, although it looks as though Youth work is being diluted by a locality management structures. What was in place and was showing an improvement with the community getting more involved in its own development has been curtailed until the new structure is determined. Services ought to be assessed on the personal development of the client groups and the positive development of local communities not just the little they cost. Investment structures should be adopted in order to measure the success of local ventures. Measurement can include the numbers benefiting from each venture, sustainability, diverse inclusion. And community cohesion. The clarity of purpose is being lost, a number of officers feel that Early Intervention is for younger children and miss the key role the Youth Service has to play in the world that enables young people to be picked up when the issue presents – there is a battle for ‘priority’ in the current climate and treated work and work with parents is being seen in many areas as a catch all for work with teenagers and again replacing the work with teenagers- there is a substantial need for young people agreed over 13 years to have places to go without their parents where they will feel supported, listened too and developed. It is always essential to remember that the young people we work with often have parents who are not always giving them the best advice are not the best people to support them and working with them will impact on a later generation, the mistakes made with this generation are not going to be prevented and we would see a lost generation of teenagers who feel the system and the world is against them.

1st April 2011

Written Evidence Submitted by BBC CHILDREN IN NEED

MEMORANDUM:

INTRODUCTION

1. BBC Children in Need is the largest independent funder of disadvantaged children and young people in the UK. Our definition of disadvantage is broad and encompasses: poverty and deprivation, disability, illness, abuse and neglect and behavioural problems. In the last 10 years we have granted over £300 million to nearly 16,000 organisations. In 2010 we made 1,275 grants to the value of £39 million and anticipate that in 2011 we will make grants to a similar level.
2. In terms of youth services, we are currently supporting 459 projects to a value of around £22.5 million addressing the needs of disadvantaged young people across the UK (280 projects at £15 million are in England alone). These projects include generic youth work and clubs, outreach or detached, issue based and drop in youth work. Alongside these we support many other forms of projects and activities that reach young people including arts and creativity (£8.6 m), befriending and mentoring (£6 m), counselling (£11 m), sports and health (£5.8 m) and training and employment (£7.8 m, including a discrete £2 million NEET focused programme funded in partnership with The Hunter Foundation).
3. Our submission to the Education Committee's review of services for young people is from the perspective of an independent funder and is based on many years experience as a grant-maker in this sector. This text also draws on learning that has come from an internal review of community-led youth clubs for disadvantaged young people. This involved in-depth interviews with the providers of 57 youth clubs across the UK, an online survey of over 200 young people attending youth clubs and separate learning events with providers and young people.
4. While this submission refers primarily to mainstream youth provision, we have experience and knowledge about provision to more targeted groups such as disabled, homeless, in care and offending young people. There are many similar issues in planning for and delivering to these more targeted groups; however, there are also some very specific factors in meeting their needs that are not represented here.

EVIDENCE

Relationship between universal and targeted services (in targeted settings)

5. Our emphasis on meeting the needs of disadvantaged children and young people means that most of what we fund needs to be targeted in nature. For many of the youth services we fund, particularly youth clubs, this can involve

having an open door policy in targeted communities. The activities and services will then become more targeted as the young people engage.

6. Having a universal approach in marginalised or deprived communities brings its own set of challenges to engaging harder to reach young people that universal services in more well-off areas may not experience. From our review of community led youth clubs we learned that these include:
 - young people's concerns, such as fear of violence, bullying and stigma
 - parental concerns, such as worry about their child's safety and the focus of the service
 - chaotic lifestyles of certain families preventing attendance
 - other interests pulling young people away, for example *"it's weed or alcohol or us"* (from a youth club provider).
 - harder-to-reach groups can be different in nature and more challenging to engage than in more well off communities
7. Having a universal service in a marginalised community but with an outreach strategy to engage the harder-to-reach young people is an important approach for youth services. Indeed, this universalism can be a facilitator to engagement as it can allay concerns that it is only for 'poor' or 'troublesome' young people that can keep all young people away.
8. Another benefit of being universal in a targeted setting is that youth services providers report that it is important to establish and maintain links with other services in their communities, such as police, social services and schools, in order to identify hard-to-reach young people. The providers can then use this information to support their outreach practices, such as knocking on doors, going to where young people 'hang-out' and distributing flyers.
9. All projects we have spoken to acknowledge that it takes time to build up trust and relationships with a community and the young people in it; hence our assertion that having a genesis and maintaining a role within a community is an essential element of engaging all young people, including those who are considered harder to reach.
10. Supporting the principle that to engage you need an embedded local service with outreach capacity, we learned from a survey of over 200 young people that two-thirds of them need little additional information about their youth clubs in order to attend. They have friends who tell them about it, have 'always known about it' or it is near where they live. The remaining third were engaged through outreach activities, such as information in their schools, referrals from elsewhere and being approached by a club leader.

Volunteering and National Citizen Service priorities

11. Many community-based projects have volunteers from the local community. An aspect that is important in their connection to the young people from the community they served. In our review 80 % of the projects had previous and current users of the clubs as volunteers. There was a clear message that this

recruitment required little effort as young people engaged in the project often actively want to be volunteers. For many attendees becoming a volunteer is a natural transition from their youth club as their sense of responsibility develops and they 'want to give back' and/or as they are not ready to leave the club completely.

12. Having young volunteers who were past participants brings many benefits to the club and those attending. These include:
- developing a young person's sense of public contribution as they give back to the youth club, other young people and the community
 - having volunteers with current life experiences that help them empathise with and relate to engaged young people and become mentors or role models
 - they know how the youth club or service works and can guide young people through its range of offerings, including how to access more targeted support
 - the young volunteers can have relationships with and support attendees outside the youth service and this can develop their sense of responsibility within their community
 - the volunteering helps in the transition to life after the youth service
 - seeing young volunteers encourages others to do the same when they reach a similar stage or age – it becomes an ambition to progress through the service from participant to volunteer
 - particular challenging young people may hold respect for an older teenager which they may not offer to a leader
 - some young volunteers may progress to or also be part of the management of the project, building their skills and capacity in running and managing voluntary and community services.

Who accesses services, what they want and their roles in shaping them

13. From the data of our current portfolio of 459 active youth projects we see that the 50 % of young people expected to attend youth services are aged 10 to 15 years, with an equal distribution on each side of that with 22 % being 5 to 9 year old and 21% being 16 to 18 year olds.
14. In terms of main issues worked with, 60 % of the youth services we fund have a primary focus on working with young people living with issues of poverty or deprivation. Other main issues being addressed included young people with very risky behaviours (17 %) and those who are disabled (8 %).
15. Young people are not necessarily bonded to one youth club and they do not necessarily attend those closest to where they live. From our survey, almost a third of young people attend more than one youth club even if their main youth club was within walking distance, which was the case for just over two thirds of young people. The choices by young people are a combination of pragmatic and discerning factors including: location, opening hours, activities

and services offered, where their friends go, the people that run it and, even, where their parents prefer them to be.

16. A key factor is that a youth club fits (in a social as much as a geographical context) within the regular contact points in their lives, for example, home, school, family and friends. Young people are less likely to engage with services set away from these. For some, it matters less if the youth club or service is not the biggest or the best, as large, anonymous centres can be intimidating and require a certain amount of confidence to engage.
17. The options are naturally comparatively restricted for young people living in rural areas – where provision may be narrow or non-existent and transport to services elsewhere is a significant barrier. This emphasises the importance of competition in improving the quality of services. Where choices are restricted there is a higher possibility of services being under-developed, which can include the calibre and capabilities of the youth workers and the aspirations of the young people attending.
18. For many young people a youth club is a place for them to connect with friends, trusted adults and have something to do. That this engagement may lead to increased self-awareness and confidence or a greater sense of direction in life may not be initially clear to young people. However, in our interviews and survey with young people there was a sense of appreciation for what their youth club was doing or had done for them since they engaged. We heard that these young people wanted more of the same. In fact, 94 % of the young people we surveyed stated their youth club had at least made 'a bit of a difference' to their life: within this, 22 % claimed it had totally changed their lives. In interviews the young people were able to express how the clubs had:
 - offered them alternatives to previous risky or problem behaviour
 - provided development and career opportunities
 - built confidence
 - enabled them to have some fun
 - given them something to do
 - allowed for a safe place to be with friends and meet new ones
 - introduced them to caring adults who had become role models.

It is worth noting that what is appealing for funders is not necessarily the same aspect that motivates a young person to engage, for example, they will sign up for a trip but not a workshop on substance misuse. Our funding tries to take account of the nuances and incentivisation aspects of programme planning.

19. The establishment of community-based youth clubs has traditionally come from wider community interests who recognise a gap for young people in their area or have real or perceived concerns about 'youth nuisance'. The involvement of young people, however, in instigating the need for and leading the development of youth clubs in their communities is not always obvious. Only three out of 57 providers we interviewed said the youth club was what the young people wanted and only one stated that the young people were the main interest that drove the establishment of their youth club. More positively, a third were able to talk more broadly about the young

people being involved in some capacity at set-up. For the most part this involvement consisted of young people being consulted (including via outreach), being part of community groups or committees and leading or assuming leadership of a club's development. Many of these youth clubs that have had young people's engagement at the outset have been established in the past twelve years. This highlights the more modern practice of young people's participation in matters that concern them.

20. We also asked young people how they engaged in their youth clubs ongoing decision-making. This revealed that only 5 % of young people felt they had no involvement with decisions in their youth club. For the remaining 95 % it was possible to identify those who saw their contributions on an individual level and those who saw them on a collective level, that is, were part of group decision-making within their youth club. In fact, young people were increasingly likely to be involved in group decision-making the older they were. It was also common for youth clubs to have a scale of involvement by age. For example: 12 year-olds as participants choosing their activities; 15 year-olds assuming voluntary responsibilities such as leading younger people in activities; and 18 year-olds becoming full volunteers and/or members of management committees.

21. As a funder it remains difficult for us to ascertain the quality of young people's involvement in projects. We recognise that making the space and time for participation can be more for the benefit of organisations applying for funding than for the benefit of young people. We also recognise that clubs which have their genesis in the community do not always start from the premise that participation and empowerment is an essential part of youth work and that this understanding and the know-how to implement it can require time and support to develop.

Roles of voluntary, community, statutory and private sectors in providing youth services

22. We see the interaction and links between all these sectors as vital in the provision of effective youth services. Much of what needs to be achieved to improve the lives of vulnerable young people relies on sharing knowledge, expertise and resources across organisations operating in these different spheres. It is common for many of the voluntary and community youth services we fund to be part of or contributing to multi-agency or integrated working groups in their local area.

23. The expert knowledge from statutory youth-worker stakeholders is valuable, especially their connections to the latest information on issues being addressed and where to link for support and best practice. With the possibility of less statutory youth services, there is a risk that the loss of this expertise will create a knowledge vacuum in local areas across the country.

24. For community-based services we know that strong links with local business, statutory and voluntary organisations:

- enable referrals to and from each other which is especially important for marginalised young people
- are sources of key local knowledge about issues, individual young people and service opportunities and challenges
- enhance opportunities to share resources and reduce costs, such as accessing / providing in-kind support
- widen the choices of services, facilities and activities for young people
- enable a co-ordinated holistic approach to needs, leading to better support for young people

25. In the forthcoming era of budget constraints we expect the need for community providers to build and form relationships with other local organisations and across sectors to increase in importance.

Training and Workforce Development

26. Training for part-time workers and volunteers has traditionally been something workers would receive on the job or in their own time. The increasing emphasis, however, on those working in the sector to be highly skilled in engaging and delivering provision to young people has resulted in added pressure on the voluntary and community sector to ensure that the volunteers and staff they are using are appropriately trained.

27. We learned that there was an equal split across providers of youth clubs about what were essential attributes when recruiting staff and volunteers. 'Personal qualities and experience' were viewed as the most essential for 43 % of providers while qualifications and skills were most important for 42 %.

28. The personal qualities highlighted by providers included:

- having empathy and respect for young people
- being positive role models
- trustworthiness
- being tolerant and patient
- enthusiasm and willingness to do extra.

29. While many were able to identify desirable qualifications and experience for working in youth clubs as important, there was a mixed response to making qualifications and/or experience a requirement in recruitment.

30. Being local and having local knowledge of the community and the youth club itself are also highly-valued features of staff and volunteers.

Public sector spending cuts

31. We currently support around 2,400 not-for-profit organisations working with disadvantaged children and young people across the UK. In 2010 we saw requests to the value of £226 million against available funds of £39 million – a

ratio of almost £6.50 requested for every £1 available. We are anticipating increased demand on our available funds in the coming year.

32. While it is very early days in terms of understanding the implications of local spending decisions, the number of requests we received to fund youth services in England in our January 2010 grant round as compared to our January 2011 grant round rose by 35 %. The regions with the most prominent increases are in the South West and North of England.

How value and effectiveness of services can be assessed

33. Having the best evidence available to assess the needs of young people and the effectiveness of the services that work with them is essential to us when making decisions about new and continuing funding.

34. We provide mandatory Self-evaluation Training to organisations where we fund salaried posts in order to bolster their ability to report on the outcomes they achieve for children. We have done this through investment in around 60 training days a year for funded organisations across the UK. This ability of projects to self-evaluate and reflect on their performance against desired outcomes (successes and failures) will remain of utmost importance to projects seeking further support. We have identified a challenge for many organisations in setting up straightforward systems to capture relevant and regular qualitative data to enable outcomes to be analysed and understood.

35. We also recognise that there will be a greater responsibility for the larger funding or infrastructure organisations (including statutory bodies) to take a lead in aggregating the lessons and outcomes from across the work of the smaller, less well resourced voluntary and community sector organisations. Further, assessing the value and effectiveness of youth services does not rest with one group or type of stakeholder within the sector, i.e., it cannot be the sole responsibility of providers. There is vested interest for all stakeholders to work together to gather, analyse, exploit and share data and knowledge in order to develop the best possible practices and structures to meet and address the needs of all young people, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

36. Open access services in disadvantaged settings are important for engaging the young people in the communities they are set. When commissioning and planning universal services in targeted communities it will be important to ensure a range of direct contact strategies are in place to engage the 'harder-to-reach' young people in that area.

37. It is important to encourage services to develop and maximise opportunities for progression through youth services; for example, from participant to volunteer to youth worker. Alongside this, to help the young people connect

their growing responsibilities within their youth services to the wider communities in which they are based.

38. Establishing and maintaining links with other agencies and providers in local communities may become increasingly challenging in the more localised and increasingly competitive commissioning environment. All providers in the new settings need to be supported and encouraged to remain open to sharing resources and knowledge and developing partnerships in order to ensure services for young people are their most effective.
39. We need to recognise that not all providers, in particular those from community grass-root origins, have the resources and capacity to recruit appropriately qualified staff; or train their workforce (including volunteers) to the level that would be preferred. For many who recruit based on personal qualities and experience, on-the-job training is all they are able to offer. There is a need for much more high-quality short-burst training on the job for youth workers who have the right qualities, attributes and life experience but who lack the knowledge of how to translate these in a sustained way into effective youth work practice.
40. Recruiting a workforce (paid and voluntary) from local communities offers many benefits to all involved. Providing localised support to recruit and train people from the communities being reached is therefore needed.
41. As finances tighten and all stakeholders rearrange to maintain service provision, there will need to be a careful focus on the ongoing ability of providers to engage young people in planning and decision-making. All effort should be made to ensure that participation of young people does not fall away because it becomes too difficult and/or expensive within new arrangements.
42. Assessing value and effectiveness of services and interventions that work to improve the lives of young people is not just the responsibility of those leading the provision. Resources and capacity to assemble and exploit learning could be developed in local partnerships in order that learning about effectiveness and good practice is maximised and not lost.

1st April 2011

Written Evidence Submitted by The Scout Association

The Committee asked for a written note on the following issues:

1. A comparison of the costs of the National Citizen Scheme with the costs of Scouting
2. The percentage of people who come back to Scouting as volunteers in later life
3. Examples of good and bad practice with regards to youth services in local authorities.

1 A comparison of the costs of the NCS with the costs of Scouting

The best estimate based on public figures for the cost of the proposed eight week National Citizen Service course is £1148 per individual.

The cost for a young person attending a Scout Group would on average total £350 per year to include:

- weekly meetings and ongoing leadership support
- two full weekend residentials
- a full week-long residential
- membership subscriptions to local Group, and to County and national operations for access to all services
- insurance for personal accident and for public liability

Thus a young person could get three-and-a-quarter years of Scouting for the cost of eight weeks with the NCS.

2 The percentage of people who come back to volunteers in later life

The Scout Association has seen year on year increases to its membership in the last four years. From our membership data we know that 45% of our recruits are parents of existing members and another 45% are former members.

As part of our impact assessment we found that over 55% of our Explorer Scouts volunteer in an external capacity outside Scouting and 57% of our Network members. This compares favourably with the national youth average (Fiona Blacke quoted 27% in her evidence last week). Over 35% of members said that Scouting influenced their decision to volunteer elsewhere.

3 Examples of good and bad practice with regards to youth services in local authorities

Many Scout groups are suffering because of increases to the ground rents charged by local authorities. Similarly the removal of discretionary rate relief to Scout groups from some local authorities is causing financial uncertainty for many groups. We estimate that up to 30% of Scout groups are affected. Below is a selection of case studies which illustrate the type of rises groups are seeing.

Ground rent horror stories

1. Groups in the London Borough of Hounslow are likely to see ground rent increases from an average of £125 per annum to £4500. This has increased because the authority now says it has to increase ground rents to “market” rate. However, across the borough’s northern boundary , the London Borough of Ealing continues to offer Scout groups long term land leases at peppercorn rents proving that it can be done and creating a very immediate postcode lottery for charities in the area.
2. Banstead District Scout Group has received a request for an increase in ground rent from the current £135 per annum to £10,500 from Surrey County Council.
3. Leeds City Council has increased the fees for renting a building to the 12th Morley Scout Group and the group now needs to find an additional £6480 per year. They anticipate that this will cost each child an additional £108 per year. They anticipate that the group will fold by the end of the spring.
4. Barwick in Elmet Scout Group in Wetherby District have used the local school for Scouting purposes for free for over 25 years. The group expect that rate to rise to £100 per week in 2011, increasing their costs by £5000 per year.
5. The 141st Birmingham, 1st Yardley (Spitfire District) group are currently charged a ground rent of £2500 per annum by Birmingham City Council. However, until this year Birmingham City Council have always provided a grant to cover the full amount of the ground rent. The group are currently in discussion with the council as to whether the grant will continue but are expecting to have to find an additional £2500 per year from 2011.

Ground rent success stories

6. Chelmsford Borough Council continues to exempt local Scout groups from council tax and charge them £15.00 per year ground rent.
7. The 1st Moss Wrexham Scout group rent a community hall from Wrexham Borough Council. The rent has increased steadily over the years, more or less in line with RPI, and the group have use of a modern refurbished hall, toilets and a kitchen. The hall is well lit, heated and

cleaned regularly. The normal rate to hire the room to the general public is £50 per night. This deal represents great value and annual increases in line with RPI allow groups to budget accordingly.

05/2011

Written Evidence Submitted by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Committee recently. You asked for further information about the outcome led approach to youth support services in Kensington and Chelsea. By way of background, my service covers the following range of activity:

- Youth Services (including youth centres, outreach work etc)
- Youth Sports Development
- Schools Sports
- Connexions
- Enterprise and apprenticeships programmes
- Health promotion programmes (including the Teenage Pregnancy programme, substance misuse education and prevention)
- Youth arts and culture programmes
- Accredited programmes for young people (including Duke of Edinburgh Award programme)
- Targeted activity programmes for vulnerable young people
- Youth participation programme and the Borough's Youth Forum
- Targeted Youth Support
- Young people's website
- An array of youth support services commissioned via the voluntary sector

When I was asked to lead the service six years ago, it was apparent to me that the problem was not a lack of measures, it was the sheer volume. My service was responsible for over 200 targets and sub targets – either directly or as a supporting service. This left the service itself lacking a clear focus at times. Through the development of an integrated youth support strategy, we identified 15 key targets as a means of measuring the overall quality of our offer to young people, (see below). In addition, the targets were selected because they could not be achieved by a single service in isolation. They required services to coordinate which increased effectiveness and efficiency and drove out duplication. The same targets formed our commissioning priorities with our VCS colleagues. Thus we were able to draw in our VCS partners to focus on the same aims. We were careful not to over prescribe as we wanted to ensure sufficient room for creativity and innovation. We have been very successful in achieving the targets we set for ourselves and we all share in that success.

As we move in the direction of opting out of the local authority and forming a social enterprise, we are more conscious than ever of the need to prove our worth. We are realigning our service in relation to four key themes:

- Early intervention
- Enterprise and learning and services to schools
- Services for young people with complex needs
- Generic services such as youth clubs, sport, health

We will set a series of measures against these themes. Themes are based on our understanding of young people’s needs. Crucially (and perhaps this is where the world of youth support services may change) our market research tells us these are the service areas that commissioners will pay to have delivered. With that in mind, we will have to ensure we have the data available to show effectiveness. It is no longer enough (if indeed it ever was) to say what we do is intrinsically a ‘good thing’. We have to prove it and with evidence.

Table One YSDS High Level Performance Indicators (extract from RBKC integrated youth support strategy 2008-11)

Indicator	Source	Method
The percentage of young people 13-19 in the cohort participating in structured positive activities (annual)	National Indicator Set (NIS) NI110	Tell us survey CCIS
16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment (NEET)	(NIS) NI117	Connexions impact data
Participation of 17 year-olds in education or training	(NIS) NI191	Connexions impact data
The number of young people participating in sport as a percentage of the total number of young people aged 5-19	(NIS) NI157	To be measured by independent survey
The number of conceptions among girls aged under 18 resident in the authority area per 1,000 girls aged 15-17 years resident in the area in the current calendar year as compared to the 1998 baseline	(NIS) NI112	Teenage Pregnancy Unit
Participation in and outcomes from youth work: recorded outcomes	BVPI 221a	EYS
Participation in and outcomes from youth work: accredited outcomes	BVPI 221b	EYS

The percentage of schools achieving healthy schools status, as measured by the Healthy Schools Audit	DCSF	Local monitoring
The percentage of young people participating in the School Sports Partnership programme that undertake at least two hours of high quality physical activity a week	DCSF	PESCCL survey
No. of contacts per young person (as a percentage of the local youth population)	Local measure	EYS
Participation as a percentage of the borough's 13-19 yr age group	Local measure	EYS
Level of satisfaction with YSDS services	Local measure	Annual survey of users
Section 140 assessments are at 100%	Statutory requirement	CCIS
Increase the number of young people with a disability accessing YSDS services	Local measure	EYS
Increase the number of LAC in the borough accessing YSDS services	Local measure	EYS

05/2011

Written Evidence Submitted by Social Finance

Could Social Impact Bonds be applied to youth services?

- Social investment in any form is not a replacement for the revenue that the youth sector is currently losing.
- Social Impact Bonds represent just one of a range of social investment instruments that will be needed to capitalise the sector – and will include debt, equity and equity-like finance. Earned income and contract income will continue to be important.
- Having said that, by raising investment from non-government investors, Social Impact Bonds do potentially offer a mechanism to pay for improved youth outcomes.
- Social Impact Bonds are potentially attractive because Government only pays for what works while service providers get paid for up front. As the financial return is tied to the social impact, the interests of Government, service providers, service users and investors are aligned.
- In many ways youth services offer good potential for Social Impact Bond financing – a range of experienced, high quality service providers exist with a good understanding of their client group and proven intervention models.
- Equally, we know that when young people aren't supported the social consequences (and the public cost) can be great in terms of youth offending, teen pregnancy, poor educational outcomes, unemployment and mental health.
- The wide range of positive social outcomes constitutes part of the challenge of applying a Social Impact Bond to youth services.
- Often a single intervention can drive multiple outcomes that will benefit a number of government departments – for instance *Teens and Toddlers* run a teen pregnancy prevention programme that has also been demonstrated to have a positive impact on school attendance and achievement.
- Social Finance has been undertaking detailed feasibility studies in Essex, Liverpool and Manchester to assess the opportunities for establishing Social Impact Bonds to address the problems of some of the most vulnerable young people and their families. The failure to remedy severe behavioural problems among adolescents and the family circumstances that often lead to such problems creates enormous costs for the young people themselves, their wider communities and the public services that deal with the consequences.
- We consider that if a Social Impact Bond were to provide upfront investment and ensure the rigorous implementation of intensive therapeutic and family support programmes such as Multi-Systemic Therapy it could improve the lives of young people and their families and generate savings sufficient to more than repay investors.

- Our analysis suggests that the majority of outcome payments could be covered by reductions in the costs of foster and residential care alone. However, the programmes should also reduce demand on services such as health and the criminal justice system, and on welfare expenditure. To make the model work in a number of areas these benefits need to be reflected in the contract.
- No single government department is the obvious candidate to pay success payments on youth-focused outcome-based contracts like Social Impact Bonds.
- Without a number of departments (including Justice, Education, Health and DWP) contributing to outcome payments it is doubtful that the payout from Local Authorities would be large enough to enable investment in services.
- Developing Social Impact Bond contracts focused on youth services is therefore likely to require an expert intermediary and, in all likelihood, would be greatly helped by an interdepartmental agreement to jointly fund positive outcomes within both local and central government agencies.

Would Social Impact Bonds need to be targeted towards specific groups (e.g. young offenders) or could they be used to fund broader services (e.g. open access youth centres)?

- Part of the problem with existing funding for services in the youth sector and elsewhere is that it tends to be targeted towards preventing or encouraging specific behaviours (anti-teen pregnancy, pro-school attendance, etc.) rather than meeting the needs of individuals as a whole.
- While data in the sector is often limited, there does seem to be evidence that the same young people are often at risk of multiple negative outcomes – teen pregnancy, poor school performance, anti-social behaviour, substance abuse, poor mental health, etc.
- This implies that in fact there could be significant value to focusing outcomes-based contracts, like Social Impact Bonds, around multiple outcomes and hence broader services for those most at risk, although it may be possible to structure the contract itself around a single outcome that is tightly correlated to other positive outcomes and would reduce the complexity of contracting.
- One example could be a stated outcome of preventing entry into care for adolescents. Research highlights the poor social outcomes experienced by young people who have been looked after. A Social Impact Bond with the stated outcome objective of reducing care entry could be linked to a variety of positive social outcomes such as improved school attendance and reduced youth offending.
- To generate a social and financial return on investment, however, it seems likely that any open access services would need to be within targeted geographic areas – e.g. a defined geographic area known for poorer than average youth outcomes.

How closely defined would outcome metrics need to be for Social Impact Bonds to work? Could SIBs be based on counting heads rather than actual outcomes?

- Getting the outcome metric right is central to getting a Social Impact Bond to work.
- Changes to the outcome determine how much the public sector pays to investors and the financial return that investors make.
- The definition of outcome metrics is consequently determined by two factors:
 - The confidence of investors that the metric will capture the value created by their investment; and
 - The confidence of the commissioner(s) that the outcome metric is a reliable indicator of value to the public sector (be that savings, revenue or broader public goods).
- A Social Impact Bond focused on youth outcomes could potentially be based around metrics that the public sector already collects – teen pregnancies, school truancy rates, entry into care, grade averages, youth crime, etc. These could be benchmarked and independently audited.
- The bigger issue is therefore whether sufficient data around the impact of specific interventions exists (i.e. around what works to deliver outcomes) to give investors confidence that they will see a return on their investment when funding a particular set of interventions.
- In our work to develop a SIB with the objective of reducing entry into care by adolescents, we have studied a range of relevant interventions. The evaluation data of such services is varied in existence and quality. It is often difficult to determine which services are consistently effective in delivering improved outcomes and which are able to be replicated. The way in which services are implemented is key to their success. There needs to be a positive interface with Local Authority services.
- Data around outputs – numbers of young people worked with / literacy courses delivered, etc. – that are not linked to the outcomes that SIB contracts are based on are unlikely to give investors sufficient confidence to invest although it may be possible to persuade a small number of youth focused trusts and foundations to support a pilot on this basis.

Is it possible to measure the social and financial value of prevention? Are there issues of outcome attribution?

- There are two elements to answering this question.
- The first is the challenge of demonstrating the counter-factual – how to demonstrate that a negative outcome would have occurred had an intervention not been provided – this can be complex.

- In our Peterborough pilot, which aims to reduce reoffending among short-sentence prison leavers, the reoffending behaviour of each individual in the target population is tracked against 10 other individuals on the Police National Computer who are matched in terms of demographics and offending history.
- This 'matched control' creates a real-time baseline against which to judge the impact of our interventions. It gives us a good degree of confidence that we can measure the social value of the interventions.
- Finding such a real time control would be equally important in the youth services space where Social Impact Bond financing could be needed not only to build on positive outcomes, but also to simply maintain them in a context of falling funding.
- The challenge is finding non-binary measures that capture distance travelled.
- Social Finance does not currently have a clear sense of data quality in the youth sector. Further work would be needed to discover whether a cohort comparison approach (e.g. comparing teen pregnancies per 1,000 under 18 year olds in the intervention area to a control area) would be more effective than tracking future outcomes against historical behaviour or predicted outcomes for individuals.
- In our SIB development work around preventing care entry for adolescents, we have investigated a range of attribution methods. We are taking a pragmatic approach to this and believe it would be necessary to compare the SIB cohort to a baseline which reflects a similar cohort within the same Local Authority. This will ensure that Social Care thresholds are similar as will be the "service as usual" support.
- The second is that of attribution – that of demonstrating that it was *this* service, not *that* service that delivered the positive outcomes.
- While not perfect in this respect, one advantage of the Social Impact Bond model is that it seeks to capture the value created by a number of interventions rather than assuming that the same intervention will work for every individual in the target group.
- Intuitively, for young people facing multiple issues, multiple interventions may be needed – addressing literacy, parental mental health, housing, etc. – to deliver a positive outcome in terms of truancy, anti-social behaviour or school attainment.
- The set of interventions needed to deliver the outcome may vary from individual to individual.

Is the time to results in the youth sector a potential issue for Social Impact Bonds?

- Our first Social Impact Bond in Peterborough has a 12 month outcome measurement period for each prison leaver with a further 12 month lag on success payments to allow for court proceedings to complete and outcomes to be audited.

- It is easier to structure Social Impact Bonds around areas in which there is a fairly short period between intervention and results partially because investment is easier to find and partially because attribution is easier to demonstrate, and public sector value easier to realise.
- In our work to prevent care entry for adolescents, we can measure the days in care that have been avoided due to the SIB intervention by comparing to a cohort that has not received the intervention. It will not be feasible to measure the full extent of the benefit since for a 11 year old, that might mean measuring the days in care avoided over 7 subsequent years. Therefore there will need to be a combination of actual days saved which are measured over a reasonably short time frame post-intervention, plus a proxy to reflect the future savings to the local authority in terms of care days avoided.
- In the youth sector, the time to results issue could be resolved if the public sector were confident enough about their future savings to pay out on the basis of interim indicators – for instance if school grades aged 16 were a sufficient predictor of later employment / benefit usage to trigger a success payment from DWP for interventions provided at ages 13-14.

Where did the investment come from in the Peterborough Social Impact Bond? What are your expectations for investment sources for future SIBs?

- Investors in the first Social Impact Bond are mostly High Net Worth Individuals and charitable trusts and foundations. They include the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, the Barrow Cadbury Charitable Trust, the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation.
- Investors will receive a return if reoffending among the prison leavers falls by 7.5% or more compared to a control group of short-sentence prisoners in the UK. If the Social Impact Bond delivers a drop in reoffending beyond 7.5%, investors will receive an increasing return capped at a maximum of 13% per year over an eight year period. For example, a 10% reduction in reoffending would result in a 7.5% annualised return.
- Following the launch of the first Social Impact Bond to reduce re-offending in Peterborough, Social Finance has found enormous interest from social investors in subscribing to additional Bonds across a wide range of social issues.
- While a track record of social and financial returns develops, we would expect the majority of investors in the first Social Impact Bonds to have a social mission connection.
- Nevertheless, in time, we hope that Social Impact Bonds will develop the track record and scale to attract mainstream investment. In time this might come from pension funds or social ISAs in which a percentage of your savings go to support and improve society. We think this could be extremely attractive to people.
- In the shorter-term, we anticipate that the Big Society Bank will play a central role in catalysing greater investment into the youth space through both Social Impact Bonds and more conventional debt and equity investments to build organisations' capacity to deliver services effectively.

Would a wellbeing index be useful within a social investment context?

- The definition of outcome metrics is determined by two factors:
 - The confidence of investors that the metric will capture the value created by their investment; and
 - The confidence of the commissioner(s) that the outcome metric is a reliable indicator of value to the public sector (be that savings, revenue or public good).
- Whether or not a wellbeing index would be useful as a basis for an outcomes-based contract would need to be tested with each counterparty.
- A wellbeing index could be helpful in measuring one aspect of improved social outcomes for young people at risk of entering care. Even if it is not immediately linked to cashable savings, it is important to have indicators other than the primary outcome metric to ensure that the social impact of funded interventions is positive.

05/2011

Written Evidence Submitted by Keith Jones

I watched with interest (and some concern) the Education Committees call for evidence on Wednesday 26 January and felt that little was said that provided any real defence for the need of a universal youth work offer that has been a lifeline to so many young people for so long. For that reason I felt must write and give a practitioners point of view. I write to you also as a concerned parent, a worried grandparent and as an active member in my own local community. I write in the hope that you will consider, very carefully, the plight facing the countries young people and the impact potential of your quest for `hard evidence` may have on recommendations you may conclude regarding spend on youth work and associated services for children, young people and their families.

For too long now I have been more than a little disturbed by the heavy emphasis and imposition of the outcome and `purpose-driven` approaches to youth work which are clearly at odds with the needs of the majority of young people and their communities. In my opinion, current guidance flies in the face of, what to me, youth work hopes to and can achieve. Indeed current practice is seeing more and more youth workers spending increasing amounts of their time servicing the needs of databases rather than those they are there to support.

I am perturbed by the production-line approach that has been wilfully adopted

as the `way forward`; and by the disproportionate use and costly micro-management and tracking of young people's personal development that cannot be at all accurately be measured by the current set of expensive, labour intensive tools and monitoring systems foisted upon workers in the field in the name of accountability with the mantra "we have to be demonstrating value for money"

With the best part of thirty years of community and youth work experience behind me, (and reluctantly approaching retirement) I have had the privilege during my calling, of working with so many young people, some briefly, others for extended periods, some quite `needy`, some less so, but thankfully most are now leading stable and happy lives; and when the time is right, they tell us we helped.

Meeting with many of them later in life, all speak appreciatively of the, caring and interested adult during their formative years and of the time spent with us; `youth workers`. Here I would like share with you some, albeit anecdotal, evidence in the hope that you might gain a deeper understanding of what it is exactly you are asking for.

Recently we opened a new facility for young people and invited older members who had been involved in shaping the services provided, to come along and share in their/our achievement in bringing the project to fruition; here is what one of them wrote after the event. And I could share with you many, many more.

"Yesterday was a historic moment for everyone, past, present, and future,

whoever has or ever will be involved with the work that TCR does. To see such incredible hopes develop over so many years, and finally come to fruition yesterday w...as incredibly moving and I can't praise everyone enough. Joe - You are an utter inspiration to me. I have you and TCR to thank for my own personal career path, and if I can inspire just a single person half as much as you have me, and the many others across the dale, then I'll be a very happy girl.

Thanks Joe :) x"

Whilst the above relates to a project I worked in and tells of young people and families I have worked with, I know that `youth workers` across the country and in your very own constituency have similar and indeed more remarkable stories to tell. And it's a fair bet that each day a youth worker somewhere will meet up with a young person and reminisce; with the ubiquitous lump in the throat moment that accompanies such occasions.

So what's my point? Given the comments from the young person above, my point is this 1. I didn't plan it. 2. I couldn't measure it 3. I cannot put a figure on the eventual outcomes for the young person concerned or the savings made to society because of my influence. 4. There is no accredited or recorded outcome; apart from what you read above; and here is the rub, that `process` took ten years!

You see the thing is it happens (youth work) in spite of strategy not because of it, it comes about not because of national benchmarks or agencies but local intervention dealing with local need. It takes place in real places with real people, not names or numbers in a database. There is no coercion or hidden

agenda; it starts from where young people are in their lives. The very essence of the process is that young people come to youth work voluntarily and informal education takes place (education by stealth) or not, as the case may be. However it must not be understated that an essential element of youth work is that it is open to all and inclusive and that young people's association with all their peers is vitally important if one does not want to divide communities.

Obviously this `process` does not fit with current thinking and micro-management model, but the evidence is quite clear, it works, and what works is youth work. It is a formidable tool that, if we are not careful, could soon be lost simply because it is misunderstood (or misrepresented) and cannot be immediately measured in any meaningful way that satisfies the accountants and number crunchers.

Therefore I pose a few questions to you as an elected member to consider. When you are asking for `robust evidence` about how the impact of youth work can be measured consider this. As a member of parliament you are there to represent and ensure that your constituents receive the best possible outcomes, right?

As such, you would feel duty bound to intervene if one (or more) of your constituents had a problem. So let's say a family has experienced a housing issue that had not been resolved via normal channels so they call you in to help. Let us assume, as we would expect from our MP's, you do your duty and the problem is taken care of and the family you assisted are housed, their children go to the local school, they find work and live happily ever after, (Ok its simplified but you get the

picture) I'm sure you will have examples of this and similar problems where your support was required.

Remembering also that you are there for ALL your constituents and you do not just target those with problems, indeed in doing your job well, you will have avoided some members of your community from finding themselves in a negative situation in the first place, Yes? But how do you know who they are and how much you have assisted; and ultimately how much money was saved by your intervention, could you tell me? I would be interested to see your `robust` evidence.

Now, let's say you were not there to take on that family's issue, what would be the implications and outcomes for that family? Could you demonstrate `robustly` how your involvement had a social and cost benefit? What might have happened? Homelessness, need to claim benefits, cost of support from social services, mental health issues that would arise etc, etc the list goes on. How would you put a figure on it? And can you tell me how many you have helped who did not go on to require more intense and costly support, just because you are there doing the work you do, therefore saving the country money in the long term?

So the six million dollar question is, what evidence do your constituents, as tax payers, have that YOU provide value for money?

What would your `robust` evidence look like? Not so easy is it?

The reality is that as a constituent I have to have faith that having you in your role as our paid MP that you provide a cost effective benefit to me and

our community, and that really is, that's all there is... (Unless you know something I don't?) As a constituent I may well be able to read on a government website how much you spent on your lunch, but would it tell me how cost effective you have been? No! It wouldn't, and most of us (despite all the expenses commotion) have positive experiences of dealings with our MP or councillor.

I fully appreciate that these are challenging times but (and time will tell this story) cuts to Youth Services are most defiantly not a way to make savings in real terms. Reducing any support to children and young people will be catastrophic in your own community and we will all pay a heavy price for a long time to come. The price we pay will obviously not be confined to the public purse, it will, by default, reduce the number of young people able to achieve their full potential and create a generation with lower aspirations bringing with them to the heart of our communities all the problems associated with picking up the pieces of their difficult position that they have in no way contributed to. And please also note that youth services are not an area that communities are requesting cut backs and savings to be made, in fact quite the opposite is true.

It's a fact (measurable or not) that having universal access to a wide choice of age-appropriate services helps to ensure that young people feel valued and will (if investment is made) play their part, now and in the future and leading to visible and effective involvement in their communities that we can all benefit from. The truth is; we really do need them to do this, we cannot afford not too!

So I humbly request that, when asking for `evidence` remember that the questions about youth work arise solely because `youth work` seems less serious than mainstream education. Somehow a seemingly puritanical view has set in that seems to suggest that unless something has an immediate and quantifiable benefit somehow it is of little value. As they say, you will end up “knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing”

My view would be that you take this view at your peril; MP's will be next, some would say this line has already started with the call for a reduction in the number of MP's. Apparently someone did some `robust` evidence based research and found that “the House of Commons could do the job that it does with 10% fewer MPs without any trouble at all.”

Now where have I heard that before?

So, your task should you choose to accept it is “do not let either of those cuts happen” Be part of the solution, not a creator of the problem, and make no mistake, young people need you now; probably more than they have ever needed you before.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I would very much welcome your feedback and comment. And you have my word that I will feed your responses back to the young people. At the very least the ones I work with, the thing is, will I be telling them you are on their side?

05/2011