



# YOUNG ROOTS POSITIONING RESEARCH

The Centre for Public Innovation

May 2015

The Centre for Public Innovation is a Community Interest Company that provides research, training, support and advice in the fields of health, social care, criminal justice and community development.

Our mission is to improve the outcomes of public services for their users, with a particular emphasis on the most disadvantaged.

**Contents**

<b>1. Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Aims and Objectives</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Findings</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>4. The Value and Impact of Heritage</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>5. Feedback on the Young Roots Programme</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>6. Conclusions and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>7. Appendices</b> .....	<b>38</b>

## 1. Executive Summary

### Introduction

In January 2015, the Centre for Public Innovation (CPI) was contracted to provide a better understanding for the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) of the new strategic environment for work with young people, and consider how the Young Roots programme could be positioned in relation to, for example, local authority commissioning frameworks and the wider delivery vehicles for youth work across the United Kingdom.

The review sets out the current thinking and policy drivers with regards to youth provision, and the impact this is having upon the youth sector. The report also identifies a need for the heritage sector to engage more fully with the main service providers for children and young people, in terms of establishing better contacts, relationships and partnerships. The first step of this process is to understand and clarify what the 'offer' is that projects funded via Young Roots can make towards some of the most commonly defined goals within children and young people's policy.

The Heritage Lottery Fund anticipates using the findings to inform development and advocacy work for the Young Roots programme, whilst in the longer-term, the research will inform the planning for the future development of HLF funding for young people.

This report makes recommendations on how to improve engagement with partners, as well as suggestions to improve the 'visibility' of the Young Roots programme.

### What is Youth Work?

The central purposes of youth work are educational and are concerned with the personal and social development of young people.

Youth work is underpinned by a clear set of values articulated by the National Youth Agency in England as including:

- Young people choosing to take part
- Utilising young people's view of the world
- Treating young people with respect
- Seeking to develop young people's skills and attitudes rather than remedy 'problem behaviours'
- Helping young people develop stronger relationships and collective identities
- Respecting and valuing differences
- Promoting the voice of young people.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.nya.org.uk/careers-youth-work/>

Local authorities have historically provided two types of youth work service:

- Open Access (universal)
- Targeted.

Open access youth services include a broad range of activities centred on youth centres. The activities include leisure, cultural, sporting and enrichment activities. Targeted youth services are aimed specifically at vulnerable young people and may include for example:

- Teenage pregnancy advice
- Youth Justice teams
- Drug and alcohol misuse services
- Homelessness support.

Targeted services are often contracted out to local voluntary or community groups and on occasion, private contractors, although provision continues to be overseen by the local authority<sup>2</sup>.

Context: Summary of national policy for young people

There is a sizeable youth population across the UK and the following table outlines the spread across each area according to the 2011 Census data table: Population Estimates by five year age bands, and Household Estimates, for Local Authorities in the United Kingdom<sup>3</sup>.

**Table 1 Youth population across the UK**

Age	England	Scotland	N.Ireland	Wales	Total
10-14	3,080,929	291,600	119,034	177,748	3,669,300
15-19	3,340,265	330,800	126,241	199,120	3,996,400
20-24	3,595,321	363,900	126,031	211,924	4,297,200

Whilst there are some commonalities, there are areas of marked differences between the nations in regards to youth provision. All have experienced cuts and each area has responded to those cuts in different ways. In England the impact of the cuts have filtered through over time since the start of the recession and we are seeing services develop new strategies to ensure survival in this climate of austerity; the changing landscape within which services currently operate is not due to settle for the foreseeable future.

<sup>2</sup> *Youth services in England: Changes and trends in the provision of services* (November 2014)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-294273>

In Wales, whilst there is continuing funding support for open access universal provision, there is an increasing shift to target funding towards reducing the NEET ('not in education, employment or training') population in terms of youth work, including developing stronger links between youth work, formal education, schools and broader support services. Wales appears on the verge of major changes in terms of the youth agenda and structures are in place ready to facilitate this (such as the role of 'lead professional' and early identification system which will reinforce effective partnership working to meet the needs of vulnerable young people).

In Northern Ireland, the *National Youth Strategy* indicates that much work is afoot to review and redesign youth services so that a cohesive and meaningful impact is made for the benefit of young people. It seems that the changes planned will provide the framework and impetus required for the youth service to evidence their value in terms of outcomes.

In Scotland, the youth service is a key support player in the school curriculum, the *Curriculum for Excellence* (CfE) which itself brings challenges in implementation. Delivery of youth provision is embedded within this framework, offering provision both inside and outside the school environment whilst being integral to it rather than peripheral.

There is clear evidence that the contribution that the youth service makes to education (formal and informal) is appreciated by schools in terms of the added value it brings to the classroom. Whilst youth work is a discipline in its own right, it is being utilised more and more towards supporting the school curriculum which itself is changing shape to be less about content and more about development. This does not necessarily mean that youth work occurs primarily in schools but rather that it is increasingly dovetailed with the educational agenda both inside and outside of the school environment, and that its value is increasingly recognised by schools for supporting their work.

#### Impact of changes to the youth sector

Youth provision across the UK is increasingly shifting focus to target vulnerable groups such as children in care, NEETs, young offenders and those at risk of sexual exploitation. This has dramatically impacted upon the wider universal offer for all young people, which in turn has reduced opportunities and resources for working at the universal level with young people most at risk of developing problems, to address them early or prevent them from escalating.

The reduction in investment and other changes in infrastructure organisations that support the voluntary sector, has in turn impacted upon small to medium organisations and their capacity to apply for funds and adjust their business model to respond to the changes. Much youth provision is now being delivered with reduced staffing levels, which creates difficulties in managing new development and innovation. There is a consensus that support is needed to fund core services so that developmental work can be carried out with communities.

#### Heritage and the Youth Sector

There are a number of heritage organisations that see working with young people as a priority and are delivering various forms of youth work through regular programmes. Through the interviews there was common agreement that there was a preference amongst heritage organisations to maintain a wider universal appeal with the main aim to increase numbers of children, young people and families accessing heritage sites including museums rather than only focus on targeted vulnerable groups. The majority of heritage organisations who participated in this research spoke of the young person's work, to date, being funded via core funds supplemented by grants. However with less grants available the sector spoke of their difficulties of sustaining some of their work with young people unless funding could be obtained to fund posts and infrastructure costs.

### Young Roots

National youth organisations felt there to be a disconnect between what Young Roots was trying to achieve and the youth sector, and felt this relationship should be strengthened by articulating a clear offer which would take into consideration the wider policy changes and the reduced capacity amongst organisations to apply. The same organisations suggested HLF utilise the expertise of the national organisations to support with grant distribution, whilst supporting the sector to develop proposals which support sustainability and are underpinned by youth participation. (This latter point could perhaps be remedied to some degree through the development of a robust Youth Participation Strategy by Young Roots)

The Young Roots programme was considered to support a number of key objectives and outcomes in particular:

- Softer skills
- Technical skills
- Learning
- Leadership
- Project management
- Volunteering and social action.

However, it was felt by some interviewees that despite meeting the objectives, the outcomes attained were not necessarily reported or fed into the relevant local commissioning and strategic partnerships, that is, those who were locally responsible for setting the direction and budget for young people's work. This in turn meant that the 'project learning' gained did not necessarily inform future commissioning of young people's services, that this learning and therefore potential improvements were lost.

**Interviewees also felt there were a wide range of voluntary organisations that worked directly with young people but not necessarily funded through statutory funds, which would not be aware**

**of how the heritage investment could be used and what outcomes it could achieve for young people and their organisational objectives.**

Recommendations

Following on from the findings and conclusions (above) the following recommendations are made:

1. Undertake a feasibility study into HLF collaborating with national youth organisations which represent each nation to utilise their expertise to help administer and market the Young Roots programme to the youth sector. Each organisation would have specialist knowledge of geography, relevant local and national policy, and existing networks with a range of small to large organisations representing both statutory and voluntary sectors.
2. Produce a robust youth participation strategy with assigned resources which underpins the Young Roots programme to ensure young people are involved in the decision making process of the grants process and formalise their role to become ambassadors for the programme.
3. Develop a marketing strategy which promotes and showcases the Young Roots programme using previous and current projects and partners to showcase the benefits and activities which can be undertaken through the programme, making best use of social media platforms. The marketing strategy should utilise organisational e-bulletins, newsletters and websites of national youth organisations to market the grants programme. Use innovative mediums which encourage dialogue and a relationship between the heritage and youth sectors such as speed dating network events.
4. Develop the existing Young Roots online community network<sup>4</sup> further to enable both heritage and youth projects to share ideas, resources and experiences of how projects have influenced and shaped local policy. Ensure the online resource is marketed through the right social platforms and linked to other online forums which specifically target young people's agencies as well as the heritage and voluntary sectors.
5. Retain a universal focus for the Young Roots programme but produce a specific series of outcomes for projects which work with vulnerable young people and the opportunity for Young Roots projects to support targeted services.
6. Consider widening the remit of the programme to include younger children, and families to fit in with the Think Family agenda.
7. Leverage funds into organisations to build in capacity to help with project management, bid writing.

**2. Aims and Objectives**

---

<sup>4</sup>[Young People and Heritage forum | Heritage Lottery Fund](#)

## 2.1 Introduction

The Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) was set up in 1994 under the National Lottery Act and distributes money raised by the National Lottery to support projects involving the national, regional and local heritage of the United Kingdom. HLF operates under the auspices of the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF) and since April 2013 it has been delivering its fourth Strategic Framework: '*A lasting difference for heritage and people*' (see: [Heritage Lottery Fund homepage](#)).

The Young Roots programme provides grants of between £10,000 and £50,000 for projects that engage young people aged 11-25 with their heritage. Projects are youth-led and delivered through partnerships between youth and heritage organisations. Applications to this programme need to show that with the investment, individuals will have:

- Developed skills;
- Learnt about heritage;
- Changed their attitudes and/or behaviour; and
- Had an enjoyable experience.

Projects must also meet one outcome for heritage and demonstrate that more people and a wider range of people will have engaged with heritage.

Since the introduction of the programme over a decade ago, the wider policy context has changed significantly across the four countries of the UK, although the fundamental principles that have historically informed Young Roots are unchanged: young people are under-represented as audiences and participants in heritage projects and services and elements of the heritage sector still struggle to engage young people. In those ten years the youth sector has undergone massive change, and the levels and distribution of resources has shifted in both the heritage and youth sectors.

## 2.2 Purpose and scope of the research

This research has been commissioned to provide a better understanding of the new policy and delivery environment, and to consider how the Young Roots programme can be positioned in relation to, for example, local authority commissioning frameworks, as well as the wider delivery vehicles for youth work across the UK. The research also considers how heritage organisations view their role in working with young people and how this work is sourced. The findings will be used to inform the development and advocacy work relating to the Young Roots programme, and in the longer-term the research will inform the planning for the future development of the programme and funding for young people.

## 2.3 Methodology

To inform this work, semi-structured interviews were undertaken with 30 individuals (considered to be representative) from both the youth sector and heritage organisations. Suggestions for interviewees were provided through HLF as well as via organisations themselves and included:

- National and regional youth sector organisations including umbrella organisations (representing all four countries) – 13 interviews
- National heritage organisations – 5 interviews
- HLF Young Roots national and regional staff – 2 interviews
- Local authority representatives who previously had involvement with a Young Roots project – 3 interviews
- Young Roots grantees - 4 interviews
- Local authority young person's strategic/commissioning leads – 3 interviews

The report is presented utilising both the interviews and wider documentary analysis to back their findings, where applicable, and to provide context. Sources include:

- Government policy on the youth sector (with reference also to policies of the devolved administrations in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland);
- Current strategic thinking in the youth sector and the sector's priorities as manifested in position papers by key youth sector and umbrella organisations.

The interviews were designed to provide:

- Input on how HLF funding for young people could better engage with the sector
- An understanding of the current environment for youth work, and related policy and strategic direction.

A full list of participants can be found in Appendix A. The interview topic guide can be found in Appendix B.

### 3. Findings – Youth Sectors across the UK

#### 3.1 Capacity of the youth sector to support project delivery

Stakeholders were asked their views on what the capacity of the youth sector is in supporting the Young Roots programme in both its delivery and in the engagement of young people at a local project level. To support context, at a wider level representatives from each of the four nations when reporting to Government on the impact of budget cuts for local authorities, noted how the youth service environment was being shaped in response to this as below

Common across the nations is the move towards the integration of services, albeit done in ways that are particular to the nation in question. Youth services in all four nations are under pressure to become 'smarter' regarding delivery, with less local authority funding available to them.

"We [umbrella organisation for youth organisations] are increasingly coming across the impact of the budget cuts on the youth sector. Everything is being moved up the chain to support specialist provision to those children and young people who are seen to need it the most. This leaves the youth sector to still deliver high quality with a budget which can't even cover skeleton staff."

(National Youth Organisation)

Whilst there are differing priorities regarding the continuation of universal open access provision across the nations with some making more cuts than others, a recurrent theme was an increasing focus on 'targeted' and 'intensive' approaches to youth work interventions across the board, driven by budgetary constraints. With youth workers increasingly being merged into multi-agency teams and re-badged as 'troubled families' workers<sup>5</sup> or being deployed to deliver targeted support for the NEET population both inside and outside of the school environment. In addition, it was agreed that youth service providers are increasingly operating in an environment of competitive tendering for local authority contracts whilst being expected to work to new performance outcome frameworks and delivering evidence-based interventions.

This is impacting on the capacity of the youth sector to work with wider communities. Some of the stakeholders spoke of the constraints in approach with the growing focus upon NEETs (and other targeted populations) thereby limiting the opportunity to support HLF in its wider aims of bringing heritage to a broader audience.

---

<sup>5</sup>Youth work in a changing policy landscape: the view from England: Youth & Policy 2013

"Substantial amounts been taken from youth specific provision resulting in more targeted provision. Open access is only delivered in targeted settings, in some places supported by multi-agency problem solving groups which look at areas of concern and hotspots and then we put out a detached response team who will signpost the young people if needed. As a result the wider youth offer struggles, with the focus on statutory responsibilities and vulnerable young people".

(Local authority commissioner)

With austerity measures increasing, youth delivery and strategy in areas of England are delivering targeted provisions either to specific groups such as Looked After Children (LAC), Young Offenders, NEETs or provision is targeted to deprived areas of need. This has had a significant impact upon wider generic universal provision which in several areas is no longer available.

"Increasingly what we find is that universal provision is being decimated and we are having to close our doors. Most of my colleagues have gone and provision is becoming increasingly targeted with the council playing less of a role in its delivery".

(Youth sector representative)

The majority of respondents felt that the increasing drive towards targeting resources is having the effect of underestimating the value of providing universal services which support prevention and early intervention strategies. This was seen as an essential area where Young Roots could continue to offer a programme which does not define cohorts or stipulate a criterion and emphasised an evidence base which supported the role that early intervention could play, as well as providing opportunities to all.

There were also reports of commissioners attempting to 'bridge the gap' between 'what was' before the cuts and 'what is' now, that they were in the particularly difficult position of trying to 'mend' something that is broken but not having access to the tools to do so.

"As a commissioner my portfolio has broadened and I am increasingly placing pressure on providers to offer more but for less ... the level of need is multi-faceted and cannot be sorted on the cheap".

(Local authority commissioner)

"The cuts to universal open access services does not make the need go away. It simply transfers 'up the chain' where it is then dealt with by other services who are expected to do more with less with what may have become a more complex need by that point".

(Local authority commissioner)

### 3.2 Context: national summary of policy for children and young people

#### 3.2.1. Youth service cuts

In the 2012 *Children and Young People Now* magazine survey, 56% of children's services directors who responded said that 'youth services' would be among the hardest hit in the cuts<sup>6</sup>. Universal services have been sacrificed in many areas in order to re-route finite funds to more targeted need.

Local authority savings were made, for example, by:

- Closure or replacement of youth centres;
- Reduction in the universal youth offer;
- Focusing on areas of high need/high risk;
- Reduction of universal Connexions and advice and guidance;
- Integration of below the threshold services (parenting support advisors, outreach workers, youth workers etc) into locality teams to facilitate early intervention; and
- Increased targeting of parenting programmes.<sup>7</sup>

In the same survey, some questioned the need for some of the services in the first place. As a senior commissioning officer noted, "More than 80% of local people never used our services anyway – so they weren't really universal". Another officer commented that several services were previously working to the same objective and rather than remove the delivery, the cuts had led them to remove the duplication and in some areas triplication of services through the reduction of services to a core offer. Other officers reported that the specification and monitoring of outcomes was likely to be keener and more business-like going forward. The survey authors wondered whether this might mean that the commissioning relationship would become more managerial and whether this could potentially favour the large charities used to high value bids and contracts.

Significant reductions have sometimes led to innovative and focused practice. For example, the closures of youth centres in one authority led to the development of a suite of mobile facilities, including for sport and music making. These were deployed in 'hotspot' areas, targeting young people on certain days of the week. Young people were maintaining access to provision and in their own environment<sup>8</sup>. The move to 'one stop services' has reduced capital and management costs, for example, and closer working relationships have meant that young people have received a more coordinated provision with common assessment frameworks and processes in some areas.

---

<sup>6</sup>*Families on the Front Line: Local spending on children's services in austerity*. Family & Parenting Institute, Oct 2012

<sup>7</sup>*Picking up the pieces : Results of a survey on the state of young people's advice, counselling and support services* (Nov 2013)

<sup>8</sup>*Families on the Front Line: Local spending on children's services in austerity*. Family & Parenting Institute, Oct 2012

Co-location has helped services adopt the *Think Family Agenda*, a national policy driver for integrated working. One council merged a number of services into a single integration function composed of:

- Teenage pregnancy outreach workers
- Education welfare officers
- Connexions officers
- Drugs support workers
- Youth workers
- Youth offending prevention officers
- Family support workers, and
- Flexible learning support officers.

It not only saved on cost resources (for instance fewer managers and less infrastructure was subsequently needed to support the integrated team) but vulnerable families were supported more effectively at the level of early intervention. Prior to this a family may have been working with a number of services who carried out separate assessments each of them coming from different professional directions. Post the change, there was a much higher likelihood of having a clear understanding of the families' needs and where everyone fitted when trying to address them.

Whilst in some areas cuts have driven up performance through innovation, there are many areas where cuts have left gaps in service to be plugged by youth service provision already working at capacity. For example, Youth Information Advice & Counselling Services (YIACS) reported that referrals from statutory services have increased following the demise of Connexions, redefinitions in Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) criteria and cuts to youth services. In an increasing number of areas, YIACSs are now seen as the hub of expertise in a landscape devoid of alternatives. YIACS reported that whilst they have also experienced funding and consequent service cuts, their counselling services have seen an increased demand due to increases in mental ill health, stress, depression and anxiety for example alongside homelessness and unemployment<sup>9</sup>.

The Family & Parenting Institute in its 2012 report: *Families on the Front Line: Local spending on children's services in austerity* highlighted that families' access to efficient, effective and free (or low cost) public services can help them become or remain resilient and any drop in income is likely to be magnified if services are being rolled back simultaneously. For this reason it is of real concern that many of the families most dependent on services are the group most likely to be more affected by changes to benefit

---

<sup>9</sup>*Picking up the pieces : Results of a survey on the state of young people's advice, counselling and support services* (Nov 2013)

levels – meaning that austerity measures taking hold in both domains could create a double impact on family life<sup>10</sup>.

"It bears remembering that today's young people are tomorrow's parents, workers and citizens. Failure to protect them from increased hardship and marginalisation now will show up problems for the future".

(Youth Organisation)

Whilst the cuts have been ongoing over recent years, it is possible that the full social and longer term economic impact (such as increased mental ill health, lack of youth aspirations that can come from ill resourced communities) has not yet filtered through and it could be years before the full impact is reflected in poorer outcomes for young people and their families. Nonetheless, with reduced money to go round, many local authorities will inevitably need to target finite resources to those with the highest need.

"Give it another 2-3 years and we will really start to see the impact of changes on communities, by that time there will be even less to work with."

(Young People's Organisation)

Short term contracts are not uncommon in the current environment. This can impact negatively on staff recruitment and retention practices, future planning, and the achievement of meaningful targets within limited timeframes. Some of the youth organisations expressed serious concern for the youth sector workforce with increasing redundancies, job role changes and reduced salaries, with expertise being lost.

"We used to have such a vibrant young people's workforce. We have lost so many of the good workers they have lost their job, status and positions and being replaced by an unqualified workforce."

(Youth Worker Lead)

Various strategies have been employed to manage the impact of cuts. These include:

- Improving the way outcomes and impact are demonstrated (60%)
- Greater use of volunteers, apprentices or students (57%)
- Bidding in consortia (48%), and
- Increasing earned income e.g., from selling services to schools (36%).<sup>11</sup>

Whilst demonstrating outcomes and impact can lead to improved commissioner confidence, other strategies such as consortia bids are resource intensive and have no guarantee of a positive result. This impacts on the ability of smaller organisations to engage in such strategies, leaving the way open for

---

<sup>10</sup>*Families on the Front Line: Local spending on children's services in austerity.* Family & Parenting Institute, Oct 2012

<sup>11</sup>*Picking up the pieces: Results of a survey on the state of young people's advice, counselling and support services* Nov 2013

larger organisations with more tendering competencies to win larger contracts at the expense of smaller agencies.

The *Picking Up the Pieces* report identified a number of successful survival strategies including: remaining true to core business and building on what is known to work, reconfiguration of services, improving efficiency/leadership/governance; and partnership working.

New delivery models are beginning to emerge. The Cabinet Office is encouraging ‘mutualisation’ as a delivery model supported by short-term financial incentives and underwriting staffing costs, all of which can appear as an attractive proposition. Although mostly relevant to London, there are increasing examples of cross-borough collaboration and national cross-sector partnerships are emerging, such as Ingeus and Ambition<sup>12</sup> working to remove barriers and support young people into employment.

Throughout all the changes, youth participation and the youth voice have generally had funding maintained and there is a strong government expectation that the youth voice continues.<sup>13</sup> There is a commitment to the active engagement of young people in their own communities and for young people to be involved in various aspects of decision making, from advising on national policy to shaping how services are developed and audited at a local level for instance.

### 3.2.2 England

The publication produced by the National Youth Agency (NYA): *Youth Services in England (2014)*<sup>14</sup> suggests that the funding situation is likely to change for the worse over the next 18 months following the 2015 spending cuts. Funding uncertainty means that there is little investment in programmes that build long term relationships and support for young people. Pressures from competition are challenging the voluntary sector in terms of balancing charitable aims with business drivers.

Services in England are being reshaped through various permutations ranging from some local authorities commissioning out youth provision to others fully delivering youth provision in-house, with many variations on these themes. There is no longer a common form of youth service immediately identifiable by its delivery framework and some are being delivered by completely new structures, for example Knowsley Youth Mutual is an employee- and young person- owned and driven Community Benefit Society in Knowsley. The Tri-borough arrangement between London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster City Council developed a new Community Interest Company in Richmond and Kingston in west London, and reconfigured a co-operative in Lambeth in the South of the capital as a means of working together to improve efficiency and delivery. This was whilst also remaining independent and continuing to represent the needs, priorities and ambitions of local people in their respective neighbourhoods.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Youth services in England: Changes and trends in the provision of services* (Nov 2014)

<sup>13</sup> *Youth services in England: Changes and trends in the provision of services* (Nov 2014)

<sup>14</sup> *Youth services in England: Changes and trends in service provision* (Nov 2014)

Whilst re-shaping is taking place within budgetary constraints, other factors which inform how they are structured include the strength of existing non-council provision and the level of understanding of senior leadership and elected members as champions of youth work provision, all having a consequent impact on commissioning decisions.

Whilst the financial climate has seen some levelling of budgets in 2014, further large government reductions are anticipated in 2015 and beyond, for example:

- Lancashire: 50% over 3 years from a baseline of £22m
- Shropshire: 45% over two years, and
- Somerset: £4.5m to £500k over three years.

Payment by Results and performance targets add significant complexity to delivery of programmes. In addition, funding is generally more targeted to specific demographic cohorts such as teenage pregnancy or NEET for example. Where there are grants through current commissioning structures, these tend to be small.

### 3.2.3 Wales

Wales has experienced continuing spending cuts at an unprecedented level, leading to consideration of the regionalisation of public services across local authority boundaries. Central strategic support for youth service is now located in the Education, Employment and Skills portfolio of the Welsh Assembly, potentially improving links between youth work provision, broader support services, and formal education which have to date been variable.<sup>15</sup> Local Authority Integrated Plans (which integrate Youth Service plans) promote a multi-agency approach to delivery.

In February 2015, Professor Graham Donaldson published *Successful Futures*<sup>16</sup> after being asked in March 2014 by the Welsh Government to conduct a fundamental review of curriculum and assessment arrangements from Foundation Phase to Key Stage 4. The report was anticipated by the Minister for Education and Skills as the 'most significant curriculum reform Wales has ever seen'. Professor Donaldson's report concludes:

"Together, the current national curriculum and assessment arrangements no longer meet the needs of the children and young people of Wales. The case for fundamental change is powerful."

Professor Donaldson identified some real strengths in Wales, including the Foundation Phase and the commitment to the Welsh language and culture. His report also identifies the shortcomings of the current

---

<sup>15</sup> *The National Youth Work Strategy for Wales 2014-2018: Supporting young people to reach their potential and live fulfilled lives*

<sup>16</sup> Donaldson, G.B.C. (2015) *Successful Futures: Independent Review of Curriculum and Assessment Arrangements in Wales*

curriculum arrangements and has made a series of recommendations to address these and improve how children in Welsh schools are taught and assessed.

The *National Youth Work Strategy for Wales, 2014-18* recognises the value and role of open access youth work provision whilst putting forward a *Youth Engagement and Progression Framework* as a consistent and integrated offer for young people via the development of the 'lead' professional and collaborative working across services.

It is expected that there will be an increasing emphasis on youth services to adopt a focused approach to targeting priority groups such as the NEET population including working closely with Career Wales<sup>1718</sup> for young people aged 16-17. Local authorities are expected to have an early identification system in place to identify those at greatest risk of being NEET. Youth workers have been identified as potential 'lead' workers to broker support services and provide continuity of support and contact to vulnerable young people, supporting them to access wider services to facilitate engagement or prevent disengagement in education and training. To inform future direction and guidance the Welsh Government will undertake a review of the impact of youth work practice in schools by 2017.

In addition, a National Outcomes Framework providing a clear coherent qualifications route and a professional development framework will be developed, supporting the need for a robust evidence base for youth work interventions. This will be informed by a National Youth Work Audit to help benchmark service provision across Wales, supported by a Quality Mark for youth provision.

From 2014, local authorities have received a four year grant to support open access provision to meet local need and fill gaps identified within the *Local Authority Single Integrated Plan*, support the implementation of the Youth Engagement and Progression framework implementation plan, and support staff training needs. Local authorities will be accountable to the Welsh government in relation to how they spend this grant and the impact it has locally.

In addition, there will be a focus on ensuring the 2014-2020 European Social Fund (ESF) programmes support youth employment, engagement and attainment, targeted at the NEET/risk of becoming NEET population with alignment to the Youth Engagement and Progression framework and local provision maps.

Through the provision of a 'Youth Guarantee' (full roll out of which is in September 2015) it is envisaged that every young person will have access to a suitable learning place post-16. This will continue to build

---

<sup>17</sup>Career Choices Dewis Gyrfu Ltd (CCDG) is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Welsh Government which was formed on 1 April 2013. Trading as *Gyrfa Cymru Careers Wales*, they provide all age, independent and impartial careers information, advice and guidance service for Wales

<sup>18</sup>*Gyrfa Cymru Careers Wales* is part of the broader "Careers Family" in Wales which includes the Welsh Higher Education Careers Advisory Services, Secondary Schools, Further Education Institutions, Work Based Learning Providers, Local Authority Youth Services, Learning Coaches, Jobcentre Plus, Probation and Youth Offending Services and others.

on current effective practice in many parts of Wales with the aim of developing a consistent approach across the whole of Wales regarding engaging the NEET population.

It is the intention of the Welsh Government to invite tenders from traineeship providers for the period April 2015 to March 2019. Successful applicants will need to demonstrate their engagement with 14-19 networks and show how planned provision has taken account of local needs. Consideration will also be given to how funding can be provided to offer young people with more opportunities to use their Welsh language outside the school environment, thereby increasing their confidence and increasing the connection to their Welsh culture and heritage.

From April 2015, a revised National Voluntary Youth Organisation (NVYO) Grant will be available through competitive tender, with target criteria focused on organisations that are best placed to lever in additional investment from other sources, increasing the resource capacity available to young people.

### 3.2.4 Northern Ireland

The policy framework for youth work sits within the Department of Education. The investment in youth work is directly linked to supporting good quality educational services that deliver positive outcomes for young people. The Youth Service is composed of a voluntary sector and a statutory sector. The statutory sector is under the control of the Education Authority and consists of a number of youth clubs and outdoor education centres, the voluntary sector is by far the larger sector and is composed of many different organisations.

There are approximately 148,000 young people who are registered participants in the Youth Service. There are almost 1900 registered youth service providers, reliant on a workforce of 23,510, of whom over 90% are volunteers. Uniformed organisations make up over 50% of the total number of youth units and account for 37% of the young people who participate in youth service activities on a regular basis.<sup>19</sup>

During 2013-14 the Department of Education allocated approximately £33 million resource and £5 million capital into youth services, distributed annually via six different funding schemes, one in each Education and Library Board (ELB) and one in the Youth Council for Northern Ireland (YCNI)<sup>20</sup> all operating independently of one another. Each of the five ELB's and the Youth Council received revenue budgets of approximately £5-6million.<sup>21</sup> It was anticipated that once established, an Education and Skills Authority (ESA) would be set up to create a single, all encompassing body which would subsume the ELB's and the Youth Council offering a coherent and strategic approach to planning, performance management,

---

<sup>19</sup>A *Statistical and Geographic Report of the Registered Youth Service in Northern Ireland 2013 Data Cycle*: The Youth Council for Northern Ireland

<sup>20</sup>YCNI is funded through grant-in-aid by the Department of Education. YCNI has the status of 'Non-Departmental Public Body' (NDPB). This is a body which has a role in the processes of government but is not a government department. Through the delivery of its functions and work programmes, the Youth Council seeks to champion the well-being, rights and participation of young people.

<sup>21</sup>*Priorities for Youth: Improving Young People's Lives through Youth Work* (2013): Dept of Education

and funding. However, the plan ran into problems when political disagreements emerged over who would represent the controlled school sector, attended mostly by Protestant pupils. Voluntary grammar schools also objected to ESA, due to concerns they would lose some of their autonomy.

On 1 April 2015 the Education Authority (EA) was established and replaced the five Education and Library Boards and the Staff Commission for Education and Library Boards. The EA has responsibility for education, youth and library services throughout Northern Ireland with a headquarters and five regional offices. Initially there will be no change to how services are provided however a long term change programme is currently being implemented to manage the transition from five organisations with responsibility for delivery of education services to a single authority.

The Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI) considers that in policy terms, youth work has not been aligned with related policies such as Extended Schools, Education Other Than At School (EOTAS) and the development of area learning communities, and as such, there have been missed opportunities for the development of links between them.<sup>22</sup> In turn, the *Priorities for Youth (2013)* highlighted the potential role of the youth service to make itself relevant to a wider audience by delivering against a range of key strategic outcomes such as those contained in the *Programme for Government 2011-15*, the *Children and Young People 10 Year Plan*, the *Child Poverty Policy* and the *Play and Leisure Policy*. In addition, Northern Ireland Youth Service has been undergoing a raft of changes, the culmination of which is expected to be completed by April 2016.

As part of the mechanism of change and the strategic change of direction, ETI has developed quality indicators for the youth sector around the core themes of achievement and outcomes, provision and leadership and management. A Practice Development Unit (PDU) will link youth sector organisations and training providers to identify, coordinate and manage a range of functions such as continuous professional development opportunities, advice on governance, and application of the non formal curriculum. It will establish a forum for sharing best practice and information across all learning providers.

Planning, funding and delivery of youth work will be based on a composite assessment of need linked to the Department of Education priorities. Implementation of the priority actions in the policy are being progressed in tandem with the Education Authority and the Youth Council. The Department led on the development of the Regional Advisory Group which has recently published the first action plan, that is, The Regional Youth Development Plan 2015/16 (RYDP)<sup>23</sup> which once approved will be implemented via annual Youth Development Plans, taking into account anticipated needs such as youth intervention programmes as well as changing needs. EA will also support the development of a quality assurance system in all parts of the youth service and design a framework of expected outcomes cross referenced with specific provision. This will be supported by a management information system.

---

<sup>22</sup>Priorities for Youth: Improving Young People's Lives through Youth Work (2013): Dept of Education

<sup>23</sup><http://www.eani.org.uk/latest-news/regional-advisory-group-for-youth-publishes-first-action-plan/>

The intention in Northern Ireland is that youth work in general will be focused into ‘intervention streams’ based on age bands. For 9-13 years and 14-18, the focus will be on youth work activities within identified priority areas. The focus for the 16+ age group will be on programmes that facilitate access to training opportunities or apprenticeships, including volunteering within the wider community. Volunteering and issue based programmes will be the focus for the age band 19-25. For the age range 22-25 the focus will be on those in or at risk of becoming NEET.

In terms of local authority funding allocations, this will be weighted more towards disadvantage and need rather than entitlement. Whilst there will be priority age bands, this does not preclude youth work interventions being provided to other age bands, based on assessed need. Access to youth work at this level will provide a lever into more targeted/specific youth work activities as needed. Priority groups, (such as NEET, young people in care, young parents/carers) will be targeted for youth work intervention.

Historically, Northern Ireland had limited tracking capabilities in terms of understanding the NEET population. However, steps have been put in place to remedy this with a mapping process undertaken and a strategy (*Pathways to Success*) which seeks to effectively join up action taken across the Executive to ensure that young people’s needs are identified and matched with relevant opportunities<sup>24</sup>.

Participation of young people is integral to the youth service’s future and will be embedded in delivery. EA in collaboration with sector partners and young people will drive options forward for strengthening participation in the youth service at a local, sub regional and regional level.

*United Youth* is a good relations programme that will provide flexible, high-quality, young-person-centred opportunities for 16–24 year olds who are NEET. It is a key commitment in the Northern Ireland Executive’s ‘*Together: Building a United Community*’ Strategy. In 2014, organisations were invited to come forward with concept pilot proposals to test different approaches that could achieve the best outcomes for *United Youth*. Following the development phase, around ten pilots will be taken forward to move into delivery mode later in 2015, prior to the anticipated full roll-out of the programme in 2016.<sup>25</sup>

Whilst the strategy and supporting policies set out some exciting concepts in terms of strategic planning and direction for the future of youth work, this has not been without casualties in terms of the recession. For example the budget for 2015/16 proposes a number of cuts with an overall cut to the Youth Service’s recurrent budget of £3m. This is to be apportioned as:

- Youth Council NI - £1m reduction from a baseline of £5.1m (19.6%)
- ELB Youth Services - £2m reduction from a baseline of £26m (7.7%).

---

<sup>24</sup>[Department for Employment and Learning, pathways-to-success.htm](#)

<sup>25</sup>[Department for Employment and Learning, success through skills](#)

It is unclear how the Youth Service will fare overall in light of these cuts. The UK Faculty on Public Health notes that the recession has impacted many families who are consequently struggling with debt, poor mental health, and unemployment.<sup>26</sup>

### 3.2.5 Scotland

In Scotland, the landscape of youth work is underpinned by an interrelated number of policy and regulatory areas, for example the *Strategic Guidance for Community Planning Partners: Community Learning and Development (CLD)* which states that CLD's specific focus should be:

- Improved life chances for people of all ages through learning, personal development and active citizenship
- Stronger, more resilient supportive, influential and inclusive communities.

Youth work aligns to relevant legislation including *Children & Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*, the provisions of which will come into force in Scotland over the next two to three years. Youth mental health and wellbeing is also supported through the *Your Health Programme* which acts as a coordinating body to support the delivery of youth health improvements policy across Scotland.

The *Requirements for Community Learning and Development (Scotland) Regulations 2013*<sup>27</sup> mean that each local authority area will develop a three-year plan that outlines how CLD will be delivered. The first of these plans will be ready by April 2015. The Scottish Government's *National Performance Framework* sets out the strategic objectives for all public services, including those delivering community learning and development.<sup>28</sup> Education Scotland has made a commitment to ensure that its activities in relation to the CLD Guidance and Regulations have a clear focus on implementing the *National Youth Work Strategy*. This includes monitoring and evaluating the provision of youth work in local delivery plans, ensuring that young people have access to high quality and effective youth work practice.<sup>29</sup>

YouthLink Scotland (the national youth work agency) has committed to work with the Scottish Government to ensure that youth work has a clear role in Scottish Government policies and implementation strategies, working across government on issues relating to education, justice, health, sport, culture equality and employability. Education Scotland's intention is to continue to work with YouthLink Scotland and partners to provide sustainable learning opportunities for the sector. In addition, the CLD Standards Council for Scotland will work with YouthLink Scotland and partners to develop support and training for volunteers linked to the Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Strategy for CLD as well as exploring options for developing national standards for youth work.

---

<sup>26</sup>[http://www.fph.org.uk/the\\_impact\\_of\\_the\\_uk\\_recession\\_and\\_welfare\\_reform\\_on\\_mental\\_health](http://www.fph.org.uk/the_impact_of_the_uk_recession_and_welfare_reform_on_mental_health)

<sup>27</sup><http://www.cldstandardscouncil.org.uk/Home>

<sup>28</sup>*An Introduction to Scotland's National Performance Framework: 2011*

<sup>29</sup>*Our ambitions for improving the life chances of young people in Scotland: National Youth Work Strategy 2014-2019*

Much of youth work delivery in Scotland is staffed by volunteers, without which the sector would be severely limited. However, recent budget cuts cause concern for the sector. The Chief Executive of YouthLink Scotland expressed concern that further ongoing austerity measures could see youth work under real threat in some parts of the country. The Scottish Government no longer ring fences youth work spending but has continued to support youth work by making money available to voluntary organisations through initiatives such as *Cashback for Communities* and committing itself to a youth work strategy. The *Cashback for Communities Fund* reinvests the proceeds of crime back into communities to benefit Scotland's young people and is administered by YouthLink. Youthlink estimate that up to 400,000 young people take part in youth work activities every week with around 40% from the poorest 20% of the country.<sup>30</sup>

The *Scottish Strategic Plan 2013-18* highlights that youth work makes a contribution to many national outcomes, including those relating to health and wellbeing, literacies, youth justice, outdoor education, environmental issues, sport, arts and culture and employability but that there is a particular resonance with national Outcome 4, which relates to the Curriculum for Excellence in terms of formal education and whilst not the only driver, partnership with formal education is a key one.

The recent development of the policy and practice framework for the *Curriculum for Excellence (CfE)* means that the youth work sector has a significant role to play as delivery partners for educational establishments, offering young people valuable opportunities for learning and personal development both in and out of school. Alongside the *Outdoor Learning Agenda* and *16 plus Activity Agreements*, new opportunities and challenges face schools and colleges in their interface with youth work, with young people learning through a range of providers.

Through *Activity Agreements* 3,500 of the most vulnerable 16-19 year olds are supported through a programme of informal education each year with 70% going on to positive destinations.<sup>31</sup> A case example, noted in *Curriculum for Excellence* illustrates *Activity Agreements* in action: *Highland Council Activity Agreements* are set up to meet individuals' needs after they leave school. An *Activity Agreement* is a plan of learning and activity which an advisor will help a young person put together, so that they can move on to further education, training or employment. It can include volunteering, short courses, supported learning and practical experience including work experience placements. The *Highland Council Activity Agreements* project is supported by the European Social Fund.

*Opportunities for All* brings together a range of existing national and local policies and strategies to provide a single focus to improve young people's participation in post-16 learning or training, and ultimately employment through interventions and support until at least their 20<sup>th</sup> birthday. There is an

---

<sup>30</sup> <http://thirdforcenews.org.uk/tfn-news/families-and-young-people/council-cuts-jeopardising-youth-work>

<sup>31</sup> <http://thirdforcenews.org.uk/tfn-news/families-and-young-people/council-cuts-jeopardising-youth-work>

explicit commitment to offer a place in learning or training to every 16-19 year-old who is NEET. Youth workers offer a key contribution to this agenda for example, by helping young people develop skills valued by employers, or supporting young people to re-engage with education.

It is intended that the Youth Employment Scotland Fund (£25m) launched in 2013 will support unemployed young people (16-29 years) into work through supporting recruitment incentives for employers of small- and medium-sized businesses and larger enterprises<sup>32</sup>. There continues to be a commitment to the growth and development of the Modern Apprenticeship programme. There has been a year on year increase in young people accessing the programme and it is intended that this will increase to 30,000 starters per year by 2020.<sup>33</sup>

In terms of youth education, the *Curriculum for Excellence* (CfE) requires both a mindset and practice shift in terms of education delivery. The emphasis is on the breadth, challenge and depth of learning rather than on curriculum content, although key areas of knowledge are defined such as literacy, numeracy, health and wellbeing. It is envisaged that CfE will equip learners with skills for learning, life and work and will encourage innovation. Learning will not be restricted by age cohorts but there will be more flexibility according to need. CfE also encourages learning to take place in the outside world, for example through work experience. CfE encourages schools to be more than just the provider of learning experience and to broker a range of experiences in other contexts, working as active partners with other providers. This includes the expectation of partnership work to secure appropriate post 16+ *Learning Choices*, ensuring all young people have access to the right learning provision, effective information, advice and guidance on future learning and employment.

*Curriculum for Excellence: Building the Curriculum* (2008) noted a range of good examples in practice in terms of youth service with differing school and youth work partnerships and models in place. In some cases, local authorities have appointed youth workers as part of a pilot programme, and others have entered into service level agreements with young work providers from the voluntary sector to provide services for young people. As one headteacher noted: “we also benefit from the community based networks available to youth, workers and from continuing professional development activities that they have carried out for our staff”. Education Scotland has expressed a commitment to support the CLD sector in preparing all young people for employment as a core element of *Curriculum for Excellence*.

There may be current and continuing challenges for schools in terms of embracing CfE within the school environment. A recent study by the University of Stirling in 2011 highlighted that whilst teachers in one local authority were committed to it in principle, many staff did not feel they fully understood what it

---

<sup>32</sup> <http://www.employabilityinscotland.com/policy-and-partnership/youth-employment/youth-employment-scotland-fund/>

<sup>33</sup> <http://www.employabilityinscotland.com/policy-and-partnership/youth-employment/youth-employment-scotland-fund/>

meant in practice. This uncertainty led to anxiety and insecurity for many teachers.<sup>34</sup> This in itself could impact on the effectiveness with which the youth service is engaged and embedded into the curriculum. Nevertheless, headteachers and others are becoming aware of the range of skills and expertise that youth workers can contribute, including accreditation programmes such as ASDAN and other awards, volunteering opportunities and personal development programmes, and the use of youth work approaches in improving engagement with young people, families, other partners and communities.<sup>35</sup> As one headteacher reported: “The street work that the youth workers carry out has offered support beyond the school day and has directed many into clubs and other support networks within the community. It has also provided intelligence for us to support our young people better.”<sup>36</sup>

Scotland’s first *National Youth Arts Strategy (Time to Shine, 2013)* is benefiting from £5m of new funding from Scottish Government. Key initiatives under the strategy include nine Youth Art Hubs for young people to participate in and access arts and creative activity, youth arts advisors have also been selected across the country to guide the delivery of *Time to Shine (TTS)* via the establishment of a National Youth Advisory Group, shaping the future of arts for young people in Scotland. The launch of ‘TTS, Digital’ is accompanied by a £450,000 fund to develop young people’s creativity and experimentation. In response to YouthLink’s assertions, a Scottish Government spokesperson advised that since 2013, over £6.9m had been given directly to voluntary youth work organisations. Whilst funds are also provided to local authorities direct, however, the lack of ring fencing will mean that local authorities will allocate resources according to local priorities.

The *Scottish Youth Strategy 2014-2019* refers to GIRFEC (Getting it right for every child) which is a consistent way for people to work with all children and young people. There are ten core components and a set of values and principles which bring meaning and relevance at a practice level to single-agency, multi-agency and inter-agency working across the whole of children’s services. They can be applied in any setting and circumstance where people are working with children and young people. This includes a consistent understanding of information sharing as appropriate, a co-ordinated and unified approach to identifying concerns, assessing needs, and agreeing actions and outcomes, based on Wellbeing Indicators. As well as access to the right help at the right time through effective planning processes, and high standards of joint working where more than one agency is involved with a young person with a Named Person (and a Lead Professional where necessary) to coordinate and monitor multi agency activity.<sup>37</sup>

### 3.3 Wider youth agendas in the UK

---

<sup>34</sup> Developing Curriculum for Excellence: Summary of findings from research undertaken in a Scottish local authority

<sup>35</sup> *Curriculum for Excellence: Building the Curriculum* (2008)

<sup>36</sup> *Curriculum for Excellence: Building the Curriculum* (2008)

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/People/Young-People/gettingitright/background>

Following the election of the coalition government, the concept and policy supporting Big Society was launched. Three main strands were identified within the Big Society agenda:

- Social Action: people give time, effort, money
- Public Service Reform: decreasing centralised bureaucracy, giving professionals more freedom, opening up public services to new providers
- Community Empowerment: Neighbourhoods being in charge of their own destiny.

The National Citizen Service (NCS) came out of this policy driver. The NCS is a voluntary personal and social development programme for 16 and 17 year olds in England which takes place three times yearly. Young people engage in out and bound-type activities prior to agreeing on a social action project that makes a difference to the local community.<sup>38</sup>

As part of the Department for Education's (DfE) wider transition programme for the youth sector, a consortium of four organisations known collectively as Catalyst, led by the National Council for Voluntary Youth Services (NCVYS) and supported by partners including the National Youth Agency (NYA), Social Enterprise Coalition (SEC) and The Young Foundation, played a key role in ensuring the voice of the youth sector contributed to the reform of services for young people.

Catalyst worked towards three key objectives over the two-year period 2011-13:

- Strengthening the youth sector market
- Equipping the sector to work in partnership with government
- Coordination of a skills development strategy for the youth sector's workforce.

One of the outcomes of their work has been the development of an outcomes framework for young people.<sup>39</sup>

The Centre for Youth Impact, building on the work of Catalyst and supported by Cabinet Office funding, aims to increase the use of high quality evidence in the design, delivery, evaluation, funding and commissioning of services for young people. The Centre is made up of a consortium of three organisations: The National Council for Voluntary Youth Services (NCVYS), Project Oracle, and the Social Research Unit at Dartington. The Centre works with three areas of focus: with early adopters, funders, and at a national level in England. It has developed an 'offer' to build skills, capacity and infrastructure, and works to create momentum around a network of organisations working with and for

---

<sup>38</sup><http://www.ncsyas.co.uk/about>

<sup>39</sup>McNeil, B., Reeder N. & Rich, J., (2012)A framework of outcomes for young people

young people in terms of evidence and impact. It also works to ensure the *Framework of Outcomes for Young People* (a framework highlighting the importance of social and emotional capabilities to the achievement of other outcomes) remains relevant and accessible as a resource to organisations working with young people.

The Centre for Youth Impact has been working with early adopters the Brathay Trust, The Foyer Federation, and London Youth who act as gateways into existing regional and national networks, through their involvement in previous initiatives. The Centre for Youth Impact has been utilising their competencies to build infrastructure and develop and expand the early adopter network, cascading knowledge and learning to the sector. It is anticipated that a network of 'evidence hubs' will reach across England by 2017, representing key youth interest groups. The Centre, in offering training and events brings together funders and commissioners with providers with a view to develop shared learning, supporting the development of relationships between funders and providers.

### 3.3.1 Social Action

The most high profile of the Coalition's youth policies was set out in *Positive for Youth* (HM Government 2011), frequently referred to by stakeholders as the 'revealed truth on what needs to be said about and done for and with young people.'<sup>40</sup>

The National Citizen Service (NCS) is open to all 15-17 year olds in the four nations, supporting young people to build skills for life and work. Participants take on new challenges and adventures, and contribute to community projects that benefit both young people and society. In total, 31,738 young people took part in the NCS programmes in summer 2013, and 7,828 in autumn 2013. The Cabinet Office commissioned Ipsos MORI to evaluate the impact and value for money of these programmes. The report found that NCS increased participants' trust in others, improved short-term and long-term educational and career aspirations as well as the level of control that participants felt they had over their future and that through an improved understanding of local communities, community engagement improved. Experiences gained by NCS graduates are now recognised positively by employers and educational institutions alike.<sup>41</sup>

Alongside evidence frameworks and knowledge dissemination strengthening the sector, there are a raft of additional organisations supporting the voice and contribution of young people to their communities. In early 2014 the British Government announced that 41 voluntary and community sector organisations would be granted a total of £11m via two funding streams to encourage young people to help others through social action. The programmes are part of the Cabinet Office's commitment to 'Step Up and

---

<sup>40</sup>Davis, B., (2013) Youth work in a changing policy landscape: the view from England

<sup>41</sup><http://www.the-challenge.org/ncs-with-the-challenge>

Serve', aiming to double the number of young people aged between 10 and 20 years taking part in social action activities by 2020.

The Uniformed Youth Social Action Fund (UYSAF – £10m) supports organisations delivering a range of projects across the four nations for young people living in disadvantaged areas and hard to reach communities. Young people are offered opportunities to both develop themselves and their communities through social action. An interim evaluation report produced by the Behavioural Insights Team<sup>42</sup> provides compelling evidence that young people who take part in social action initiatives develop some of the most critical skills for employment and education in the process.

#iwill is a national campaign that aims to make social action part of life for as many 10 to 20 year-olds as possible by the year 2020 with high level support from the coalition government. Through collaboration and partnership it is spreading the word about the benefits of youth social action, working to embed it in the journey of young people and creating fresh opportunities for the participation. The campaign is being coordinated by the charity Step Up To Serve.

---

<sup>42</sup>Evaluating Youth Social Action, An Interim Report Does Participating in Social Action Boost the Skills Young People need to Succeed in Adult Life? Kirkman, E., Sanders, M. and Emanuel, N. Behavioural Insights Team

## 4. The Value and Impact of Heritage

### 4.1 The Impact of Heritage for Young People

As highlighted in the 2012 evaluation of the Young Roots programme,<sup>43</sup> participating in heritage can contribute to young people's personal development, with emerging evidence of a positive relationship between heritage participation, wellbeing and health. Involvement in a heritage project can make a significant contribution to community life by boosting social capital, increasing mutual understanding and cohesion and encouraging a stronger sense of place. This was echoed in a follow up study to the evaluation carried out by CPI looking at the impact of the Young Roots programme from the perspective of six young people.<sup>44</sup>

However, if the relationship between the youth sector and the Young Roots programme is to be strengthened, several interviewees stressed the need for a clearer definition of heritage to be articulated and shared. With the overarching definition encompassing the built historic environment, natural heritage and intangible culture such as memories, knowledge and practices that people and communities have transmitted across generations this can create some challenges for those not familiar with the scope of heritage and its contribution to their interests and strategy.

Explaining the value of heritage is not a straightforward thing to do – evidencing it even less so. This is despite Young Roots projects working to challenge the traditional understanding of heritage through redefining what heritage means. This redefinition is not filtering through to the expected range of audiences.

The evidence gathered through the 2012 evaluation (of the Young Roots programme) showed that partnerships between heritage and youth organisations produced positive benefits on both sides. Youth organisations shared their knowledge, access and expertise in working with young people and helped heritage organisations to adapt their methods of working to encourage more young people to access and help define and shape their own heritage. Direct contact with young people, in particular from diverse groups, helps to challenge stereotypes and negative perceptions of young people. For youth organisations their relationship with heritage organisations helps to deepen their understanding of what heritage is and give access to different resources and projects which young people can get involved with as well as support young people with learning, education, volunteering and accredited training.

---

<sup>43</sup>[young-roots-evaluation](#)

<sup>44</sup> 2014. Young Roots Programme. Impact Case Studies. HLF

The evaluation of the Young Roots programme highlighted three different types of heritage impacts:

- **Individual impacts** such as pleasure and fulfilment, meaning and identity, challenge and learning and the relationships between heritage participation and health and wellbeing
- **Community impacts** including social capital, community cohesion and citizenship
- **Economic impacts** such as volunteering, skills development and job creation.

Numerous studies have explored the benefits that individuals gain through engagement with heritage – particularly through active participation in heritage projects – from enjoyment and a sense of fulfilment, to the development of new skills and improved physical and mental health. The 2013 review<sup>45</sup> of the value and benefits of heritage by HLF noted that ‘there is widespread agreement that the strongest evidence for the benefits of culture for individuals is found in ‘personal development’ e.g. new skills, new experiences, improved confidence, changed attitudes, education support’.

Some of the most detailed evidence in this area comes from HLF<sup>46</sup> who commissioned a three-year study of the impact of participating in heritage projects. They found that HLF volunteers report levels of mental health and wellbeing that are far higher than for the general population, or for the general volunteering population, particularly with regard to their ability to ‘play a useful part in things’ – an indicator that combines a measure of self-worth with social connectedness. One in three (35%) of volunteers reported an increase in self-esteem and confidence in their abilities. The research also found that heritage volunteers made modest skills gains and were using these skills in different ways beyond the workplace to further their community engagement.

There are indications that the individual impacts of heritage – particularly concepts such as learning, identity and belonging – can translate into impacts on the wider community through a number of mechanisms. Visiting heritage sites and participating in heritage projects enable people to connect with each other and form new friendships and networks, leading to increased social capital in the community. The vast majority (92%) of heritage volunteers meet new people through their involvement with HLF projects. Perhaps more importantly, 35% of volunteers sustain these relationships by socialising outside of the project itself.<sup>47</sup>

Heritage experiences can help people to understand more about themselves and others who are different to them, contributing to greater levels of tolerance and respect and increased community cohesion. Heritage projects can become part of the currency of conversation within a local community which boosts instances of ‘co-presence’ amongst distantly connected people.

---

<sup>45</sup> Values and benefits of heritage: a research review by HLF Strategy & Business Development Department: December 2013

<sup>46</sup> BOP Consulting (2011) *Assessment of the social impact of volunteering in HLF projects: Year 3*: HLF

<sup>47</sup> BOP Consulting (2011) *Assessment of the social impact of volunteering in HLF projects: Year 3*: HLF

- 72% of HLF volunteers increased or significantly increased contact with older adults, and
- 23% stated that volunteering helped them to increase their understanding of over 65-year-olds.<sup>48</sup>

Heritage projects contribute to a greater public spirit and mutual understanding in an area, with one participant commenting that “the projects all unite communities with a reason to be proud of those that have gone before them”.<sup>49</sup>

#### 4.2 Heritage and wider policy

A jointly funded project by Scottish Natural Heritage and Learning and Teaching Scotland<sup>50</sup> sought to understand how outdoor learning could be harnessed to address the aims of the current national curriculum development initiative: *A Curriculum for Excellence (hereafter CfE)*. The outdoors was found to provide a distinctive learning environment for all young people interviewed. In young people’s accounts, it was apparent that the outdoor experiences they valued were characterised as fun, uninhibited, and authentic.

In a research report produced by the Regional Youth Work Unit in the North East<sup>51</sup> it was suggested that there were obvious links between the types of project supported by the Young Roots grant programme and new Government initiatives for young people. These initiatives included: (in schools) the *Five-Hour Cultural Offer* and the *National Curriculum*, and (in youth organisations) positive activities within the 10 Year Youth Strategy.

The *Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE)* programme set up by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in 2008, in collaboration with the then sector-leading non-departmental public bodies: Arts Council England (ACE), English Heritage (EH), Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) and Sport England (SE) aims to generate strategic evidence that will be used to inform the deployment of public funds to maximise engagement in sport and culture, and the value citizens in England receive from that engagement. As part of the CASE programme, DCMS commissioned the EPPI-Centre (Institute of Education, University of London) and Matrix Knowledge Group to undertake a research project to investigate the drivers, impact and value of engagement in culture and sport.

---

<sup>48</sup> Opinion Leader Research (2006) Capturing the public value of heritage, English Heritage

<sup>49</sup> DCMS (2013) Taking Part Survey 16 English Heritage

<sup>50</sup> [http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/commissioned\\_reports/ReportNo225.pdf](http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/commissioned_reports/ReportNo225.pdf)

<sup>51</sup> 2009. Take the Risk and you won't be disappointed: A Review of Heritage Lottery Fund Projects involving Young People in the North East. Regional Youth Work Unit.

When compared to non-participation in structured arts activities, participation in structured arts activities, for example, was found to improve:

- Secondary school students' academic attainment
- Pre-school and primary students' early literacy skills
- Young people's cognitive abilities (based on various measures of intelligence), and
- Young people's transferable skills.

#### 4.3 Heritage and the youth sector

One of the main concerns expressed by the national youth organisations consulted was the lack of relationship between heritage and youth sectors and, as a result, little recognition given to the contribution which the heritage sector can and should make to local multi-agency partnerships. Rarely is the culture sector considered as one of the key partners. As a result, this lack of engagement in local decision-making processes and service delivery priorities correlates in the generally low profile that culture has within the overarching frameworks developed by central government. This was echoed by the local authority commissioners interviewed who were unaware of the Young Roots programme, and confessed, had never considered the role which culture could play in local young person's policy and provision. The importance here is that these frameworks establish both the parameters in which local action takes place, and the processes by which key commissioning decisions are made.

Heritage organisations echoed these concerns. Despite their increasing engagement in broadly defined education work, when it came to 'mapping' outcomes against specific policy objectives, very few of the programmes were developed with programme-specific policy outcomes in mind. Thus, while projects may have broad goals such as improved literacy or self-confidence, these did not always translate easily to the more detailed measurements required by policymakers and commissioners.

Fortunately, there is evidence gathering which is increasingly taking a holistic view of the role of cultural agencies within the wider public sector, viewing agencies as 'having a bearing on' changes in individuals and society – rather than trying to track specific changes to specific interactions. Heritage organisations are starting to be recognised through some of the work undertaken by national organisations as valued partners in the delivery of learning for children and young people.

Successful models of working with young people are emerging. Heritage stakeholders highlighted how outreach and partnerships with other agencies were considered key and effective. Examples in practice include encouraging organisations to use heritage premises for their own activities. This then facilitates initial contact and ongoing engagement.

There is significant opportunity with the increased focus on NEETs to demonstrate how the Young Roots programme can contribute to educational outcomes in particular in the wider context of 'learning'. Not only the contribution to academic performance but also what is sometimes called 'personal, social and emotional development.' Based on the notion that 'emotional well-being, knowing who you are, where you fit in and feeling good about yourself'<sup>6</sup>, are all integral to the learning.

More recently these broad educational outcomes have been joined by social action policy which includes issues such as citizenship, social cohesion and co-operation, which have risen up the political agenda, with much of the focus being on children and young people. Given the role of cultural activity in the formation of identity and in developing relationships and attitudes to the wider society, policymakers are now increasingly looking to how cultural institutions can contribute towards outcomes in these broader social policy areas as well.

## 5. Feedback on the Young Roots Programme

Respondents were asked to provide feedback on the Young Roots programme including promotion and decision making of grants to understand how best to communicate the key benefits of being involved in Young Roots projects in order to promote the programme more effectively to the youth sector.

### 5.1 Heritage an abstract construct

Organisations were found to not immediately connect heritage to youth work, with heritage viewed as an abstract construct. It was not clear to many of the stakeholders interviewed how the funds could be used and the benefits of such a programme. This then creates challenges when trying to promote Young Roots across the sector and encourage applications. In order to market messages effectively to the youth sector, the benefits needed to be articulated more clearly and showcased, this in turn would provide youth workers and professionals the right tools to engage young people with heritage and encourage them to think about heritage projects.

### 5.2 Using heritage outcomes to achieve wider policy objectives

The heritage organisations recognised the focus on NEETs and increasingly they were seen as organisations which could provide creative and exciting opportunities to support employability projects, where skills development and accreditation tended to be built in. Due to the massive role volunteering plays in social action, the opportunities provided through the heritage sector to volunteer and build communities provides the opportunity to include both targeted as well as universal appeal.

At a local authority level, heritage is not generally viewed as in alignment with employment and educational strategies. Commissioners do not necessarily recognise the role which the grant programme can play to support local policies even though there is a wide range of existing evidence to support the range of both hard and softer skills which a younger person can acquire through their involvement with a project.

Organisations such as the Venture Trust have developed a 'logic model' to demonstrate how their work with young people and outdoor activities brought benefits and value for money. An outcomes framework had been developed which provided a baseline assessment of individuals and then monitored changes in confidence levels, life style choices and relationships. This helped to articulate how their work could support the wider policy. This approach could be utilised and tailored to meet the needs of NEET young people.

### 5.3 Young people's participation

Interviewees felt strongly that young people should be involved in the decision making process of grant giving. Several examples already exist of successful programmes where young people are trained as grant assessors and panel members. There was also the suggestion that HLF should recruit and train young people to become Young Ambassadors for the programme, who could promote the programme, work with potential projects to help them with their applications, meet with funded projects to monitor the grant and support organisations with the youth-led element of their project.

The heritage organisations discussed the impact that wider youth sector changes had had on their work in museums and galleries. Where there were dedicated young person's posts, they were paid from either core development funds or Arts Councils England (ACE) resilience funding and were linked to the sectors' widening participation and audience work backed by a youth engagement strategy. Additional funds tend to be grant based with stringent criteria.

*"We are a medium sized museum and we use our collections to engage. We undertake a lot of regional skills sharing with other organisations and use a triangle of participation. We have a monthly youth panel, run paid internships and recruit youth consultants".*

(Heritage organisation)

### 5.4 Innovation

One of the challenges reported of applying for lottery funds was the expectation that the proposal needed to "identify new ideas and be innovative". However organisations recently no longer had the capacity to undertake additional development work but would prefer to receive support to sustain areas of work which had already been proven to be effective and work with young people. This has started to be recognised within lottery funded programmes and increasingly the criteria now asks for evidence of what works rather than to request newly developed ideas. This was welcomed by the sector and was felt to be more manageable.

*"We [heritage organisation] just don't have the capacity to research new ideas ... we know what works and investment should be provided to sustain this work."*

(Heritage sector organisation)

With reductions in funding, organisations welcomed the fact that HLF would now allow monies to be used to back fill posts as both heritage and youth sector organisations identified previously not having additional capacity within organisations to carry out new work. With a decrease in staff to deliver new projects without any back fill available.

### 5.5 Targeted vs. Universal

Several of the respondents did not wish to see the programme become targeted, as this provided less opportunity to work with young people from a broader basis. Also stakeholders were concerned with the newly emerging definition of youth work which was tighter and did not reflect youth work in its true sense.

*"There [are] significant concerns across the [youth] sector how what is now being defined as youth work is a move away from the true values of what youth work stands for. There is a very narrow focus of what youth work is and should be doing. We are under pressure to accredit everything we do with young people."*

(Youth work organisation)

"The benefits of the heritage monies are that it can sit outside of local developments and be funded directly to an organisation - this then allows us to continue to do what we know is effective with young people."

(Youth organisation)

## 5.6 Capacity of organisations

The maximum availability per grant could possibly be a potential deterrent in organisations applying for the funds. Previously local infrastructure organisations would support the voluntary sector including small size community groups and small to medium size organisations in support of making bid applications. However with the reduction in infrastructure support this has impacted upon the capacity and capability of organisations to apply for the grant.

A number of the respondents had not known applicants could also bid for smaller sums. Some respondents felt the size of the grant and associated paperwork and expectations were beyond the capacity of the organisations that were not able to commit the resources or felt they would not be able to manage the size of the grant.

Provider organisations working with minimum staffing levels did not feel equipped to undertake the required developmental work with young people prior to bid submission.

"There needs to be flexibility, it is not always practical or realistic to involve young people in the process for developing an idea then going through the application process. There should be flexibility to present ideas to young people once the monies have been granted."

(Youth organisation)

With the changes in workforce there were increased numbers of new and unqualified staff who did not necessarily have the skills to oversee a project and successfully engage with young people for the duration of the proposal.

Many organisations lack business skills to look at new ways of drawing in funding. Many smaller organisations run by volunteers don't necessarily understand the language of outcomes and along with

the increased support small to medium organisations needed to successfully deliver to contracts, this can impact upon the success of grant funded projects such as those Young Roots could be involved with.

Several of the larger national youth organisations suggested that a way forward would be for a larger umbrella organisation to support the sector and provide the infrastructure as well as HLF working with agencies to help distribute funds. Several examples were given of successful partnerships. In addition a number of practical suggestions were put forward:

- Utilise organisational e-bulletins, newsletters and websites of national youth organisations to market the grants programme
- Use innovative mediums which encouraged dialogue and a relationship between the heritage and youth sectors such as speed dating network events
- Consider widening the remit of the programme to include younger children, and families to fit in with the Think Family agenda
- Leverage funds into organisations to build in capacity to help with project management, bid writing
- Develop outcomes which are specific to vulnerable young people.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

### 6.1 Conclusions

The policy environment related to children and young people in the UK is currently going through the biggest change in a generation.

It is important for people working in the heritage sector to continue to develop narratives and an evidence base to understand and demonstrate the value of heritage. At a time of significant cuts in public funding at both local and national level, when parts of the heritage sector are under extreme pressure, it is more critical than ever to develop a compelling and robust argument for the value of heritage.

Local heritage and youth organisations should use their Young Roots experience to demonstrate the offer and benefits which a heritage programme brings to the local economy. As the evidence shows various elements can contribute to the wider objectives of policy for children and young people at local, regional and national level. By being clear on the 'offer' this will help both sectors distil and articulate the range of activities and the kinds of outcomes that it can offer for children and young people, in a language – and with reference to a policy environment – that other public sector partners can identify with.

Outcomes and performance management are becoming more of a feature for youth services commissioned by local authorities and this brings opportunity for cross fertilisation of outcomes. In highlighting how the Young Roots programme supports education and employment, this will support national strategic drivers and can be reflected in Young Roots own governance frameworks. Also, whilst universal provision may be reducing/ceasing in some parts, the increase in targeted provision could be utilised by Young Roots as a means of achieving outcomes beyond that which Young Roots currently set which although isn't an expectation, does mean the projects bring added value in terms of wider agenda's.

Overall, the evidence base in relation to Young Roots is strongest when it demonstrates the immediate effects of young people's interaction with the sector, principally in terms of enjoyment and learning outcomes – particularly of life skills/non-cognitive skills, but also related specifically to education, employment and wellbeing.

## 6.2 Recommendations

Following on from the findings and conclusions (above) the following recommendations are made:

1. Undertake a feasibility study into HLF collaborating with national youth organisations which represent each nation to utilise their expertise to help administer and market the Young Roots programme to the youth sector. Each organisation would have specialist knowledge of geography, relevant local and national policy, and existing networks with a range of small to large organisations representing both statutory and voluntary sectors.
2. Produce a robust youth participation strategy with assigned resources which underpins the Young Roots programme to ensure young people are involved in the decision making process of the grants process and formalise their role to become ambassadors for the programme.
3. Develop a marketing strategy which promotes and showcases the Young Roots programme using previous and current projects and partners to showcase the benefits and activities which can be undertaken through the programme, making best use of social media platforms. The marketing strategy should utilise organisational e-bulletins, newsletters and websites of national youth organisations to market the grants programme. Use innovative mediums which encourage dialogue and a relationship between the heritage and youth sectors such as speed dating network events.
4. Develop the existing Young Roots online community network<sup>52</sup> further to enable both heritage and youth projects to share ideas, resources and experiences of how projects have influenced and shaped local policy. Ensure the online resource is marketed through the right social platforms and linked to other online forums which specifically target young people's agencies as well as the heritage and voluntary sectors.
5. Retain a universal focus for the Young Roots programme but produce a specific series of outcomes for projects which work with vulnerable young people and the opportunity for Young Roots projects to support targeted services.
6. Consider widening the remit of the programme to include younger children, and families to fit in with the Think Family agenda.
7. Leverage funds into organisations to build in capacity to help with project management, bid writing.

---

<sup>52</sup>[Young People and Heritage forum | Heritage Lottery Fund](#)

## 7. Appendices

Appendix A: ..... Table of interviewees

### NATIONAL/ REGIONAL YOUTH SECTOR ORGANISATIONS

Name	Position	Organisation
Isabelle King	Innovation and Sustainability Manager	NCVYS - National Council for Youth Organisations
Safia Noor	Social Partnerships Manager	NCS - National Citizen Service
Gillian Lithgow	Development Manager	YouthLink Scotland
Leon Mexter	CEO	Youth Focus North East
Chris Quinn	Director	Northern Ireland Youth Forum
June Trimble	Director	Youth Action Northern Ireland
Denis Palmer	CEO	Youthnet Northern Ireland
Helen Mary Jones	CEO	Youth Cymru
Catrin James	Urdd Gobaith Cymru expert in Youth Policy	Urdd Gobaith Cymru
Paul Glaze	CEO	CWVYS - Council for Wales of Voluntary Youth Services
Margaret Jervis	Operations Director	Valleys Kids
Leah Doherty	Co-ordinator	GwirVol - volunteering
Bethia McNeil	Interim Director	The Centre for Youth Impact

### NATIONAL HERITAGE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS

Name	Position	Organisation
Catrin Hughes	Programme Manager	TCV
Amy Cervantes	Young People's Lead	Prince's Trust
Lucie Unsworth	National YP's Lead	Canals and Rivers Trust
Rachael Crofts	National Young Person's Lead	Geffrye Museum
Andy Beer	Head of Visitor Experience and Learning	National Trust

**LOCAL AUTHORITIES WHO HAVE HAD INVOLVEMENT WITH A YOUNG ROOTS PROJECT**

Name	Position	Local Authority
Sarah Bellamy	Senior Youth Worker	Kiveton Park Youth & Community Centre and I.T. Training Centre
Rachel Tranter	Head of Arts	London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Shirley Robinson-Viney	Youth Council Lead	Worthing Youth Council

**YOUNG ROOTS GRANTEE**

Name	Position	Organisation
Rachel Rickards	Business Development	City of Bradford YMCA
Emily Reddy	Green Spaces Manager	Groundwork North Wales (Wales)
Elain Johnson	Senior Practitioner	Tayside Council on Alcohol, North East - Young Person's Service
Malcolm Jack	Head of Funding & Contracts	Venture Trust

**HERITAGE LOTTERY FUND**

Name	Position	Organisation
Karen Ziesler	Development Manager, NW	HLF
Melissa Strauss	Young Roots Programme Manager	HLF

**LOCAL AUTHORITY YOUNG PERSON'S COMMISSIONERS/ STRATEGIC MANAGERS**

Name	Position	Local Authority
Louise Atherton	Programme Manager Targeted and Specialist Commissioning	Leeds City Council
Kate Jennings	Commissioning Manager	Merton Council
Gill Potts	Lead Youth Worker	Halton Borough Council

Appendix B: ..... Interview topic schedule

### **NATIONAL/ REGIONAL YOUTH SECTOR ORGANISATIONS**

(context specific to Northern Ireland, Wales, Scotland and England and may be broken down further into regions dependent upon interviewee's role)

- a) What is the current landscape and future of the youth sector?
- b) What have been the main strategic changes which have impacted the sector?
- c) Can they provide examples of what impact this has had locally for youth provision, the workforce, wider provision and young people themselves?
- d) Are there any specific initiatives/ developments they are aware of to try and counterbalance some of the impact? If so are they influencing the change? Are they involved with any campaigning?
- e) What are the most common local priorities for commissioners and strategic representatives concerning young people?
- f) How are young people's services now funded and managed - what does this mean for both statutory and voluntary provision?
- g) (If they have had direct involvement with a YR's project) Ask how the Young Roots grant helped to achieve local strategic objectives and how it could also assist in the future.
- h) (Where no previous contact) Ask a more general question to how Young Roots can be aligned to meet local priorities? (Discuss relationship with education, outdoor learning, employment, volunteering, health and wellbeing, resilience, self esteem, etc.)
- i) Any suggestions to how the YR programme could be marketed/ promoted to the youth sector? What do they see the benefits of heritage for young people and organisations to become involved? - practical suggestions
- j) What do they perceive to be the challenges to ensure there is local support of Young Roots?

### **NATIONAL/ REGIONAL HERITAGE SECTOR ORGANISATIONS**

- a) What is your interest in young people?
- b) Has this interest led to any initiatives/programmes?
- c) Where and how do you draw down funds to work with young people? Do you face any barriers in accessing funding from local authorities, and the youth and heritage sectors?

- d) Who do you work with locally both strategically and operationally from the youth sector and has this relationship changed in most recent times?
- e) Have you any examples of where you have tried and achieved local buy-in to heritage developments and the benefits for young people?
- f) Any suggestions to how the YR programme could be marketed/ promoted to the youth sector? What do they see the benefits of heritage for young people and organisations to become involved? Practical suggestions

#### **LOCAL AUTHORITIES WHO HAVE HAD INVOLVEMENT WITH A YOUNG ROOTS PROJECT**

- a) What can they tell us about the local youth sector, what has changed?
- b) What has become challenging from both a strategic and operational perspective when planning and providing services for young people
- c) Can they describe the local commissioning arrangements for children and young people services and if this has gone through any significant change or is in the process of doing so.
- d) What are the local priorities in relation to young people?
- e) How did the Young Roots grant help to achieve some of the local strategic objectives and how may it assist in the future? What were the most significant benefits?
- f) Any suggestions to how the YR programme could be marketed/ promoted to the youth sector? Practical suggestions

#### **PREVIOUS YOUNG ROOTS PROJECTS WORKING WITH VULNERABLE YOUNG PEOPLE**

- a) Describe the rationale of the Young Roots Project?
- b) How did this fit in with local strategic objectives/ priorities or was it aligned more so to local need in a targeted area?
- c) Were you able to involve any local youth sector organisations?
- d) Has the work from the project fed into any local strategy/ initiatives/ further projects? Did it generate any interest? If so, which areas were commissioners and strategic representatives particularly interested in?
- e) Have you used the outcomes from your Young Roots work to inform other projects or tenders for funding?
- f) What is the current position of your organisation in regards to funding and local commissioning?
- g) What is the current working environment within the young sector? What impact has this had for your work and the organisations?

**LOCAL AUTHORITY YP COMMISSIONERS/ STRATEGIC MANAGERS/ YP LEADS**

- a) Can you describe your local commissioning arrangements for children and young people services and if this has gone through any significant change or is in the process of doing so.
- b) What are your current priorities and how much has this been influenced by national strategy and how much is informed by local need?
- c) What has happened to your local youth sector in the last 3 years and what provision do you have now
- d) What is your feeling of what the local authorities' primary focus is an immediate concern and as a future plan?
- e) Has there been any change in the focus of how local services are procured, is there an emphasis on local provision, voluntary sector input and collaborative work?
- f) Have you considered the Young Roots Programme? Discuss how the programme's activities, outcomes and other benefits could be aligned locally.
- g) Any suggestions they could provide to how the YR programme could be marketed/ promoted to the youth sector? What do they see the benefits of heritage to be? Practical suggestions
- h) What are the opportunities and methods to maximise local strategic buy in and sustainability of a project
- i) What do you see as the challenges to ensuring there is local support of young roots?

**HLF CONTACTS**

- a) Outline what has been picked up anecdotally
- b) What has been the direct and indirect this has for the Young Roots programme
- c) Is this reflected in the types of organisations applying, completing and type of subject
- d) Do you have examples of where the project supported local wider priorities and this was acknowledged?

Appendix C: ..... Areas Facing Cuts<sup>53</sup>

**Dudley Council** is considering potential cuts of up to 50% to youth services in the next financial year. The council hopes that voluntary and community sector organisations will fill gaps in provision. Protests have occurred within the local community, but had little impact on plans.

**Cardiff Council** intends to make £37 million of cuts in the 2015/16 budget. Youth provision is likely to be heavily impacted but the full extent is currently unclear. Community groups are expected to fill the gap.

**Basingstoke** is facing 80% cuts to its youth service from Hampshire County Council, dropping to £973,000. This would see one youth pod being opened in Basingstoke, providing services for 12 hours per week. The public is currently being consulted about the plans.

**Bradford** was facing cuts of 79% to its youth service, however, following action from the community, this has been changed to 36%.

Councillors in **Bradford** have raised concerns about the running of youth centres in the area. Following cuts to the budget, it was hoped that voluntary organisations could take over the running of seven youth centres. However, all of these centres have a backlog of costs relating to building maintenance, which these organizations may not be able to afford.

**Warwickshire County Council** has agreed £518,000 of cuts over four years starting in 2015. This will not only affect youth services, but funding agreements with the voluntary sector. Statutory budgets for youth work have previously been reduced by 59%, meaning this cut will further reduce services, and youth clubs will be closed.

**London** is likely to see 90% cuts to youth services, following revelations in Mayor's Question Time in November. This would see funding drop from £22.6m to £2.3m by 2016/17.

Within London, **Haringey** council is required to make £70 million of cuts, with £17.3 million affecting children and youth services. Remaining youth services are to focus on preventative work for young people.

**Staffordshire County Council** is ending its open provision in December 2014, closing all youth centres in the area, and supporting community provision instead.

**Trafford** is facing a high level of cuts across all services, with plans to close all youth centres in the area. It has been suggested that these centres become social enterprises that secure their own funding.

**West Sussex** closed a number of youth centres in 2012, due to financial cuts and declining need. Members of the local community, in partnership with 4Youth have continued offering clubs and groups

---

<sup>53</sup><http://www.nya.org.uk/supporting-youth-work/policy/cuts-watch/>

for young people, parents, and pre-school activities. The centre is running successfully, and is a benefit to the community.

**Wolverhampton** reduced its budget by £1.75 million in 2014/15, which severely reduced youth services. Only 8 youth work positions remained in the area, with 140 redundancies taking place.

**Cornwall Council** will not provide an open access youth service in the next financial year due to financial cuts. This places youth centres in doubt, with some needing to be sold as the council cannot afford the upkeep of the buildings.

**North Yorkshire** needs to make reductions of £74 million in the next financial year and youth services will be reduced in that. The council has emphasized that statutory requirements will still be met following cuts.

**Brighton and Hove** council has planned 100% cuts to the funding of voluntary and community sector organisations. This will eliminate youth services in the area, and force the closure of youth centres, youth clubs and both targeted and universal work with young people.

**Hampshire County Council** is also reducing funding to children's services, with a possibility of 80% reductions to the youth service. Following consultations with the local community it has been announced that the youth service will receive £1 million more than was previously planned, allowing the youth service to continue to maintain a service for young people.

**Romsey** is facing funding reductions from Hampshire County Council of up to 80%, which are likely to strongly impact youth charities in the area which form the majority of youth services. This may mean that services are reduced to one day a week.

**Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council** has had its funding for youth services cut by 81% by Hampshire County Council. This will mean the closure of the majority of youth services in the area. There are plans to replace services with "youth pods", 23 of which will be opened across the county. One of these will be in Basingstoke, meaning that the youth service in the area is reduced to 12 hours a week.

**Oldham Council** is to close two youth centres as part of austerity measures to save £60 million.

**Staffordshire County Council** has faced backlash after closing 33 youth centres. Local campaigners are working to reverse the council's decision, and are organising protests in the area.

Following the announcement that youth centres would be closed in **Newquay**, local campaigners have created a working group to maintain youth services and keep at least one youth centre open.

**West Berkshire** is consulting members of the local community about proposed cuts to services, which could see the closure of detached youth work services in the area, in addition to a job club for NEET young people.

**Brent Council** is currently holding a consultation with members of the local community about which services will need to be reduced or cut in aid of saving £54 million. Youth services are among those being considered for closure, with the potential loss of children's centres, a day care centre, and respite care for families of young people with additional needs.

**Warwickshire County Council** is reducing funding to the community and voluntary sector, leading two main charities in the area to change their structure. Warwickshire Voluntary and Community Action is considering merging with Warwickshire Children and Voluntary Service due to reduced funding for both services. This would lead to continued services for young people in the area, but at a reduced level than previously.

The St Nicholas Youth Centre in **Yate, South Gloucestershire** has been forced to stop offering youth services due to a lack of funding. Other organisations have been encouraged to replace services by the council, who can no longer afford to fund the centre.

**Salford Council** is trying to further reduce spending by considering reducing school transport for young people with special education needs or disabilities. They are proposing training these young people to use public transport or travel independently to reduce the need for specific school transport. This highlights the level of savings needed by the council and presents significant safeguarding issue for a group of vulnerable young people.

**Blackpool Council** has been one of the more heavily impacted areas, having its overall budget cut by a quarter in the last three years. Last week the council announced that it must find a further £25.2 million of savings, meaning that up to 300 jobs will be lost. Children's services in the area have lost £24 million of funding in the last three years, and further cuts are likely to impact the voluntary sector in the area, meaning youth services will be further reduced.

**Carmarthen Council** has confirmed funding will be removed from a youth service project in the area and the manager will be made redundant in April. Whilst it will be run by volunteers, there are concerns that it will not be able to continue for more than six months.

Bromley Youth Music Trust will lose all funding from 1st April. The trust particularly works with young people who would not have access to music provision usually

**Bromley Council** is removing £300,000 of funding from the trust, meaning it will be unable to continue.

**Penarth** is losing a youth club due to council cuts. The Penarth and District Scout and Activity Centre which runs a youth club one night a week, will be closed. There are three youth clubs remaining in the area, but there are concerns about the fall in provision.

**Shropshire Council** is carrying out a consultation with residents of **Ludlow** reviewing the Ludlow Youth Partnership. As the council needs to make £140,000 of savings, it is being considered what youth

services can be maintained and what cannot. The consultation includes questionnaires which are being given out in schools and to youth groups.

Proposed changes to funding youth services in **Warrington** have caused concern amongst the local community. The council wish to loan £3 million to a charity to create a youth zone in the area, whilst council provided youth services have faced cuts. Members of the community have raised concerns that this money could be better spend on existing services.

**Northamptonshire County Council** is to outsource all staff and services, including youth services. The first county in the country to consider this option, the Council hopes that by outsourcing all services it can save up to £12 million.

**Purley** is to lose its only youth centre at the end of the financial year as the council is removing all funding for the service, including rent for the youth centre site.

**North Yorkshire council** is to cease funding for all youth clubs, removing all open access provision across the area. Also being changed is the structure of youth support services, children's services, and social work services.

**Walsall Council** is under pressure to make £86 million of savings, and may close 10 youth clubs in the area. This will affect 54 youth work jobs. Projected budgets from the council aim to reduce youth service costs by £1 million over the next four years.

The closure of a youth centre in **Melksham, Wiltshire** is costing the council £11,000 per month. Cuts forced the council to cease funding services in the centre, but the cost of the building remains even though it is empty. This decision has left young people with no dedicated centre in the area.

The Gaming Zone in **Rushmoor, Hampshire** provides free, open access support for young people, and information about housing, drugs, child protection and sexual health. The services have had to make sudden cuts and closures as Hampshire County Council will not provide any funding for the next financial year. The service is seeking funding from businesses and other groups, but may have to close entirely.