



# YOUNG PEOPLE FRIENDLY NEIGHBOURHOODS

Supporting young people and  
community development

Six points for action



Publisher details – published by Groundwork UK  
Written by Kevin Ford (FPM)  
Edited by Jonathan Hopkins (Citadel Communications)

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all those who took part in the Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods project, particularly the young people, local residents, volunteers and staff of Groundwork trusts, Sanctuary Housing and the wide range of local housing associations and other partner organisations.

We are also indebted to the support and input of the partner organisations in the Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods project: Groundwork UK, Sanctuary and Youth Access.

Final thanks go to Bill Badham and the members of the FPM consultant team – Harriet Gore, John Thurlbeck, John Walker, John Papworth and Annette Goldband for their ideas, reflections and commitment to services with and for young people.

Published under Creative Commons  
This material may be freely used provided that its source is acknowledged.

# CONTENTS

---

Foreword.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Youth provision in crisis?.....	4
A search for innovation.....	4
Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods.....	5
Neighbourhoods fit for young people: six propositions.....	9
Proposition 1: Community-led partnerships.....	9
Proposition 2: A bedrock of community relationships.....	10
Proposition 3: Commissioning by communities.....	11
Proposition 4: Community investment over time.....	12
Proposition 5: A community premium.....	13
Proposition 6: One set of services.....	14
Conclusion.....	15

# FOREWORD

---

Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods is a well-designed scheme which has achieved notable results in a short time. The principles that underpinned YPFN were sensible and an important part of the scheme's success.

This report develops six propositions based on the learning from YPFN and the wider experience of Groundwork and its partners. While these propositions are directed primarily at youth work they have a broader relevance to public service provision in a time of rising need and squeezed budgets.

There is a growing recognition, particularly in local government, that we must analyse and approach communities as sets of assets not just bundles of need. This insight is in turn linked to what we at the RSA call a 'social productivity' approach to public services; we should judge public service interventions by the degree to which they enable and encourage people to meet their own needs, individually and collectively. A third related principle is the engagement of communities in the design, commissioning and delivery of services.

Joining these ideas together along with this report's plea for a long-term approach I would add another suggestion. Young people need support to develop their own solutions but they can themselves become powerful advocates, guides and friends of others in their neighbourhood who need support.

As the RSA has found in its work with people in drug and alcohol recovery, when a service recipient develops to become a volunteer helping others it is powerful in many ways: for their self-esteem, for the way they are seen by others and as an exemplar for those earlier in the recovery process. Teenagers who may find it hard to relate to their peer group or adults in authority can get great satisfaction from working with young children or elders. The aim is not simply to address problems but to work with people so their identity is anchored in a sense of agency and contribution.

An explicit aim of youth work should be to develop the right incentives, support and expectations to foster a spirit of community engagement and volunteering in young people. This is the best answer to the challenge of achieving long-term impacts and sustainability and it is also the ethos which can underpin the mutual model for youth work which has emerged through YPFN.

In short, the corollary of Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods is neighbourhood friendly young people. Locking these two concepts together through the right policies and resources can be critical to making some of our most disadvantaged areas better places to live. This report and the work and ideas behind it can help bring such a vision closer.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew Taylor', with a long horizontal stroke underneath.

**Matthew Taylor**  
Chief Executive, Royal Society for the Arts

# Introduction

---

Most young people are doing all right in England today <sup>1</sup>. For some it has never been better. For many the transition to independent adulthood is a challenge for which they are able to find support from family, friends and trusted adults. They also have access to a wide range of opportunities and services in their time outside school or college for recreational, cultural, educational and social activities.

For a significant minority of young people (around 1 in 5) the world is a bleaker place to be in and for a small minority of these young people things can be very tough indeed <sup>2</sup>. A combination of poverty, ill health (particularly mental ill health), low educational achievement, few opportunities for paid work, risk of crime and offending, risk of alcohol and drug misuse severely limit their life chances. The effect is magnified by the immediate neighbourhood in which they live <sup>3</sup>.



The evidence from statistics and research tells us that despite our best efforts, most of the ways in which society has been trying to support young people still seem to let down the most vulnerable. Despite good intentions the investment of large amounts of public money on good ideas and short-term interventions has not addressed the issues. Between 1972 (a start of modern concern over youth participation in education, training and employment) and 2012 there have been well over 100 separate government initiatives to tackle the problems faced by young people. Few have survived intact for more than three years and the stubborn statistics of disadvantage and underachievement among 10-20% of young people persist.

In 2011 the Department for Education invited voluntary organisations to propose innovative solutions to improving outcomes for young people <sup>4</sup>. Groundwork developed a new programme (Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods), working in local partnerships with social housing providers to provide neighbourhood level support, which combined open access to activities and services with intensive wraparound support for those young people who needed it.

This pamphlet provides insights from the Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods programme and sets out six propositions that will enable communities to take control or ownership of the services they need to support young people. None of the propositions is expensive. The cost of failure is in not acting to prevent the high levels of emergency and remedial support which amounts to many billions of pounds of public money <sup>5</sup> – and the wasted life chances for many young people.

## Youth provision in crisis?

Statutory guidance requires local authorities to 'secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, equality of access for all young people to the positive, preventative and early help they need to improve their well-being. This includes youth work and other services and activities <sup>6</sup>'. However, government does not prescribe which services and activities for young people local authorities should fund or deliver, or to what level. The government has said that assessment of local priorities and decisions on services for young people 'are best left to local people'.



Poorer neighbourhoods have tended to have the least access to provision outside of schools and colleges, often heavily reliant on local authority or other publicly funded youth services. As the impact of recessions and austerity has deepened since 2008, those services that support young people in their development and transition to adult life have been disproportionately cut back. It has been estimated that between 2009/10 and 2012/13 many local youth services lost between 25 and 75% of their funding <sup>7</sup>.

These cuts have taken place against a backdrop of rising youth unemployment (which hit 22% in 2013) and often strong local campaigning to maintain services led by young people themselves <sup>8</sup>.

The voluntary youth sector has also been hard hit by the loss of public funding for youth provision. A survey for the National Council for Voluntary Youth Services (NCVYS) in 2011 found that 70% of responding organisations were cutting services to young people because of falls in funding <sup>9</sup>.

## A search for innovation

Across England there has been a flurry of activity to find new ways to provide support for young people. Change is all too often driven by the needs to make savings quickly and not necessarily by the values of collaboration and holistic responses to need.

Local authorities do, however, have a strategic leadership role. They are expected to involve young people in service design, delivery and governance. This includes new service structures and new ways of commissioning with voluntary and community organisations <sup>10</sup>. As they investigate new ways of working many are discussing approaches and patterns of services which draw on much older ways of meeting need, such as co-operatives (modern origins in 1844), voluntary youth and community work (stemming from the YMCA in 1844) and community development and self help (as old as society itself) <sup>11</sup>.

# Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods

In 2011 Groundwork set up a partnership with Sanctuary Housing (bringing expertise in social housing and neighbourhood investment), Youth Access (with expertise in supporting young people through youth work and counselling interventions) and FPM (with expertise in the development of new ways of delivering public services, including mutuals and co-operatives).

The partnership won funding from the Department for Education for two years to involve young people in 20 English neighbourhoods to work with others in their localities to develop new ways to provide support so that it would be sustainable in the long term. It was built from a successful previous approach developed by Groundwork – Youth Works – which supported young people through education, training and employment opportunities to regenerate their communities and create safer environments.

YPFN provided young people aged 11-19 the chance to shape and run services with local residents in their communities, to help build communities in which young people feel a strong sense of belonging. Through innovative partnerships YPFN projects have supported the design and delivery of effective wraparound youth support and sustainable models for youth provision. The programme:

- involved 2,400 young people in over 47,000 sessions of youth work and positive activity in their neighbourhoods
- involved 1,440 (60%) young people who were aged 12-16
- included 504 (21%) young people who were not engaged in education, employment or training, or were at risk of disengaging.

YPFN wanted to get away from approaches in which trained professionals arrive from outside, deliver their services and then disappear, the so-called “shiny cars” syndrome.

YPFN was well received in the neighbourhoods and met all its targets; it emphasised the importance of the communities in which young people live and the value of engaging social landlords as key actors in supporting them. Young people themselves were seen as co-producers of the work in their neighbourhoods.

The programme tested four core elements of services and support: a community-led approach; the active engagement of housing associations; a local offer of wraparound services for young people; and project sustainability.

## 1. A community-led approach

Each neighbourhood had their own distinctive challenges requiring local solutions. Community engagement was built into the programme from the start, developing the skills of volunteers and links with other initiatives in the area, working with youth work professionals to ensure high quality interventions.

The local perception of the organisations involved was varied. For some neighbourhoods the organisations were outsiders, offering something of short-term benefit. In other places it was possible to build a deeper dialogue and joint vision for a more lasting and sustainable development. The development process faced occasional hiccups – for example when local people felt that the agenda was being steered towards that of YPFN, rather than reflecting their own purposes.

In most areas it took a significant time to establish local partnerships, for example building new links with housing associations or new ways to connect with the local authority. However, the development of new local partnerships was reported to be one of the most important factors in building support which could be sustained after the funding for YFPN ended.

A key finding is that community-led open access services for young people, supported by housing associations as the conduit that brings together partners and experts alongside residents, provide the basis for long-term partnerships based in communities with a long-term view. YFPN achieved:

- more young people and adults involved in volunteering
- the creation or strengthening of 20 neighbourhood partnerships between young people, older residents, housing associations, Groundwork Trusts, local voluntary organisations and public authorities.

## 2. The active engagement of housing associations

Thirty one per cent of housing association residents are under 25. Evictions and repairs are the highest among this group. Anti-social behaviour is a key issue for housing providers and is perceived to be concentrated among young residents. Many housing associations have started with a deficit model of these problems – how to limit and contain or move them on. The ‘young people friendly’ approach seeks to turn this on its head. It develops a shared commitment to have a local neighbourhood in which young people have constructive things to do, feel part of the community and have a strong sense of belonging.

Sanctuary Housing was a partner in YFPN and has a long history of community investment. Sanctuary found that in YFPN neighbourhoods there was evidence of reduction in anti-social behaviour and perceptions of improved relationships between young people and adult residents.

The programme also brought together representatives from over 70 other housing associations to explore the reality of creating young people friendly neighbourhoods. There was a strong appetite to take the principles forward (with many saying that they had worked in this way for years).

Many housing providers want to take a lead role in ensuring that their young residents are properly supported. They liked the idea that young people should be involved and engaged in developing and delivering services. They were very concerned not to be left to do this work alone. They were acutely aware that young people’s issues can often be very complex and support is best delivered by trained, committed staff.

The providers did not necessarily see themselves as youth work providers but felt they had a key role as local animateurs and orchestrators of organisations and agencies that do provide services. This included setting up new young people-led organisations in their neighbourhoods.

The housing associations will be in contact with young people for many years – they are in it for the long haul. They felt they were uniquely well-placed to be leaders and catalysts in community partnerships.

YFPN projects provided young people with support through good youth work. This early intervention led to measurable reductions in evictions, arrears, and anti-social behaviour and greater community and inter-generational cohesion. For example YFPN achieved:

- reductions in anti-social behaviour of up to 40% in some neighbourhoods
- improvements in resident satisfaction and quality of life and the relationships between young people and other residents in the neighbourhoods.



### 3. The offer of wraparound support

In delivering YPFN, Groundwork and its partners wrestled with the tension between their own organisational purposes (and business imperatives) and the wider purposes of the communities they were serving. There was also a tension between the requirement to deliver an agreed quantum of service to young people, specified in the contract with the Department for Education, and a desire to engage with young people in their communities and identify what interventions would be most helpful to them.

YPFN found that externally specified targets for reaching particular young people (particularly those at risk of becoming NEET) in neighbourhoods created some problems. Where this was perceived to be the main driver of the work it had a negative impact on the way the project was seen.

The project undertook to provide “wraparound support” for young people most in need. This worked best when it was part of a wider open access offer of support and activities. The wider offer brought youth workers into contact with the young people with additional needs. It was clear that some young people’s issues were very complex and wraparound support needed to be delivered by well trained staff.

In a short-term programme results need to be evidenced quickly and information provided to the funders swiftly. Many outcomes are longer-term and take time to emerge, Also the speed of reporting requirements may preclude the local community having ownership of the data. Ideally the local community should have time to make sense of the statistics and have control over how these are conveyed to funders. YPFN produced evidence that projects achieved:

- improvements in young people’s self confidence and skills
- more innovative solutions to providing one-to-one support in addition to group work.

### 4. Exploring sustainability options from the start

YPFN built in support to explore the long-term sustainability of projects from day one. This included early discussions about the potential to develop Community and Youth Mutuals as a vehicle to enable local people (young and old) to own their own services. The mutual approach could provide new ways to keep services going and build active links with local commissioners.

Young people were given training and other support to explore and develop new ways to sustain their projects. There was considerable interest in youth mutuals, which are organisations co-owned and led by young people that provide services for young people. The membership of a youth mutual is drawn from users, i.e. young people, together with employees and other stakeholders with an interest in young people’s services. This model ensures that young people have a direct say in how the organisation is led and managed.



YPFN also worked with commissioners to explore their approaches to sustaining work with young people in neighbourhoods. Commissioners understood some of the key issues in developing local communities. They could see the value of young people becoming active drivers or owners of their services.

They recognised the challenge of reconciling community-based solutions with funding streams that target individual needs. They also located YPFN as part of the wider agenda of localism and public service reform. There was potential for support for young people to be mediated at neighbourhood level and draw from: community budgets; City Deals; budgets held by Police & Crime Commissioners; Health & Wellbeing Boards; Job Centre Plus, and others.

YPFN found that young people want to be actively engaged in the decisions that affect their lives, their friends and peers. YPFN achieved:

- the establishment of the first youth-led mutual in England and a pipeline of three partnerships working towards youth and community mutuals which include young people
- the involvement of young people at the heart of their own projects and services in most of the YPFN neighbourhoods.



# Neighbourhoods fit for young people: six propositions

YPFN has shown the potential to develop neighbourhoods where young people will have a fair chance to grow, develop and lead productive lives. We have also seen how so much of the system that should provide support simply fails to do so. This has raised important questions about the way we go about providing support to young people.

From the shared experience of Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods, we have identified six propositions that would enable the development of neighbourhoods that are fit for young people. It is time to debate these propositions and act to better support young people.



## Proposition 1: Community-led partnerships

Difficulties, crises and problems are a normal part of communities. We need to stop thinking about how we solve problems for people through processes of target, catch, treat and release. The processes are expensive, intervene too late and usually fail to provide a means of reintegration back into communities<sup>12</sup>. Most of the interventions made by agencies are time-limited and usually short-term. There is little lasting economic benefit to the neighbourhood from their involvement. We need to find a way to reverse this, without losing the value of external expertise.

Short-term interventions can create partnerships of convenience with external agencies and a necessary suspension of competition in order to focus limited resources. However, the issues that need to be addressed are not simple and the solution requires local partnerships united for a common purpose in the interests (and under the direction) of local residents. Community-led partnerships are committed to a shared local vision, prepared to risk time and effort to help young people revitalise their neighbourhoods – as opposed to working in the neighbourhoods as a result of winning funding to do so.

The potential of housing associations to be engines of community development has been revisited. YPFN engaged with over 70 housing associations to discuss the idea of young people friendly neighbourhoods. There were outstanding examples of local people taking ownership of their neighbourhoods with support from their housing association. This supports the findings and call for housing associations to be “bolder, more strategic and more radical in their approach to localism”<sup>13</sup> as a core part of their operations.

### Action: Let residents reclaim their neighbourhoods

YPFN showed that young people want to make their neighbourhoods better places to live. As far back as 1982 the Thomson Report argued for young people and their communities to have greater control in the operation of services that should ultimately be accountable to them.

Housing associations should take a lead role in facilitating neighbourhood level partnerships through which residents, young and old, are able to reclaim their neighbourhoods. The simple reason for this is that they will be present in the neighbourhood for a long time.

Housing associations could become key agents, animators and facilitators of local community partnerships. Their place in local communities, relationships with local people, history and comparative stability add considerable weight to such partnerships.

## Proposition 2: A bedrock of community relationships

People get most things done, either individually or collectively, through their networks of relationships. It is the social capital which enables some to thrive. Youth and community work as a professional discipline focuses on the process of building relationships with young people and their communities which are voluntary and start where the young people are <sup>14</sup>. People also need relationships with others within their communities and relationships which link them to people and resources outside <sup>15</sup>.

If the relationship with young people is effectively imposed from outside, is short-term and is required by an external agency (such as government) then it is distorted. It may be transactional at best and can easily become tokenistic. So we need to rethink how we can create an environment in which young people can develop helpful effective relationships with people in their neighbourhoods, including older residents, professionals and specialists where they are needed.

Building a bedrock of relationships in neighbourhoods requires a planned process. Left to chance there is a risk that the most vulnerable young people will be preyed upon by others offering the appearance of worthwhile relationships but which turn out to be abusive (such as gangs offering a false sense of belonging, worth and security). Where relationships have broken down outreach and detached youth work have a proven record in this arena.



### Action: Invest in youth and community work

Young people involved in YFPN did not want to be left to improve things on their own. They were insistent on the continuing support of adults in the community and professional staff. This action cannot be achieved by parachuting professional staff into neighbourhoods for short bursts of improvement.

We should invest in the support of skilled youth and community workers, building relationships within and between communities and generations. They can work with the young person to identify relevant support and services which can wrap around them when they are needed.

### Proposition 3: Commissioning by communities

Once local people young and old have started to take control of their neighbourhoods, a new deal can be struck between communities and the professionals who serve them.

Rather than short-term interventions for particular problems, there needs to be a shared purpose and social value to create a better neighbourhood. We need to find better ways to enable people in their neighbourhoods to manage and control the process of commissioning services.

The important difference in this approach is that the communities would be accounting to funders and others for what they have done for themselves, rather than the funders finding ways to get an account of what has been done to them. This poses difficult questions in relation to the current orthodoxy in the commissioning of services. It changes the role of the local authority. It may challenge the idea that services should mainly be provided through a competitive market place.



Yet in dialogue with local authority commissioners many would welcome an approach in which decisions about services were made by people close to those (or actually those) who need them. The more forward thinking and enlightened commissioners were committed to try to find ways of providing long-term consistent support, if this would lead to better outcomes.

In Lambeth ambitious plans are well advanced towards the creation of a borough-wide commissioning body for young people's services, owned and controlled by young people. The body will work through neighbourhood level partnerships. Similar approaches are developing in Norfolk and Bedfordshire.

#### **Action: Commissioning should start in neighbourhoods**

There is a growing body of evidence about commissioning from community and participatory budgeting<sup>16</sup>. YPFN conversations with commissioners had the characteristics of conversations with community animators, rather than bureaucratic procurers of services.

Young people should be fully involved in these processes and should be in control of commissioning their own services. This could be as part of community commissioning or through separate arrangements such as Youth Mutuals.

## Proposition 4: Community investment over time

Significant and lasting change cannot be achieved in two or three years. Often, a timeframe of five years is suggested as a minimum and for some particularly difficult neighbourhoods and communities, it may take considerably longer and the impact of the early intervention programmes not felt for a generation<sup>17</sup>. We have to find a way of providing consistent supportive relationships for children and young people through transition to adulthood. This means a planning timeframe of at least eight years and in the case of young people with particular challenges this is more likely to be 10 to 15 years.



The public spending cycle also has a profound effect on organisations that are engaged in delivering public services using public money. The organisations become trapped by the mechanics of the cycle and pushed into a project mentality where the main concern is delivery of the targets and performance indicators that have been set by their funders. The shorter the timeframe for the work, the weaker is the case that trustees and directors of organisations can make for investing in the greater good and wider common purpose. Organisations are driven to maximise return on projects rather than investing for long-term benefit.

There is a case for short-term initiatives to stimulate change if they are built on longer-term consistent support. The problems start when this is the only source of money available. YPFN worked best where the short-term opportunity was part of much longer-term relationships with the communities and young people. Without this the quest for funding can become an end in itself. It can take organisations away from their core purpose. It can lead communities and neighbourhoods into undertaking activity which is not their real priority.

### Action: Think and plan long term

A switch to long-term thinking and long-term support is inextricably linked to how money is routed to meet the needs of young people and older residents in their neighbourhoods. If we are serious about working with people in poor and disadvantaged neighbourhoods we surely must commit to support for a reasonable period of time. Otherwise our words are not matched by our deeds.

Funders and commissioners should make explicit requirements that those seeking short-term funding for a particular intervention in a neighbourhood have connected it with local structures and organisations which are present for the long haul and have the long-term interests of all residents as their primary concern.

## Proposition 5: A community premium

The current orthodoxy that markets and market-like mechanisms are the best way to manage public services has led to separate systems for identifying need, specifying results and procuring providers of services – all at a distance from the people in the communities who will receive the services. There is a dynamic relationship between purchaser and provider (or buyer and customer). Unfortunately this is almost wholly exclusive of the service user.

Markets work best when the customers have purchasing power and the capacity to choose what goods or services they want. If we could channel the money for services to those neighbourhoods and give the local people control over how it is spent we would see a dramatic reduction in the costs and the potential for more of the money to benefit the people it was designed to benefit. In doing this we can reduce the number of different funding streams and initiatives each with its own bureaucracy and costs. We can also dramatically increase the speed with which the community and its partners are able to respond to need.

Housing associations provide an example of how this might work. A proportion of rent is provided through housing benefit (or other benefits) – enabling public subsidy to go smoothly to the housing providers, without the need for other complex mechanisms. The rent from the residents provides the resources for a range of community investments to support residents. There is no external process for commissioning. The housing association would hold the funds on behalf of the neighbourhood and could become the hub of a local commissioning process for services to support its residents. Other organisations could play this role but few have the long life and capacity or the scale of a social housing provider.



### Action: Channel money directly to the neighbourhoods

The community commissioning case studies and work on participatory budgeting emphasise the value of local neighbourhood-level structures through which local people drive the provision of services.

We should explore whether a local services premium could be routed through rents, as a sort of capitation fee similar to the way schools receive funding per pupil. This puts the resources in the hands of local neighbourhood partnerships. This would need an appropriate governance and accountability structure but examples already exist as part of neighbourhood partnerships, including suitable arrangements for young people.

## Proposition 6: One set of services

We need to stop separating open access services from those that are targeted. They are parts of the same system and need to be seen and connected together. Young people need to have open and local access to services which enable them to learn, grow and develop in their time outside school, college, training or work. Public money is already targeted on those with greatest levels of need – inextricably linked to poverty. Open access services in areas of high need are targeted services. The distinction between the two is false and unhelpful.

The open access services provide the earliest intervention in relation to problems. Often they help the young person to solve the problem before it escalates. The aim is to create a neighbourhood that young people feel part of and want to live in. This will reduce the need for expensive targeted interventions later on.

Some young people need specialist help, sometimes very intensive. Others might break the law and will be punished for it. In both cases most young people will need to be able to return to their neighbourhood and live there. Open access services are a vital part of the process of reintegration. The reality in most neighbourhoods is that good open access services for young people will connect with the vast majority of young people who live there. They are part of the neighbourhood and are known to people there.



### Action: Target resources not services

Funders should focus their attention on finding ways to channel resources to poorer neighbourhoods. The people in the neighbourhoods should be empowered to decide how best to spend the resources to meet their shared needs. Work with young people will be part of this. It needs to be open to all in the neighbourhood and through work with all will reach those most in need.

It is then possible to work with those young people to develop the packages of wraparound support that can transform their lives. The support is likely to involve their families and carers, schools, health, social services and often youth justice.



## Conclusion

### Places where people want to live

People want to live in places they are proud of. Most people in the UK do not move more than a few miles from where they grew up <sup>18</sup>. For young people from poorer backgrounds the likelihood of moving away is even smaller. A policy which assumes people will move out to get on is not supported by the data. Most people stay in or near their own neighbourhoods so we have to find ways to enable them to make their neighbourhoods better.

All too often Government and charities set out to provide young people who live in poor neighbourhoods with the means to escape. These communities are simultaneously stigmatised and asset-stripped. And if you can't leave you are stuck in a neighbourhood that is defined by what is missing.

YPFN confirmed that the systems used to procure public services are not fit for purpose. Good things do happen but the project suggests that they do this despite the processes designed to support them rather than because of them. Putting local people, young and older, in control of commissioning has the potential to reduce some of these tensions and enable local communities to get more from skilled interventions from outside.

Young People Friendly Neighbourhoods showed the enormous potential to liberate energy and enthusiasm to improve the quality of life in neighbourhoods when residents, including young people, are given a real stake in doing it.



- <sup>1</sup> Evidence of the state of the world for young people in England: youth crime rates have fallen every year since 2006/7; first time entrants to the youth justice system dropped from 110,000 in 2007 to 40,000 in 2011; drug taking and alcohol consumption by young people both fell between 1998 and 2011; teenage pregnancy has dropped by a quarter since 1998; truancy has also fallen in this period. However, young people are facing high rates of unemployment (22% for 16-24 year olds); lower wage levels when in work and are more likely to be living at home than in previous generations. More young people than ever before are achieving qualifications and going to university (approximately 30% of 18-year-olds go to university) but 40% leave school without 5 A-C GCSEs. (Sources: the Economist; the Guardian; Youth Justice Board; DfE; ONS; BIS)
- <sup>2</sup> See for example DfE report Matt Barnes, Rosie Green and Andy Ross (2011) Understanding Vulnerable Young People – analysis from the longitudinal study of young people in England P6
- <sup>3</sup> Roger Casson and Geena Kingdom (2007) Tackling Low Educational Achievement. York Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- <sup>4</sup> Improving Outcomes grant programme 2011-13 Department for Education
- <sup>5</sup> It is estimated that youth unemployment cost the Treasury £4.8 billion in 2012, with a further cost of £11 billion in lost output from the economy - Youth unemployment –the crisis we cannot afford (ACEVO Commission on Youth Unemployment 2012). The Prince's Trust estimated the cost of youth crime to be £1.2 billion per year in its report The Cost of Exclusion – counting the cost of youth disadvantage in the UK (2010). The National Audit Office suggests a higher figure for the cost of youth (under 18) crime of £11 billion per year. The Royal College of Psychiatrists estimated the cost of mental illness in 2010 to be c £110 billion per year. The majority of mental illnesses start in childhood. (RCP: No health without public mental health – a position statement 2010)

- 
- <sup>6</sup> Statutory guidance for local authorities on services and activities to improve young people's well-being, Department for Education, 2012
- <sup>7</sup> See: The State of the Nation (2012) National Youth Agency; How things could be (2013) CHYPs, NYA and FPM; A return to Ancient Truths (2012) Community Matters.
- <sup>8</sup> See NCVYS reports on campaigns <http://ncvyspolicy.wordpress.com/category/cuts-affecting-the-voluntary-and-community-sector/>
- <sup>9</sup> Youth groups find alternative funding to make up for government spending cuts, CYP Now (14 June 2011); NCVYS Comprehensive Cuts 3 (September 2011)
- <sup>10</sup> See Report on the 12 Youth Innovation Zones in England (2013), FPM
- <sup>11</sup> Kevin Ford (2012), A Return to Ancient Truths. Community Matters, London

- 
- <sup>12</sup> For example see figures on re-offending (Ministry of Justice) or the difficulty faced by people with mental health problems in rejoining their communities (MIND).
- <sup>13</sup> Pete Duncan and Sally Thomas (2012) Acting on Localism: the role of housing associations in driving a community agenda. ResPublica.

- 
- <sup>14</sup> See for example Youth Work –an introduction <http://www.infed.org/youthwork/b-yw.htm>
- <sup>15</sup> See for example discussion on bridging versus bonding social capital on <http://blogs.worldbank.org/publicsphere/bonding-vs-bridging>

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Local Government Association (2013) Whole Place Community Budgets: a review of the potential for aggregation; House of Commons Library: Community Budgets and city deals 15th February 2012; Total Neighbourhoods Learning Network; Local Integrated services pilots.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> David Deming (2009) Early Childhood Intervention and Life-Cycle Skill Development: Evidence from Head Start. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 2009, 1:3, 111-134

- 
- <sup>18</sup> See Professor Robert Champion, Migration and British Cities, WPEG Seminar on Migration, The Treasury, London, 15 December 2005.

## YPFN strategic partners

### **Groundwork UK**

Groundwork works locally through its federation of community-based Trusts to help people and organisations make changes and create better neighbourhoods, in particular for disadvantaged communities where we can make most difference.

[www.groundwork.org.uk](http://www.groundwork.org.uk)

### **Sanctuary Housing**

Sanctuary manages homes across England and Scotland and supports those communities in local projects and initiatives to rebuild and regenerate neighbourhoods.

[www.sanctuary-group.co.uk/housing](http://www.sanctuary-group.co.uk/housing)

### **FPM**

FPM supports organisations in learning, development and capacity building to deliver better services and partnership working, including the development of community mutuals.

[www.fpmonline.co.uk](http://www.fpmonline.co.uk)

### **Youth Access**

Through its 200 members nationwide, Youth Access is the largest provider of young people's advice and counselling services in the UK, including capacity building for wraparound services.

[www.youthaccess.org.uk](http://www.youthaccess.org.uk)



Registered address:  
Groundwork UK  
Lockside  
5 Scotland Street  
Birmingham  
B1 2RR

© 2012 Groundwork UK.  
All rights reserved. Registered charity 291558



Printed on Digigreen 250gsm & 150gsm Silk  
100% FSC mixed sources certified  
(minimum 50% post-consumer fibres)