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**Introduction and background**

The UK Youth Parliament (UKYP) was born in 1999, out of an idea proposed by Andrew Rowe MP, who realised the importance of youth participation in government decision making and wished to create a body which would give young people in the United Kingdom a voice through which to express their interests and concerns. The aim of the UKYP is to empower young people from the ages of 11 to 18 by giving them the chance to influence national and local government. The organisation adheres to Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which states that “children and young people have a right to express an opinion, and to have that opinion taken into account, in any matter affecting them.” UKYP is alone amongst youth organisations within the UK in having elected representatives.

The first annual meeting of the UKYP, known as the Sitting, was held in February 2001. The Sitting brings together all the Members of the Youth Parliament (MYPs) from England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland to discuss policy issues, as well as other topics of importance to the UKYP. A Manifesto detailing UKYP policy is produced at the Sitting and presented to Government. In 2002 and 2003, the Government provided an official response to the Manifesto.

Interest in the UKYP is growing and this year the Annual Sitting attracted 400 delegates, a hundred more than the previous year.¹ To ensure that UKYP has the structures and support necessary to sustain its continued growth and enable it to meet its objectives, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) decided to undertake a comprehensive review of the UKYP. The Office for Public Management (OPM) is delighted to have been commissioned to carry out this review and to presents here a final Report on its findings.

**Format of report**

The intentions of this Report are twofold. First, to present an accurate account of the views of those who took part in the Review. These views may differ from what is felt to be “reality.” However, we think it is important to present people’s views without modification, since their actions and opinions with regard to UKYP will be informed by their perceptions and it is these which UKYP will need to address. Second, to provide UKYP with some preliminary recommendations for how it might address the criticisms of stakeholders and MYPs. We hope these will inform its success in the future.

Part 1 of this Report contains an Executive Summary and Recommendations developed following the consultation.

Part 2 presents findings from the consultation and survey. The views of MYPs are reported separately from those of other stakeholders and reflect the exact debates and recommendations that took place amongst them in workshops and at the MYP conference. MYPs were given an opportunity to amend the record prior to its inclusion in this report.

¹ UKYP website
Part 3 provides an overview of UKYP structures, relationships and working arrangements. This was developed following desk research, a literature review and interviews with key stakeholders to fill in any missing information. It should be noted that UKYP continues to develop new methods of working and some of the information in Part 3 may become quickly out of date.

Part 4 contains Appendices, including examples of UKYP documents, details of the research methodology and audiences and other relevant background information. It should be noted that responses to the survey questionnaire were limited: quantitative data should therefore be treated with some caution.

Quotes used in this Report reflect the views of individuals and should not be taken to represent the official position of any particular organisation.

We would like to thank the young people who responded to the survey or took part in discussion groups. We would also like to thank the DfES and UKYP for their support during the Review process and for the comments and suggestions they offered, which have contributed to this Report.
Part 1

Executive Summary

UKYP has had a short life within which it has achieved considerable success. Political support from the three major UK political parties and from government Ministers has given it access to influence at a senior level. Youth workers and others round the country provide invaluable support to MYPs and help to increase UKYP’s electoral base. The dedication and enthusiasm of management and Trustees have provided UKYP with a firm ground from which to grow in the future. Most importantly, MYPs have invested their time, energy and passion.

Success raises expectations. As UKYP’s grows its stakeholders are asking it to demonstrate the value of their involvement with it and the benefits it brings to the young people it claims to represent. For any youth organisation to meet the expectations of its stakeholders, it has to fulfil a basic set of requirements. Its structures and procedures should be flexible, so that it attracts and is accessible to young people from a diverse set of backgrounds, with a wide and varied range of interests and concerns. It needs to work on a basis of cooperation and negotiation: adult managers should act as mentors, helping young people themselves to make decisions about the organisation, rather than making decisions for them. Communication should demonstrate respect: it should be focused, prompt and easy to understand. It is also important to be part of a network. Funding for youth organisations is always tight and forming relationships with others can help to maximise available resources. Being open to the expertise and experience of other organisations is also a way of keeping up with best practice. Finally, linking into a network of youth organisations will provide opportunities for the young people to develop their skills further in other contexts.

An explicitly political (in the non-partisan sense) organisation seeking to provide a voice for young people throughout the UK will be subject to a further set of expectations. It will be expected to demonstrate awareness and understanding of the different political landscapes within the UK and to be familiar with the debates and policies specific to those landscapes. Its internal profile will need to include these different perspectives and its public face should demonstrate that it values them all, equally. It will be expected to understand its position within the wider UK political landscape relative to other lobbying and youth organisations and how and with whom to forge alliances in the interests of furthering its influence and improving the lives of those for whom it speaks.

UKYP has achieved a lot in three years. However, this Review suggests that UKYP is not meeting the expectations of many of its stakeholders. Many stakeholders feel UKYP has tried to “run before it can walk”, making claims for itself that it is not able to substantiate, given its level of funding and isolation from much potential support. Funding for the Parliament is recognised as limited, but many point out that this is the case for youth work in general. Stakeholders and MYPs from the devolved nations raise concerns about the “Englishness” of UKYP. It is felt not to have understood the need to review its organisation and procedures in the light of wider political
shifts, such as devolution and the emergence of regional assemblies within England. It is important to recognise that, whilst these views suggest disregard for the regional and devolved nation relationships that UKYP has in place, they nonetheless represent the perceptions of many of its stakeholders. It is therefore important that they are addressed.

UKYP is also seen as unwilling to recognise the legitimacy of criticism. There is considerable enthusiasm for the idea of the UK Youth Parliament, but unless it demonstrates clearly its openness to change, its existing support may be placed in jeopardy.

Specific issues raised by stakeholders fall under the following themes:

- **Structure and management** – There is some support for the current structure. Mirroring parliamentary structures is seen as a way of providing young people with an education in political machinery. However, the question is raised whether, with its existing structure, it can do more than this and become a properly representative organisation. Others see the structure as rigid and over-formal, limiting the appeal of UKYP to young people with higher levels of educational achievement – who are seen as more likely to come from middle-class backgrounds - or those who already have some involvement with youth politics or issue-based groups.

  There is considerable support for an English Youth Parliament, with UKYP functioning as an umbrella organisation. This support comes from some English stakeholders but is particularly strong amongst stakeholders from the devolved nations, who argue that UKYP functions at present as an English organisation and that this should be recognised formally.

  UKYP’s achievements over the past three years are seen by political stakeholders in particular as a result of the drive, enthusiasm and dedication of key management figures. However, there is also considerable criticism of management, which is felt to lack experience in youth participation work and to employ a management style based on command and control, rather than cooperation and negotiation. Decision-making is not seen as transparent, with no protocol for determining which decisions should be made by the young people themselves and which need to be restricted to management.

- **Diversity and representation** – The diverse ethnic make-up of the Parliament is recognised and applauded. However the great majority of participants believe that MYPs are better educated and more articulate than “normal” young people. Some feel that the public face of UKYP is always represented by white males and are unsure whether or not this reflects the make-up of the Parliament as a whole.

  There is a perception that the diverse ethnic make-up of the Parliament is not matched by diversity in other areas: for example, social background and educational achievement: MYPs are perceived as largely middle-class and well-educated. In the absence of diversity in these latter areas and of well-structured mechanisms by which to consult its electorate, many feel UKYP should not claim to represent all young people. UKYP’s Equal Opportunities Review (see Notes to the Trustees Report and Accounts appended to this Report) shows the
advantage it has over the national parliament in terms of representation. Once again, however, it is perceptions that count and these that UKYP must address.

- **Networks and relationships** – Stakeholders are not aware of UKYP having formal links with any other youth organisations. The lack of links is seen as restricting its effectiveness and leads to the view that UKYP is insular. Some stakeholders think that the lack of contact with the wealth of experience in the youth work and participation world suggests that the real interests of young people are either not paramount or are not properly understood. The skills and knowledge existing in youth workers, participation officers and amongst charities and voluntary organisations working with young people could help UKYP to overcome many of the issues it faces.

**MYPs**

MYPs recognise that many of the issues raised by other stakeholders need to be addressed. MYPs have been holding on-going discussions on several of the key themes running through this report, including the relative value accorded to the views of MYPs from the devolved nations, the length of the Manifesto period and increasing representation. In some cases, positive action has been taken: for example, the Procedures Group has split into two to allow time for developing mechanisms by which policy can become practice and consultation and engagement strategies discussed.

Workshops with MYPs in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland indicate strong support for an English Youth Parliament. These MYPs are also keen to express their support for a UK-wide forum which would bring an English Youth Parliament together with the youth parliaments and fora in the devolved nations.

Many of the recommendations proposed by MYPs during the workshops and the MYP Conference match those arising from the consultation with stakeholders. This is a very positive sign, suggesting a shared view of the direction in which UKYP should develop in the future.

**Young people**

None of the young people (other than MYPs) taking part in the consultation have heard of UKYP. Once it is explained to them, they see it as a good idea, though few can envisage themselves being involved with it. One of the primary reasons for this is their negative perceptions of politics and politicians (young or old). The word “Parliament” suggests too a rather formal organisation. Low expectations of their own capacities and skills may also play a role. Quantitative data shows a more positive response, however, with 41% of young people saying they would be willing to become a member of the UKYP.

Young people’s advice to UKYP about how it might encourage their involvement includes using creative and sports events to publicise UKYP, using “our language” - no jargon or “long words”.

---
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Emphasising the issues, rather than the structure or political machinery, and demonstrating UKYP’s campaign successes are also important.

Addressing the issues
For UKYP to continue its growth, to meet its own aims in the future and to fulfil the expectations of its stakeholders, some considerable thought must be given to the criticisms raised. It has clear and strong support from the MPs who took part in the Review. When MYPs make criticisms, it is in the context of helping UKYP to succeed. However, it is grass-roots support, both from youth workers and from young people themselves, that will make the difference between success or failure in the future. For UKYP to build on its past success and become a properly representative organisation which can maximise the benefit to all young people of the political support it has, the views of its critical friends need to be taken seriously.

“The UKYP needs to consider whose agenda they are following. Are they following the government’s or are they creating their own? Are they genuinely interested in young people and do they want to make the UKYP more inclusive?” (Regional co-ordinator)
Recommendations

We believe that government support for a revitalised UKYP, led and controlled by young people themselves and supported by adequate funding, will demonstrate that its commitment to young people is real and provide evidence of its trust in young people’s capacity to participate seriously and productively in the development of policy in all areas.

We feel it is important that the issues raised in the Review are addressed within a context of continuing support. We suggest that this Report is seen as an overview of “UKYP Phase 1,” setting the stage for a second phase of development. This might be done through a well-publicised re-launch of “UKYP Phase 2”, with a new structure and set of strategic objectives supported by an increased budget. Prior to this, however, we believe the recommendations should be addressed individually and in detail by MYPs themselves. To ensure that actions developed are subscribed to by all MYPs, we suggest that these discussions involve a balance of Procedures Group members and other MYPs. Finally, we suggest that these recommendations are read within the context of MYPs’ own views about the issues UKYP needs to address.

Developing the recommendations

Our recommendations address general issues arising from the Review, rather than providing specific recipes for the future of UKYP - though we have provided some examples of how our recommendations might work in practice. For UKYP to move forward with increased support and enthusiasm, fleshing out these recommendations will need to be done through discussion with UKYP stakeholders – MYPs, young people, UKYP management and Trustees, regional coordinators, youth councils/parliaments in the devolved nations, youth workers and the DfES.

Principles governing recommendations

Our recommendations are set against the outcomes of the Review and have been developed with two principles in mind:

1. they should lead to UKYP being more outcome focused and
2. UKYP infrastructure should be subservient to desired outcomes

Our specific recommendations fall under 8 strategic themes.

- **Social and policy outcomes**
  - UKYP’s influence on policy needs to be evident
  - Impact on their lives of getting involved with UKYP needs to be evident to young people
  - UKYP organisational structure should follow from desired social outcomes

- **Engagement**
  - Widen the diversity of young people involved with UKYP
  - Increase participation by non-MYPs
- Adopt a multi-level approach to engagement
- Increase opportunities for active involvement by all MYPs

**Funding**
- Increase funding
- Target funding
- Ensure uniformity of funding for all MYPs

**Structure**
- Ensure structure is sufficiently flexible to allow wide participation
- Introduce greater autonomy at regional and local levels
- Raise the upper age limit for MYPs to match that of the devolved nations

**Networking and partnerships**
- Formal and informal
- Local, regional and national

**Equal representation for the four nations**
- Develop an English Youth Parliament / Forum parallel to sister organisations in the devolved nations
- Increase regional autonomy
- Increase local consultation
- Annual UK Summit, bringing together all four youth parliaments

**Leadership and Management**
- Develop young leaders
- Restrict management function to providing support and organisational back-up
- Create a Scrutiny committee of young people to oversee management

**Communication**
- Develop internal and external communication strategies
- Address inefficiencies in communication
Social and policy outcomes

Young people say that evidence of the value of getting involved is crucial and for some young people the evidence may need to precede their own commitment. The future development of UKYP needs to be driven by a clear vision of the social and policy outcomes it is seeking to achieve and a mechanism by which its successes can be conveyed to all young people.

The new structure of UKYP should be subservient to the desired outcomes. This means young people asking “what is UKYP for” and “what are we seeking to achieve” before they decide on its organisational structure. An outcomes based approach will also impact on the way in which UKYP develops and presents policy: for example, articulating desired outcomes in a concrete manner in any particular policy area is likely to be more effective than outlining the negative aspects of a government Bill or Green Paper or expressing success in abstract terms. The current discussions of the Procedures Group, around having a longer policy development and consultation process prior to the formal presentation of the Manifesto, may well feed into further thinking on this issue.

UKYP might also develop a deeper understanding of the needs and working practices of government departments. For example, government departments are most likely to be interested in specific issues rather than the broader themes addressed by UKYP Select Committees; this may explain the absence of funding support from national parliament Select Committees. By re-structuring its own Select Committee structure or by developing procedures for bringing together “project teams” to respond to issues at short notice, UKYP might increase its influence on policy and, possibly, attract additional state funding.

The Procedures Group will have a role to play in this, as the forum for deciding on policy issues. However, it should be noted that many of the MYPs involved in the workshops expressed some reservations about the Procedures Group, feeling it was somewhat distant from the majority of MYPs: some of those holding this view are themselves members of the Procedures Group.

There may also be an opportunity for Trustees to play a greater role in this area. At present, many MYPs seem unsure of Trustees’ responsibilities and some have commented that very few Trustees are actively engaged with UKYP. The recent introduction onto the Board of more young people could help to bridge the gap between Trustees and MYPs. With young people from each of the devolved nations on the Board, the opportunity also exists for communicating a less English face. This is important for encouraging young people to recognise that UKYP reflects their interests and concerns. Consideration might also be given to inviting young people representing specific interests to sit on the Board of Trustees, following the model of Funky Dragon in Wales. As it has done in Wales, this could help to increase the involvement of more vulnerable young people.

It is important to demonstrate to young people that “people like us” can make things happen and this also has implications for a reformed UKYP. The structures which will facilitate positive
outcomes for young people sitting ‘A’ levels at school may not be the same as those for young people at work, travellers or young homeless people. The personal and wider social value to all young people of participating in UKYP will need to be made more explicit, as will their ability to effect positive change.

Engagement

Widening engagement and developing more uniform involvement and support across the country are crucial. We recommend a multi-layered approach to this, involving outreach and training at a local, regional and national level, more varied voting procedures and better publicised elections, and increased consultation on policy development. UKYP aims and objectives reflect these recommendations. However, the perception amongst many stakeholders is that these aims and objectives are not being met on the ground. As may be the case with other issues raised in this report, the problem may well lie with communicating what UKYP is currently doing and achieving, rather than with making fundamental changes.

Local

We recommend a localised “cell” approach to increasing involvement in UKYP amongst young people, working through both formal (e.g., schools) and informal (e.g., social activities, youth groups etc,) channels. This approach would complement the intention of the newly-structured Procedures Group to develop best practice in engaging young people. It would widen awareness of UKYP at a local level and begin to build up a network of young people who could be consulted as part of the policy-development process. It is also sufficiently flexible to be adapted to suit local conditions.

How it might work

Youth workers, MYPs and regional co-ordinators would develop between them an engagement strategy for widening involvement in their area. We suggest that this is kept small and realistic, using a “viral” approach. For example, working in small teams, MYPs might be asked to find 5 young people, with no previous involvement with UKYP, and bring them to the next local meeting. A next target might be to “convert” some of the young people who attended meetings into more committed supporters – for example, they could put posters up in their school, help with elections or distribute questionnaires on policy issues. These young people could in turn be asked to bring new people to the following meeting. Building numbers through personal contact and small, achievable goals is more likely to result in active and lasting support and participation than simple voting.

We recommend that local and regional meetings are opened up to all young people who wish to come, rather than being confined to MYPs only. This will widen involvement in policy development and help to cement UKYP’s presence in any given area. It will also help to address youth workers’ concern that considerable amounts of money are being devoted to supporting very few young people. Meetings might be advertised in schools and youth centres and on local youth forum websites.
Building diversity

UKYP has excellent representation from young people from black and minority ethnic groups. However, stakeholders taking part in the Review suggest that socio-economic diversity is very limited and that some groups of young people are completely excluded. There is no existing data to support this view: however, the perception is that “normal” young people do not tend to become MYPs. Whether or not this perception is borne out by the facts, it is likely to influence attitudes towards UKYP.

There are specific issues associated with communicating with disadvantaged and vulnerable young people: for example, young people with disrupted home and family lives, which provide little support and protection, are more likely to be affected by racism and deprivation. They may be more cynical about authority and, of particular relevance to UKYP, about the language and workings of government. Young refugees and asylum seekers may not understand the reasons for their exclusion from some activities or services within the UK.

For MYPs and others to develop the skills required to enable these young people to participate in UKYP – and indeed, locating them in the first place - may require them linking up with charities, voluntary groups, hostels/support centres for young homeless people, drug advice centres, refugee organisations or youth offender institutions, amongst others. Developing networks and partnerships will therefore be a key element in increasing diversity. Whilst UKYP states that it has working partnerships with many organisations, there is limited, if any, awareness of these amongst stakeholders and MYPs alike.

There may also be structural implications in seeking to involve more and more diverse young people in UKYP. Many may wish to be involved with UKYP but be intimidated or put off by the requirement to campaign for election and, if elected, represent their local area. Providing channels for their involvement may require re-thinking the Committee structure and adopting a more collective approach which places less focus on individual MYPs: this would represent a radical departure from the current structure and would change the complexion of UKYP. This needs careful and thorough discussion by MYPs.

Training

MYPs would receive basic training in outreach approaches. Topics covered might include:

- understanding the importance of using language that is accessible and attractive to a majority of young people (examples from the Review include “fighting for your rights”, “standing up for what you believe in”)
- awareness of the impact of appearance (eg, not wearing suits when meeting with young people)
- awareness of the issues that are likely to be important to particular groups of young people
- induction training
- exit training – how to maximise and apply skills developed in UKYP in other contexts.
Training packs could be developed, with ideas, information and sources of advice and support. The outreach programme could be supported by an on-line knowledge base, providing resources and a forum for exchanging ideas and solving problems.

Youth workers have asked for training and more information on what UKYP expects from them and what they in turn can expect from UKYP. At present, they feel contact outside the Sitting is limited to written requests – and some say demands – that they support MYPs. Providing training at a regional level, including information about UKYP, its aims and objectives and plans for the future would help to ensure they felt more closely allied with the organisation. Several raise the issue of wasted time at Annual Sittings: training and/or information sessions for youth workers might be provided at Sittings.

Regional
UKYP co-ordinators need to be provided for all the devolved nations (as in Scotland), as well as within England.

UKYP co-ordinators could have three basic roles. First, acting as a medium between local and national engagement work; second, providing advice and support to MYPs, when needed and third, developing the profile of UKYP regionally and within the devolved nations and linking with other regional and national youth fora.

In their role as intermediaries, UKYP coordinators could channel selected local UKYP success stories up to national level. Stories might be selected, for example, to focus attention on young people’s involvement with issues under discussion within the UK government or as a challenge to the government to attend more closely to issues of particular relevance to young people. This would help to demonstrate the impact of UKYP and illustrate the wider social and political outcomes of engagement. The selection process would be carried out at regional meetings, by young people. Information would be kept within a central UKYP knowledge base to which MYPs, youth workers and others working in partnership with UKYP would have access.

Regional coordinators would also have a communications role. As regional agenda gain in importance, other youth fora are likely to emerge, and have so already in some regions. It is important that UKYP’s relationship with these is positive and productive and regional coordinators could play a key role here.

National
National outreach work might be done through linking with other organisations working with young people and developing mechanisms for promoting UKYP in the national media. See Networking and Partnerships, below, for more on this.

Following UKYP suggestions, we would also include the following priorities as means towards widening engagement:
enhanced UKYP research on the nature of “participation” in UKYP – eg, standing for election, attendance at meetings, outreach etc, which would identify underrepresented or disadvantage groups

- Procedures Group and Regional groups to address the best means of widening participation in their localities, prioritising target groups accordingly

- A working group of youth/participation workers to identify how this work can be supported and to look at the wider issues of youth/participation worker involvement

- A working group of the Board, with involvement from the Procedures Group, to look at the role of Regional co-ordinators.

**Funding**

The government has made a policy commitment to youth participation and to the UKYP and has therefore, we believe, an obligation to ensure that it provides appropriate funding to allow it to function. We recommend that funding for UKYP is increased. We think too that funding needs to be uniform, so that each MYP receives the same level of support, wherever they are located. Finally, basic funding levels need to be agreed for a minimum period – for example, three or five years. The more strategic approach we are recommending is difficult when funding is certain for only the next year.

However, we think too that there should be conditions attached to increased funding. First, that the social value of UKYP, beyond its value to individual MYPs, needs to be demonstrated. Second, the benefits of reform will need to be evident – for example, through greater awareness of UKYP amongst young people and MPs, with the latter more willing to encourage the active participation of young people. Third, funding should be better targeted and budgets allocated to each level; that is, MYPs, youth workers and regional coordinators should have dedicated UKYP funds. Fourth, spending should be transparent and information available to MYPs, on request. Finally, an increase in funding or a commitment to funding over the medium of long term might be linked to a further review, to take place at the end of the funding period – for example, in three years time. This would provide an opportunity to take stock of the impact of changes undertaken and of additional funding.

Funds should also be tagged for specific tasks. For example, each MYP might receive an agreed amount per annum specifically for outreach work. Youth workers or regional coordinators could hold a Project Fund, to which MYPs would apply for more costly activities, on a competitive basis with others in their region. Youth workers budgets might include additional money for travel expenses and administrative support.

Raising funds from sources other than the government was not explored in great depth during the Review. There is some support for seeking corporate sponsorship for some events or projects, following the pattern of BT’s involvement in the *Seen and Heard* project. However, the decision on corporate sponsorship for projects or on an ongoing basis is one which young people
themselves should make. A higher profile for a re-launched UKYP / EYP, greater evidence of its benefits to young people and increased transparency of operations may help to encourage interest and support from business.

UKYP currently seeks and receives funding from sources other than the government: for details of this, see the Trustees Report and Accounts appended to the Report. We feel that, given the competition facing organisations seeking corporate sponsorship or grants, this is an area in which UKYP might benefit from external advice. This will provide it with further insight into the approaches most likely to succeed and how to encourage sustained, rather than one-off, support arrangements.

We recommend that funding issues and the distribution of budgets are explored more fully, in consultation with key stakeholders, including UKYP and DfES.

Structure
Mirroring UK political structures is seen as providing an excellent education for young people in the machinery of parliamentary democracy. However, there is some concern that it may not be the most effective way of ensuring that young people are able to participate in the democratic process. We recommend that consideration is given to adopting a more flexible approach to the UKYP structure – for example, the fixed Committee structure - in the interests of allowing a greater number of MYPs and other young people to contribute to debates on issues that concern them.

MYPs raise the question of whether they should continue to be matched with LEAs or be elected on a constituency basis, like MPs. Some point out that MYPs from the devolved nations are not elected to UKYP but choose to participate, from the basis of their own independent youth organisations. There is a suggestion that a completely different, non-elective approach might be considered. We have no specific recommendation to make on this issue, other than suggesting that the pros and cons of each approach are explored fully by MYPs.

Greater autonomy at regional and local levels will be a consequence in part of individual budgets. It may also follow from an English Youth Parliament. Some stakeholders feel that, in the absence of an English national parliament, the regional voice will be increasingly important. We recommend that, even if MYPs decide against an English Youth Parliament, the regional and local voice is strengthened and the extent of central command is reduced.

Finally, we recommend that the upper age limit for MYPs is raised to match that of the devolved nations. This will ensure that young people from the devolved nations, age 19 – 25, will have a voice at the UK level. It will also address concerns that the UKYP is currently run by people who are not, by its own definition, “young”.
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We suggest that careful thought is given to whether a raised upper age limit will impact on the willingness of younger people, between 11 – 14, to become involved and what effect this might have on UKYP as a whole. It will be important to consider whether any changes will leave some young people with a reduced, rather than strengthened voice. There are practical matters to take into account too; for example, will MYPs of 19 and older be allowed to be alone with younger MYPs? What might be the implications for youth workers of a raised age limit?

**Networking and partnership**

This needs to be done on both a formal and informal basis and the guiding principle should be to build connections with as many different types of organisation as possible. This will provide access to a range of expertise and influence as well as ensuring that relationships do not become strained through “overuse.”

A more diverse and explicit set of relationships will provide ex-MYPs with opportunities to apply their skills in the wider community and continue as active citizens - for example, as community advocates, peer educators.

**Formal**

Formal networks and partnerships need to be made with UK-wide, national and regional youth organisations, voluntary groups and charities, eg, BYC, NCVYS, The Children’s Society, Refugee Council, Institute for Citizenship etc. Links with the youth branches of the major political parties might also be considered.

UKYP’s aims and objectives, working practices and the terms of any relationships would need to be made clear. In the case of links with political bodies, UKYP’s apolitical, issue-based approach would need to be made explicit. Formal relationships might include agreements to take part in the UK Summit or national meetings, to provide resources (eg, leaflets on specific issues) or to help with training. The UKYP website could be linked from the sites of selected organisations.

A partnership approach would not only provide a greater and more diverse number of young people with the opportunity to participate in UKYP, but would also help to increase awareness amongst others working with young people. They would also address the concern raised during the Review that UKYP is isolated and that MYPs have little opportunity to develop their learning and apply it to the real world, once their term of office is complete.

**Relationship with government**

UKYP’s relationship with government is in need of review. At present, it appears to lack continuity and focus, with opportunities for building relationships being missed. For example, meetings with MPs and Ministers can lack follow-up or recognisable outcome and some MPs who have expressed interest in building a relationship with their local MYP have not yet been approached by them.
UKYP’s relationship with government needs to operate on different levels so that all MYPs are able to take part in some way. Not all MYPs may want to attend high-level meetings in London: ensuring that all MYPs are in contact with their local MP would provide a good basis for this. On a local level, MYPs might develop relationships with the council “youth champions” being appointed by a growing number of local councils. UKYP’s relationship with Parliament needs also to extend beyond the government of the day: that UKYP recognises this is clear from the presence on the Board of MPs from Conservative and Liberal Democrats, as well as Labour MPs. Working with opposition front benches – and back benches – as well as Select Committees and All-Party Parliamentary Groups (APPGs) is also important. It is important that opportunities for support are not missed.

UKYP might also offer a challenge to government departments to open up their own structures and develop more innovative approaches to their relationships with young people, for example, by involving young people in providing training to civil servants and MPs on the core principles of youth participation. UKYP might also evaluate each department’s commitment to active participation and publish the results. In turn, MYPs might benefit from an introduction from civil servants to the work done in each department and the ways in which government works. This would be of value to UKYP in planning campaigns and adopting a more strategic approach towards influencing policy.

The government should also provide high-profile demonstrations of its commitment to UKYP. For example, the Prime Minister might speak at the Annual Sitting (or Summit) once during a term of office, with Ministers attending in the intervening years. Other possible means of developing the relationship between government and the UKYP are suggested below, in English Youth Parliament.

There are also practical matters to consider which are important because they bear on the wider public image of UKYP. It is recognised that meetings with Ministers may be cancelled or set up at short notice, making forward planning and the involvement of MYPs far from London very difficult. However, effort should be made to include MYPs from at least one of the devolved nations in every high level meeting and also to ensure that they reflect the diversity of UKYP. Details of the best way to approach MPs and the importance of doing so might be provided in training information for new MYPs. MPs might also be made aware of the consequences to young people of short notice arrangement and cancellation of meetings and of the impression it gives of their commitment to listening to their views.

Finally, a database of past, current and possible future relationships should be maintained, to allow UKYP to identify those organisations which are able to help with its developmental needs.

Informal
Informal relationships could be developed around specific issues, following the example of the current UKYP International Affairs Select Committee, which has made links with Oxfam, to support its work on Fair Trade. A central database of NGOs and other interest groups might be
developed to support this. At a local level, relationships with groups such as those mentioned above, under Engagement, might be formed.

**Equal representation for the four nations**

Fifty percent of MYPs and 59% of stakeholders responding to the survey support an English Youth Parliament. Thirty-eight percent of MYPs and 15% of stakeholders are against it and the remainder is unsure. Though this does not constitute a majority amongst MYPs, it is clear from the consultation phase of the Review that for MYPs in the devolved nations in particular, the current structure is viewed as an English Youth Parliament in all but name. There are also issues over language for MYPs from Wales. These concerns influence not only their perceptions of the value to them of UKYP and their levels of engagement, but also the views of UKYP amongst Members of the Scottish Parliament (MSPs), Members of the Irish Assembly (MIAs) and Assembly Members in Wales (AMs). This view was consistent throughout the Review and comes from both stakeholders and MYPs alike.

We recommend serious consideration is given to addressing these concerns and propose two possible options. The decision over which direction should be pursued needs to be taken following further discussion amongst MYPs and other stakeholders.

(i) **UKYP as it currently stands is re-launched as an English Youth Parliament, a sister organisation to the Scottish Youth Parliament, Funky Dragon and the Northern Ireland Youth Forum, with matching age ranges, eg, 11, (or 14) – 25 – or even 0 - 25.**

Careful consideration should be given to naming the new organisation. There is some indication that English Youth Parliament may be off-putting to some people: others feel that an English Youth Parliament which evidently reflects the diversity of the English population could help to retrieve “Englishness” from some of its current negative associations with far-right racist groups. An English Youth Parliament might also have a closer relationship with Connexions than UKYP: as an English-only service, the development of this relationship at present risks fanning further resentment amongst the devolved nations where Connexions does not exist.

There may be funding implications in the formation of an English Youth Parliament which would need to be explored in full prior to any decision being taken. For example, UKYP is currently funded by a UK government department: it will be crucial to understand whether this funding would continue were a UK Forum to be established, with the four national parliaments within it.

(ii) **The English voice is expressed through stronger regional youth parliaments. This would ensure that the UK voice is not weakened and recognise that differences between the English regions may be as great as those between England as a whole and the devolved nations. It would also fit more closely with wider moves towards regional governments.**
If this latter option is pursued, it will be important to ensure that MYPs are aware of the different policies and practices in the devolved nations. Ensuring that all MYPs feel confident that the views of the nation they represent are taken seriously and given equal weight to those of English MYPs is also necessary.

Whichever route is chosen, the relaunch of UKYP should take advantage of relevant prominent developments taking place in the UK. For example, it could be placed within the context of the imminent appointment of a Children’s Commissioner for England, as announced in the Children’s Bill 2004.

UK Summit
With both of the above options, there would still be a need for a UK-wide forum for debate on non-devolved issues and for knowledge-sharing and learning across the four youth organisations. Rather than this being a Parliament, we recommend a Summit meeting is held every year. Members from each youth parliament / forum could volunteer to stand as representatives to the Summit and be elected by the membership. In addition to sharing policy developments made within each of the four youth parliaments/councils and developing UK wide policy, time could be dedicated to training, leadership and outreach issues. The UK Summit would also provide an opportunity for the devolved nations to provide information on developments within their own parliaments or assemblies of which all MYPs should be aware.

The UK Summit might be thought of along the lines of party conferences: other organisations could be invited to hold “fringe events” which interested young people could attend. It would provide an opportunity to showcase local and regional work across each of the four nations. Relevant government or executive members could be invited to attend seminars on specific issues. If other funding sources were developed, funders could be invited to see the type of work they were supporting. High profile “key speakers” or facilitators might be invited to chair sessions, thus attracting wider interest amongst the media and potential funders.

Each year, the Summit would be held in one of the four nations, on a rotating basis. Policy and strategy on UK issues could be developed, Ministers and MPs targeted for communication and particular Members assigned specific responsibility for setting up and attending meetings. This would provide an opportunity for young people from each of the nations to participate, since sufficient lead time would be provided for planning and organising travel etc. The cost of holding the UK Youth Summit could be shared across the four nations.

Leadership and management
It is important to make a distinction between leadership and management. At present, these functions appear to be confused. We recommend that young people themselves provide leadership and that the role of officers is confined to management, support and mentoring.
Leadership
The development of young people’s leadership skills is best approached on a collective basis and at local level – for example, leadership might be the topic of an informal local meeting. Leadership must also be outcome focused: that is, rather than being seen as a generic skill, the question “leadership for what?” needs to be asked. Young people will have different skills which will be appropriate to the different activities in which UKYP is involved. Some may be happy taking the initiative on a local level but less enthusiastic about meeting Ministers or attending Select Committees. It is important that UKYP provides as much opportunity for as many MYPs as possible to develop skills: at present, attention is felt to be focused on a limited – and “select” – few.

Training will have a key role to play in the development of leadership skills. This might take the form of twinning with other community leaders, learning networks, developing mentoring skills. The UK Summit might be preceded each year by “Leadership Academy” events, held in each region, where knowledge could be pooled and experiences shared, to feed into events at the Summit itself.

Management
With a more horizontal structure and greater local and regional autonomy and decision-making, UKYP’s central management functions might be revisited. A decision-making protocol will need to be drawn up, which makes it clear which issues (as few as possible), are reserved for officers – probably where there are legal reasons for this being the case. Even in this case, however, we feel that young people should be involved in and where possible, guiding decisions. All issues to do with the running, structure, staffing and organisation of UKYP should be taken by young people. At present, many MYPs, other than those in the Procedures Group, feel excluded from these processes. Raising the upper age limit might allow management functions to be assumed by members of the Youth Parliament itself. We recognise that young people’s time is limited and their availability to participate may be restricted by other responsibilities. Administration and implementation of management decisions may therefore necessarily be the responsibility of paid adult workers, supported, perhaps, by the growing network of “Friends of UKYP”. However, we believe that there is scope for further involvement by young people in management decisions.

Clear management objectives need to be defined too and performance must be measurable against objectives. We recommend that a Scrutiny Committee be established, composed of MYPs, which can scrutinize and evaluate management and administration processes, procedures and decisions. We have recommended this, rather than suggesting that this responsibility be undertaken by the Procedures Group, to provide an opportunity for more young people to be involved in the running of UKYP: at present, as mentioned above, there is a perception both amongst stakeholders and MYPs that they have little if any input in decision-making.

The first clear priority for management is that it must have experience of and be conversant with current thinking on youth participation. The second is that the management style needs to be
open, cooperative and built on negotiation. UKYP might also look to other youth-led organisations to develop its understanding of best practice – for example, the British Youth Council (BYC).

Two management functions need to be fulfilled on a UK-wide basis. First, knowledge management: up-to-date databases, website and other shared resources are essential. For example, information on the background of young people participating in UKYP, either as MYPs or in less formal ways, needs to be kept to determine whether outreach is successful. Second, organisational management: helping young people to access Ministers and MPs, making arrangements for UK-wide events, setting up meetings with other young organisations (see Networking and Partnerships), identifying relevant training opportunities, etc.

Following UKYP suggestions, we would also recommend that the Board and Procedures Group meet to produce a clear set of guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of each group and that a sub-group of the Board, with help from MYPs, revisits the role and responsibilities of staff to take account of the recommendations made in this Report and of staff requirements in general.

**Communication**

**Internal**

Internal communication needs to be:

- Accessible – language, layout, tone and design can all play a role in this
- Targeted - not everyone needs to receive everything but everyone needs to receive what is relevant to them
- Timely – sufficient time must be allowed where communication requires a response, planning, travel to be organised, etc
- Considered – tone must be appropriate to the nature of the communication/information

A well-managed and regularly updated knowledge store, including a diary of upcoming events, would be very useful in ensuring information was available to MYPs. However, it may be that some MYPs do not have home or regular school access to computers. To ensure that all information reaches where it needs to reach, MYPs might be assigned an “information friend”: each MYP would be responsible for ensuring information they had received had also been received by their friend. The relationship would be one-way only: ie, form a long chain rather than many pairs. This concept might be extended to other young people, as a means of helping to develop wider participation.

**External**

Communication with external organisations needs:

- To increase – at present, knowledge of UKYP, its aims and achievements, is very limited
• To present a “young-person friendly” face – at present it is seen as over-formal and not engaging for a majority of young people

• To work at all levels – local, regional, national and UK-wide

For UKYP to become an organisation that is recognised and respected as a leader in youth participation with a reputation for achieving social and political results it must communicate more widely, with a greater number of people and organisations, from individual young people up to national and UK governments. Press or communications officers might be appointed within each region to ensure that success stories or outreach projects reach the relevant local media: where similar issues are being worked on in several regions – and regional coordinators would be aware of this through their own information sharing – releases might be prepared for the national press. One of the key elements of ensuring a higher profile will be shared responsibility for information gathering and collation, rather than assigning it to one or two people.

It will be important, if UKYP is re-launched, to ensure that any momentum from the re-launch is not lost: a re-launch plan should thus include a communications strategy for the following year – for example, which are the key organisations/individuals to contact six months following the re-launch to update on how things are going? The UK Summit itself will be highly newsworthy: national press might be invited to attend particular sessions and could be asked to provide advice on how media relationships might be further developed and stories “sold”.

These recommendations will, no doubt, include elements on which UKYP is already working. The knowledge and wishes of MYPs are central to developing them further.
Part 2

Stakeholder consultation and survey findings

The range of views

Attitudes of those involved in the research tend to split four ways, with views largely reflecting the nature of their relationship with UKYP.

- **Supportive – no major issues**
  - UKYP Management, Trustees, MPs and some MYPs

- **Supportive – but with reservations**
  - Those with limited contact with UKYP, some voluntary organisations, some MYPs

- **Negative – concerns across many areas**
  - Those closely involved with youth participation / working with young people and UKYP “on the ground”

- **No view – UKYP unknown**
  - Majority of young people (not MYPs) involved in Review

“They do an amazing job on a shoe-string.” (UKYP Trustee)

“It’s evolving and has significant knock-on local effects.” (MP)

“There is not a lot of respect for the UKYP within youth work.” (Regional co-ordinator)

“It’s got that attitude: we’re adults and we want to do the best for you.” (Charity)

Four clear messages emerge from the Review.

First, there is a lot of enthusiasm for the idea of the UKYP amongst all audiences. The young people, youth workers, voluntary and charitable organisations, sister youth parliaments and councils and MPs participating in the Review express support for the idea of a democratic body capable of close involvement with policy development in the UK. Those MYPs who express concerns and frustration about UKYP emphasise their wish to help it develop and grow in the future.
Second, there is considerable concern that the formal presentation and description of the UKYP – the idea of the UKYP – is far from being realised by what it does and how it works. Many of the most negative views expressed come from people who have worked closely with UKYP in one capacity or another, all of whom raise similar issues: poor communication and organisation, lack of transparency, closed decision-making processes, a management lacking experience of youth work and participation, an overly-English focus and failure to maximise available resources through linking with other youth organisations.

Third, funding levels are not currently adequate. Every participant with knowledge of UKYP, favourable or otherwise, raises funding as a critical issue – though many point out that this is par for the course in youth work and that there are ways not being employed by UKYP of overcoming at least some of the difficulties of limited funds.

Fourth, for UKYP to continue its growth and success into the future, some considerable thought must be given to the negative comments raised by stakeholders. Whilst it has clear and strong support from the MPs who took part in the Review, it is grass-roots support that will make the difference between success or failure in the future. This is only in part a funding issue: more importantly, it is a matter of ensuring that the management, communication and skill base of UKYP are matched to the demands of it becoming a properly representative organisation which can maximise the benefit to all young people of the political support it has.

What are the aims of the UK Youth Parliament?
Stakeholders who are aware of the UKYP were asked to describe its aims: most responses coincide with the Parliament’s stated aims. UKYP is understood as aiming to be a body through which the voice of young people across the UK can be represented as one, to government and decision-makers, providing recommendations on behalf of young people and lobbying on their behalf.

Is UKYP achieving its aims?
Positive views
Stakeholders who are favourable towards UKYP think that it is still early days and too soon to make a firm judgement on whether UKYP is meeting its aims. They see UKYP as an avenue for young people to express their views in Westminster and think that it provides a channel through which young people from the devolved nations can have a voice on non-devolved issues, such as social security, defence and law and order. Some stakeholders who are critical in other areas feel that UKYP has succeeded in demonstrating that young people are interested in politics and have views on a wide range of topics.

Limited funding and high aims, combined with a lack of certainty over funding from one year to the next are thought to have made strategic planning difficult for UKYP and slowed progress towards achieving its aims. Other barriers identified include a lack of national coverage of its activities and inconsistency in support from schools, colleges and local authorities. A couple of
political stakeholders feel that the UKYP has recently made great strides towards developing a more strategic approach and that this will help it greatly in the future.

Some stakeholders suggest that UKYP will never – and should not – achieve its aims. They think that, since UKYP is a dynamic organisation operating in a continuously changing context, it will always be striving. They point out too that the success of UKYP will depend in part on the willingness of the government to listen to and act upon the issues raised by MYPs. The government can, purposefully or not, erect barriers against this. However, the MPs feel that UKYP has easier and better access to the government than other youth organisations.

“It has a louder voice than other youth organisations – part of this comes from the electoral system, which means it brings a local mandate. And the word “Parliament” gives it a different status.” (MP)

Negative views
Most of the stakeholders taking part in the Review hold negative views about the UKYP: whilst they may support the idea in principle they feel that, in practice, it is beset by problems which it is failing to address. Many see it as a “puppet” of the government. They think that the model and structure of the organisation stop it from having any real influence and from achieving its aims. These stakeholders feel that UKYP is viewed as a convenient “marker” for the government to appeal to, as a demonstration of its commitment to youth participation. However, they don’t think that it delivers any clear positive outcomes for young people. The people who hold this view are most likely to be closely involved with young people themselves: for example, youth workers, charities and voluntary organisations working with young people. It is also a view held by the Regional Coordinators to whom we spoke.

Some of the people who believe that UKYP does not achieve its aims think it is because the Parliament is not clear about its role. They see it as dominated by English affairs and feel that this means it excludes the interests of the other three nations – Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The people say that this means that the UKYP is not able to achieve its aim of speaking on behalf of all young people in the UK. (See “Representation” below.)

Many of those who are negative feel that, given active and clear demonstration of its commitment to addressing the issues it faces, UKYP will recover support and re-awaken enthusiasm for its aims. In the absence of such a demonstration, several stakeholders fear that UKYP’s life is limited.

“The real aim of the UKYP is to make sure there is a voice for young people in Westminster. However, the reality is that the UKYP does this pitifully badly and there is actually no policy outcome for young people…the UKYP is being used by the government just to put a tick in the box against youth participation.” (Regional co-ordinator)
**Chart 1: UKYP Performance – MYPs (Base: 64)**

- Agree
- Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKYP provides a voice for all young people in the UK</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP does not reflect cultural diversity of UK</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP makes best use of available resources</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has effective links with other UK Forums</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has effective links with local government</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has effective links with national government</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has good public image amongst young people</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP reflects best practice in youth democracy</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP is effective at presenting young people’s views to policy makers in an influential way</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 2: UKYP Performance – Stakeholders (Base: 61)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKYP provides a voice for all young people in the UK</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP does not reflect cultural diversity of UK</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP makes best use of available resources</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has effective links with other UK Forums</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has effective links with local government</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has effective links with national government</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP has good public image amongst young people</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP reflects best practice in youth democracy</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP is effective at presenting young people’s views to policy makers in an influential way</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Charts 1 and 2 (above) shows that MYPs are significantly more likely than stakeholders to be positive about UKYP’s performance on a range of indicators. This is in line with findings in the consultation.

Many stakeholders don’t feel able to make a judgement about UKYP’s performance: on some issues, one-third of stakeholder responses are “don’t knows.” Amongst stakeholders, charitable and voluntary organisations are consistently more negative about the UKYP than UKYP Trustees and Management. Youth workers’ views are either split quite evenly between negative and positive opinions or inclined towards the negative.

**Relationship with Government**

UKYP’s relationship with central government is extremely important to its ability to achieve its aim of being heard and listened to on national policy issues. On the whole, most feel this relationship is very good. UKYP is seen by its most enthusiastic supporters to have demonstrated that Ministers and parliamentarians will give time to young people. Chart 2 (above) shows that stakeholders are most likely to be positive about UKYP’s links with national government than on most other issues.

MPs involved in the Review are all enthusiastic about the ability of young people to contribute effectively to better policies, in all areas, not just those with immediate and obvious links to young people. They point to meetings between MYPs and senior political figures such as Charles Kennedy, Ian Duncan Smith and Tony Blair: they recognise UKYP’s growth over three years and feel that it has earned respect amongst many of those who have come into contact with it. The government itself is seen as having taken some positive steps to increase the involvement of young people in political decision-making, which has had an impact on the ability of organisations such as UKYP to make their voices heard - though there is some scepticism about how substantial the government’s commitment will prove to be.

Whilst each government department has an Action Plan and a lead on participation, there is felt to be some variability in the quality of relationships with different government departments: those with DWP, DefRA and the DoH are seen as particularly positive and productive. The relationship with DfES is seen as “sometimes good”, whilst that with the Home Office is described as “not great.” UKYP is not felt to be “of paramount importance” to the Home Office. From the department side, however, there is some criticism that MYP’s attitude towards MPs might be improved.
UKYP Structure

Positive views
There is a general agreement amongst supporters of UKYP that its current structure, which largely mirrors that of Parliament, is appropriate and works well. It is felt to facilitate easier access to MPs and Ministers and to provide young people with a good educational grounding in how parliament operates.

Some of those who raise serious issues concerning UKYP in other areas feel nonetheless that the basic mirroring structure should remain – though perhaps as an over-arching structure, with individual youth parliaments or fora in each of the four nations. As a formal structure based on a democratic model some see its primary functions as providing a political education and a high profile organisation to promote young people’s views. Those who support this structure, whilst being critical of other areas, do not see UKYP as primarily a representative organisation – which in itself raises a question about how democratic the model is: its formal nature is felt to be too alien to many young people whilst attracting very specific types of young person. (See Representation, below.)

Negative views
A majority of stakeholders see UKYP as an organisation that was “set up from the top” by MPs, rather than emerging from bottom up, out of young people’s groups and desires. Several contrast UKYP with the Scottish Youth Parliament in this respect. There is also some suggestion that the structure can be off-putting to many young people.

Many of those who see problems in the existing structure call for greater focus on the regions – for example, devolved regional budgets, full-time regional co-ordinator posts and links with emerging regional government bodies. This is seen as a way of redressing what is seen as the current central control structure, which is felt to be unwieldy, inefficient and ineffective. Others think that the focus should be on getting an MYP into every area of the country and providing them with sufficient support rather than concentrating “on the subtleties of parliament.” The concern that UKYP is a “simulation” is also raised by some stakeholders in the context of transferable skills: they feel that, because the skills developed by MYPs are specific to the “simulation” they do not relate well to the wider context of young people’s lives.

There is some support for a completely new start for the UKYP, with a radical re-structuring which does away with the Procedures Group, Select Committees and Annual Sittings and...
focuses instead on a more streamlined approach, a greater focus on consultation with young people and more attention to involving those who would not normally get involved in political debate.

The Manifesto
A revised approach to the Manifesto would be a key element in a restructured UKYP. Rather than this being formulated over the course of the Sitting, there would be a longer, broader and more thorough consultation process prior to the Sitting, which would finalise and ratify this process. This is seen as not only a way of making UKYP more accessible to a more diverse audience but also of being appealing to MPs, since it would be visibly working towards addressing the democratic deficit and encouraging wider and more complex political debate.

A more consultative approach to developing the UKYP Manifesto might mean it can no longer be changed every year: some stakeholders suggest a two-year Manifesto may be more effective. It may be that issues arise during the life of a two-year Manifesto which MYPs wish to include as formal UKYP policy: some way of ensuring that this is possible might need to be developed – for example, by allowing supplements to the Manifesto to be proposed and ratified by MYPs in Sittings held in those years when the full Manifesto is not under discussion.

Funding
The theme of funding runs throughout this Report and many of the issues raised are dealt with elsewhere. However, some stakeholders raise specific issues about the way in which UKYP receives its funding. There is some concern that the central funding system, in which UKYP receives a grant from DfES, may allow for too much influence on UKYP work. An alternative suggested is local authority funding, supported by a national sum. This is seen too as a way of addressing the current variation in levels of support from local authorities, which results in some MYPs being well funded and others being very under-funded. A further suggestion is for UKYP to be funded by a non-departmental government body – though there are no suggestions as to which one would be most appropriate.

There is also some support from stakeholders for UKYP seeking money from commercial organisations. This suggestion is made on the basis that All-Party Parliamentary Groups currently receive corporate funding without this jeopardising their independence – a primary concern of MYPs. Benefits to funders are seen as association with the democratic process, and with delivering on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Copies of Democracy for Young People Limited Trustees’ Report and Accounts are appended to this Report. The Trustees’ Report is unusually thorough, which is welcome.
UKYP Report – Part 2

Representation
There are two separate issues of representation involved:

- Does UKYP as an organisation represent the diversity of young people in the UK?
- Does UKYP involve equally MYPs from across the regions and nations in high-level meetings and policy development?

1. Representing young people across the UK

All stakeholders acknowledge that the extent to which UKYP is representative of the diversity of young people in the UK varies across the country. Many congratulate UKYP for the ethnic diversity amongst MYPs but some comment on its public face tending always to display the same few white male faces. The extent to which UKYP has managed to include vulnerable young people is felt to be negligible and many stakeholders question whether the process of becoming an MYP is inclusive. The reasons provided for the variety in representation are common to both supportive and negative stakeholders for the variation. It is in the factors felt to underlie these reasons that the difference between positive and negative views emerges.

Support (including financial)
Support from a range of sources is very important to increasing levels of representation. MPs can encourage wider enthusiasm and help to generate resources and support from local authorities, schools and other organisations. For example, in Kent, which is the “home” of the UKYP’s founding father, Andrew Rowe (who was MP for Faversham and Mid Kent) turnout is very high.

The level of support offered by local education authorities and youth workers is critical: some stakeholders suggest that less committed LEAs view UKYP elections as an opportunity to “tick the youth participation box” and provide little real help. The case study on Wakefield (overleaf) demonstrates the impact on representation that proper commitment to increasing participation can make. It shows too the value of support at a senior level.

Youth workers are vital, but the level of support they can provide is seen as limited by lack of financial resources – some stakeholders point out that they may not be paid for either some of all of the time they commit to supporting potential and elected MYPs. Some participation officers are receiving only short term funding and are unclear about whether the work they have invested in developing UKYP in their area will be able to continue. Many youth workers feel too that current funding arrangements “fly in the face” of the basic principles of participation and that it is unfair to dedicate so much money to one MYP.

"To sign the Service Level Agreement costs me £5,000 a year. Well my budget isn’t £5,000 and the UKYP is only one fifth of my time."
(Participation Officer, County Council)
Case Study: City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council

Previously opportunities for young people in Wakefield to get involved with the UKYP were very limited. This year however an event was held at Wakefield College to ensure the views of young people were reflected in action plans for Fast Forward, the Wakefield District Community Strategy. Young people also made a video as part of the process of developing the vision for the Strategy itself. Over the past four months a team of council officers has worked with young people to develop the election process for the UKYP for 2004. This has meant that 25,300 young people, over 75% of those eligible, are now registered to vote.

A record 28 candidates are standing for two MYP posts. The election will mirror the process used at local and national levels as closely as possible, with an electoral roll, publicly available manifestos, nomination checks and hustings. The big difference is that young people vote on-line. Each voter will be sent a letter with a unique identifier and a PIN that they will use to vote. Once they have voted, the PIN will expire – so no one will be able to vote twice.

Before the election, candidates attend a training workshop run with The Campaign Company, to develop campaigning and communication skills to form their manifestos. A political message from each candidate is available via webcast, on the wakefield.gov.uk website and they could record their own weblogs on the www.wakiesworld.com young people’s website. There will be a celebration event to announce the winners on the close of the poll. Wakefield MDC will continue to work to ensure people stay involved with the Council and the Local Strategic Partnership.

Wakefield MDC used a range of approaches to increase involvement using the toolkit set out in the Engagement Framework, including:

- Roadshows in secondary schools to promote UKYP and attract candidates
- Cinema advertising and poster campaign in places where young people might go, with a prize draw for all those who vote.
- Face to face contact with the Leader, CX, ACX and other senior officers.

Wakefield MDC identified some key elements in its success:

- Making it as real as possible, involving young people in decisions and making it fun
- Promotion through the Young People’s Service and the wakiesworld.com website
- The enthusiasm of young people, in particular those on the Young People’s Services Involving Young People Group
- Planning as much as possible as early as possible
- Leadership from the top – the support of the Assistant Chief Executive was crucial
- Help from other departments – with IT, press releases, organising the elections
- Using the Engagement Framework to adopt a planned/structured/focussed approach
- Commitment of youth workers, officers and teachers to the project and new ideas
NOTICE OF ELECTION

ELECTION OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE U.K. YOUTH PARLIAMENT

1. An election is to be held for two members of the U.K. Youth Parliament.

2. Completed nomination papers must be delivered to Christine Mason, Electoral Services Office, County Hall, Wakefield between Tuesday, 3 February 2004 and NOON on Tuesday, 10 February 2004. (Tel: 01924 305020 for appointment)

3. Forms for nomination can be obtained from Andrea Golding, Room 10, Town Hall, Wakefield WF1 2HQ or by ringing 01924 305745 or by e-mailing a/golding@wakefield.gov.uk


Cheryl Stewart
RETURNING OFFICER

Dated the 15th day of December 2003

Published by Electoral Services, County Hall, Wakefield
Printed by W.M.D.C. Design & Print Services
Chart 3: MYP views on support
(Base: 64)

Chart 3 shows that most MYPs are positive about the support they receive, from youth workers in particular. In the consultation, some youth workers felt that lack of funding made it difficult for them to give sufficient time to UKYP. However, the survey shows that 72% of MYPs agree that youth workers are available when they are needed. Fifty-five percent think they have enough support to carry out their responsibilities as an MYP and 45% feel they get the support they need from UKYP management.

MYPs are less likely to be positive about communication with young people: just over one-third (38%) think that UKYP does all it can to tell young people about its work.

The value to MYPs of youth worker support is very evident from Chart 4 (overleaf). Seventy-four percent of MYPs say youth workers are their most important source of support. Consultation findings are consistent with this, suggesting that the presence of an enthusiastic and committed youth worker can play a vital role in the growth of UKYP at a local level. Their understanding of the issues involved in participation is clearly crucial to its success.
Chart 4: The three most important sources of support for MYPs/Deputies
(Base: 64 MYPs, 61 stakeholders)
MYP views on funding
Chart 5 shows that MYPs identify better funding as the one thing that would help them to play their role more effectively. For youth workers, more support for MYPs is seen as most important. Other things identified relate to issues raised elsewhere in the report – for example, improved communication, training and a higher profile and greater recognition for UKYP.

Chart 5: What is the one thing that would help MYPs be more effective?
(Base: 64 MYPs, 61 stakeholders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>MYP</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater recognition / profile</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better support (local / national)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better knowledge of how to do the job</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More meetings/ contact other MYPs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearer channels of communication</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time
MYPs have schoolwork and other responsibilities and interests, which mean that the time they have to dedicate to UKYP is limited. Where schools place little value on UKYP, MYPs’ time may be even further restricted, since it will be less likely that the school will give them time off to attend anything other than major national UKYP events.

Youth workers’ time is also likely to be limited: the number of youth workers in any one area will impact on how much time they can dedicate to MYPs. UKYP management and regional-coordinator time is also felt to be stretched, which can have an impact on support for MYPs and thus on their ability to involve young people and increase representation, as well as in other areas (eg, see Communication, below).
Positive analysis
Stakeholders favourable towards UKYP tend to see the above issues as largely curable, given increased resources – primarily financial. For example, most MYPs feel that regional coordinators and youth workers “do well with the little resources they have” but that the former should be full-time posts and the latter should have more financial support. Limited funding is seen as a key reason for the variation in voter turnout across the country and restricted travel budgets for MYPs and their support workers are felt to make it more difficult for UKYP to increase involvement.

Negative analysis
Whilst those less supportive of UKYP acknowledge it has limited resources, they point out that this is common to all those who work in this area and feel that UKYP does little to maximise available resources. The criticism made most frequently is that UKYP has failed to make links with voluntary, charitable and other organisations which could help it to reach young people outside the mainstream – for example, those excluded from school, young homeless people or those in youth offender institutions. (See below, for more on links with other organisations.)

“Those MYPs at the moment are very bright and articulate and normal young people are not like that. At the moment there are no socially excluded young people involved in the UKYP. So it needs to address the issue of representativeness.”
(Government department lead)

There is also some concern expressed that MYPs have little contact with or understanding of the lives of excluded or marginalized young people and that, whilst they may be aware of the issues, know little of their real impact. MYPs come from a range of ethnic backgrounds but there is no information available on their socio-economic and educational background and the most oft-used expression used in the research to describe MYPs is “articulate,” with this being understood as something unusual amongst young people. It is not clear how many MYPs those who hold this view have met: some speculate that the public face of UKYP may not reflect its underlying diversity. However, there is felt to be considerable opportunity for UKYP to reflect better the make-up of the UK – for example, giving a higher profile to MYPs from the devolved nations.

MYPs themselves may unwittingly be erecting barriers to inclusion. For example, one respondent said of an MYP who met with young homeless people that he used political jargon and wore a suit. Similar comments were made by some MYPs about their fellow Members. There is also some suggestion that those MYPs who are most closely involved with UKYP come across as “arrogant.” Forging links with organisations and people working with socially excluded young people is seen as crucial but the success of such relationship will in part depend on MYPs being aware of and sensitive to the problems these young people can face and the impact of their own behaviour. This may, to some extent, be a “self-correcting” problem, as diversity increases amongst MYPs.
The most negative stakeholders suggest that UKYP lacks integrity by claiming to be representative of young people in the UK. This view is based on the observation that MYPs are only ever going to be able present the views of a small minority of unrepresentative young people. In seeking and claiming to be a representative body, UKYP is felt to be "shooting itself in the foot", since it is not seen to be an accurate or supportable claim.

**Case Study – Peterborough City**

Peterborough has been involved with the UKYP for one year and the city has one MYP and one deputy. In its first year, UKYP was promoted through local newspapers, youth clubs and youth projects. Eight young people from across Peterborough expressed an interest in UKYP. Voting was held over the course of a week. The final day of voting, which was a Saturday, was held in Peterborough Town Hall. During the day, support workers went out onto the streets, giving young people information about UKYP and youth involvement in Peterborough and encouraging them to go to the Town Hall to vote. The young people involved in supporting the UKYP project in Peterborough produced all the information distributed.

Two basic principles underlie Peterborough’s approach to the UKYP: accountability and representation. All the ideas that young people developed to promote UKYP were tested against and shaped by these principles. An example is the decision not to target schools in the first year of UKYP elections. Because time was limited, it would not have been possible to include all secondary schools in Peterborough. To include some schools whilst excluding others was felt to be unfair and in conflict with the principle of representation. In future years, however, planning will start earlier and all schools will be targeted.

It costs about £5,000 for Peterborough to support its MYP and Deputy MYP for their year of office. Youth workers were concerned that dedicating this amount of money to two young people was not good value for money. To address this, they invited other young people who were interested in UKYP to set up ‘active involvement teams.’ The teams include one young person from each secondary school, youth club and project in the City, elected by their peers to represent their organisation. Their task is to increase participation and reach a more diverse group of young people. They will also elect the young people who will stand as MYPs in the UKYP elections.

Peterborough thinks that the most effective way of encouraging participation is to provide real examples of what young people have achieved. The right kind of support is also essential - making sure that young people have the help they need to develop their own ideas and articulate their own views.
2. MYP involvement in policy development

Some stakeholders from the devolved nations feel that policy development takes place within the framework of an English perspective. There is also some concern that English MYPs are insufficiently informed about differences between the four nations, which can impact on policy decisions. Others suggest that there is a core group of English MYPs involved in policy development and that this is largely a function of the way in which Committees and the Procedures Group are structured.

Quantitative data suggests that, for most MYPs responding to the survey, involvement with UKYP is ongoing, rather than limited to Annual Sittings (with 67% attendance). It is not clear, however, whether regional and local activities translate into UK-wide policy. Chart 6 shows that 17% (11) of MYPs have attended a Procedures Group (PG) meeting and 33% (21) have attended a Select Committee meeting. Around two-thirds of MYPs have attended informal regional and/or local meetings. (See Appendices for analysis of the MYP sample.)

*Chart 6: Percentage aware of or attending UKYP meetings*
*(Base: 64 - MYPs)*

Informal local meetings and the Annual Sitting are seen by MYPs as being most effective: in part this is because a far greater number of MYPs have attended these meetings and so feel able to make a judgement. Around one-third of MYPs see both informal regional meetings and Select Committee meetings as ineffective and around one-quarter of MYPs are not sure about the effectiveness or otherwise of Procedures Group and Select Committee meetings.
Devolved nations and policy development

It has already been noted that some stakeholders see UKYP as only nominally UK-wide; they feel that, in practice, it is heavily slanted towards an English perspective. UKYP Policy presented in the Manifesto is criticised for showing a lack of understanding of the differences between England and the other nations in terms of their relative progress on certain key issues. For example, Funky Dragon, the Welsh youth parliament, is critical of the call in the 2003 Manifesto for a UK Children’s Commissioner, arguing that the other three nations already have Children’s Commissioners. This is not seen as a UK issue, but one for England only and thus out of place in a UK Manifesto. Differences between the three devolved nations and the specific issues being discussed within them are also felt to be poorly understood.

Some stakeholders see the growing importance of Connexions, which “has no relevance to the other three countries”, as a further indication of the increasing “Englishness” of the UKYP. Differences in the upper age limits between UKYP and the other youth fora are also felt to exclude some young people from participating in UKYP. These concerns all contribute towards support for an English Youth Parliament.

Others think that, rather than simply being focused on English issues, UKYP has a marked bias towards London and the South. For example, it is pointed out that the success of the BNP in recent elections in the north is a critical topic for MYPs from the North East and North West but that its importance was not reflected in the 2003 Manifesto. Relationships with MYPs in the northeast are particularly poor and there is some question over the northeast’s continued support...
of UKYP. Stakeholders from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland make similar criticisms – though there is no suggestion that they would consider disengaging from UKYP.

The “southern slant” is felt to exist not only in policy development but also with the involvement of MYPs from other areas of the country in meetings with MPs and Ministers. It is acknowledged that, with national parliament based in London and politicians sometimes available only at short notice, planning for regional inclusivity can be hard. However, some stakeholders think that UKYP management could do much more to address this problem.

A more positive take on this issue is that UKYP may at times need to present a consensus on issues where none exists, in the interests of presenting a “united front” and thus, perhaps, being more “user-friendly” to central government. This may result in the elision of some perspectives in final policy formulation. In part, this is seen as problem which organisations address as they grow and mature.

**An English Youth Parliament?**

Most stakeholders who regard the UKYP as essentially an English institution support the development of an English Youth Parliament. This view comes from youth fora in the devolved nations as well as stakeholders from England.

If an EYP were to be formed, it would still be necessary for an “umbrella” structure to be established, to concentrate on policy areas common across the four nations – for example, defence, law and order and employment. Those who support this structure feel that discussions would then be more productive and that the voices of those from Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales would be strengthened.

More than 50% of MYPs and stakeholders (combined) support an English Youth Parliament. Split into the two audiences, there is more support for this amongst stakeholders and a greater number who are unsure. Amongst the UKYP Trustees who responded (4), all are in favour. (See Chart 8, overleaf.)

Those who do not support the formation of an EYP feel there is already too much variation within England for an English voice to make any difference and instead would prefer greater regionalisation. They suggest that, rather than being “English” in its focus, UKYP is currently London/South focused and that the voices of those from the North are lost. Providing regional budgets and revising the structure to provide greater autonomy to the regions is suggested as an alternative to an English Youth Parliament. It should be noted, however, that an English Youth Parliament is not necessarily incompatible with increased regional independence.

Some respondents argue that UKYP might lose some of its clout at Westminster if it were to break apart into separate youth fora, and that an English Youth Parliament would have no equivalent to the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly or Northern Ireland Assembly. This is clearly a crucial issue to consider in taking forward recommendations in this area.
Chart 8: Should there be an English Youth Parliament?
(Base: 125 – 64 MYPs, 61 stakeholders)

Those who support an English Youth Parliament were asked why. The most frequent response is that it is only “fair,” given that the three other nations have youth parliaments (41% MYPs, 28% stakeholders).

Chart 9: Why have an English Youth Parliament?
(Base: 125 – All agreeing there should be an EYP : 32 MYPs, 36 stakeholders)
Links with other youth organisations

UKYP’s formal links with other youth organisations appear to be limited and short-lived. Representatives from NGOs and charitable organisations sat on the Advisory Group set up when UKYP was first formed: however, the Group “fizzled out” and most of the relationships do not appear to have continued. Those members of the Advisory Group who contributed to this Review are uncertain as to whether meetings have merely been suspended or if the Group has been formally dissolved. Relationships have also been forged with charities for the purposes of sessions or stands at Annual Sittings, but have not extended beyond this. Some of those involved in these sessions report unfavourably on their treatment by UKYP.

A majority of those stakeholders who feel able to comment on the absence of links see it as a problem internal to the UKYP, rather than unwillingness on the part of other groups to get involved in UKYP’s work. They feel that the interests of young people are better represented through partnerships, rather than by organisations working separately. This would allow resources to be pooled and expertise to be developed and shared. Linking with other youth organisations is also seen as a way for UKYP to broaden and diversify its electoral base, by providing access to UKYP to groups of young people who are currently unlikely to get involved with an explicitly and formally structured political body.

It may be the case that there is a degree of resentment amongst some youth organisations at the speed with which UKYP has developed its profile, amongst political audiences in particular, both locally and nationally. Charities working with young people and familiar with UKYP comment on how good it is at getting responses from Ministers. It is also clear from interviews with MPs that UKYP has impressed with its growth and that management’s enthusiasm and dedication and the articulacy and intelligence of the young people involved are seen as responsible for this.

Some stakeholders are uncertain whether responses from Ministers translate into action and raise questions about UKYP’s independence from Government and the DIIES (formerly CYPU): the implication of this is that UKYP is functioning as a convenient gesture towards youth participation rather than having a real impact on the lives of young people. This concern is also raised in regard to the UKYP Service Level Agreement: some stakeholders feel that this offers an opportunity for local authorities to “tick the youth participation box” without having to expend any real energy or thought into what is required for youth participation to be genuine, rather than tokenistic.

An issue raised by charitable organisations and youth workers is that of the transferability of skills developed by MYPs. Some feel that the world of “being an MYP” is somewhat unreal and that the skills developed inside the organisation have little relevance to the rest of young people’s lives. Building links with other youth organisations is seen as a way of helping MYPs to transfer and build upon skills and understand their application to the wider world.
Communication

Internal communication

Many of the problems raised about UKYP internal communications are attributed to a lack of resources. For example, with Regional Coordinators and support workers having only very limited time to dedicate to UKYP, information can be slow to reach MYPs.

Difficulties over communication appear to have had a negative impact on the ability of some young people to be properly involved with UKYP and to carry out their role as MYPs. This seems the case for Northern Ireland in particular, where communication between UKYP and the NI Youth Forum is raised as a particular problem. Notice of meetings is said to be given at very short notice and, in some cases, after the meeting has taken place. Despite guarantees of improvement, some NI stakeholders feel that little has changed.

A different criticism is that of receiving too much information: some stakeholders think they are on a general database, which means that they receive anything and everything sent out. As a consequence they tend to read nothing at all and thus may miss important information. A more targeted approach to communication is suggested.

Chart 10: the most important sources of information about what is happening in UKYP
(Base: 64 MYPs, 61 stakeholders)
Chart 10 shows again the value to MYPs of youth workers: not only do MYPs consider them the most important source of support but they also play a key role in providing information on what is happening in the UKYP. Other MYPs and the e-groups are also important, each being mentioned by 27% of MYPs.

External communication
Many of the stakeholders who are critical of UKYP communications see it as a symptom of the Parliament’s perceived unwillingness to make links with other youth organisations and several stakeholders say that their communication with UKYP has been very poor. This includes not only receiving information too late but also personal contact being unsatisfactory and, in some cases, rude.

Management
Attitudes towards UKYP management vary quite strongly between those who support the Parliament and those who are critical.

Positive views
UKYP management is described as well intentioned, passionate, energetic, hard working and committed to the success of the UKYP and its future development. UKYP is felt to be the organisation it is because of their dedication and efforts. MPs are most likely to hold this view. Some of those who have minor reservations use the expression “too hands-on” about UKYP management. Others feel that the core team is too small and unable to provide MYPs with the support they need. Many MYPs are also supportive of management.

Negative views
There are some very strongly held negative views on UKYP management and these views appear to be linked very closely with perceptions of UKYP as a “competitive,” “insular” and uncommunicative organisation.

Several stakeholders feel that UKYP management lacks experience of youth work and youth participation and that this has resulted in the structure, organisation and decision-making processes of UKYP reflecting an adult, rather than youth perspective. They draw a contrast between the Scottish Youth Parliament, which developed from grass-roots youth participation and the UKYP, which is felt to have been “set up from above.” There is considerable concern that UKYP depends too heavily on the particular people occupying management positions and that the structures are not in place to allow young people to run it themselves.

There is also confusion about how decisions are taken and a suggestion that UKYP lacks a clear policy on which type of decision is in the hands of management and which in the hands of young people. A lack of transparency surrounding some decisions appears to have led to suspicion that personal management interests are behind them and that young people’s wishes can be quashed.
Some stakeholders suggest that UKYP management style is command and control rather than cooperative or based on negotiation. This is not seen as appropriate to an organisation for young people and it is also felt that management fails to provide the support required for those demands to be met.

**Relationship with other Youth Parliaments / Councils**

The three devolved nations in the UK have independent youth fora, which act as sister organisations to the UKYP: Funky Dragon, in Wales, the Northern Ireland Youth Forum and the Scottish Youth Parliament. These organisations raise many of the same issues as other audiences, from communication to management and organisational structure. It is also noted that the devolved nations’ youth organisations provide young people with a voice and that this has an impact on the relative importance accorded to UKYP: this is not the case for English MYPs.

The key issue is the perception of UKYP as having a very English focus and failing to recognise the differences between the three devolved nations. This is discussed elsewhere in the report. However, there are some additional concerns voiced which are specific to the relationships UKYP has with its partner organisations. This section presents the views of stakeholders: MYP’s views are included elsewhere in the Report.

**Funky Dragon**

The Annual Sitting:

- The difference between the upper age limit of FD (25) and UKYP (18), has meant that Funky Dragon has not been able to field its full contingent of MYPs at Annual Sittings
  - Another reason cited for low attendance by Welsh members at the 2003 Annual Sitting is young people having had bad experiences in previous years and refusing to attend again
- Sittings are felt to be very badly organised
  - Voting procedures receive particular criticism
  - Facilitators are described as “out of their depth”
- People raising problems during Sittings are asked not to discuss them with others
  - This leads to a concern over lack of transparency and issues being “buried”
- Points raised by Welsh young people failed to appear in the manifesto

“There is a lack of credibility with the UKYP in Wales as the Welsh MYPs that have attended the events felt that they were badly organised and felt that they weren’t treated with respect. They all felt that it was a negative experience.” (MWA)

“The running of such a large event was obviously beyond the capability of the staff.” (FD)
Northern Ireland Youth Forum

Some of the people involved with the Northern Ireland Youth Forum are also MYPs at the UKYP. Problems raised about communication with MYPs from Northern Ireland have been referred to above.

A more serious concern is that of “political insensitivity” and a lack of awareness on the part of UKYP management of the impact on young people from NI of some of their decisions. In particular, reference was made to a planned meeting to be held in a British army base. NI MYPs were not willing to attend a meeting in such a venue but it is felt that, rather than their views being acknowledged and understood, they were “scapegoated” for changes having to be made to the plans. There is clearly considerable anger over this issue and a suggestion that it is not the only such example of heavy-handed treatment of NI MYP’s concerns. The general lack of knowledge amongst English MYPs about important political processes within Northern Ireland – the Good Friday Agreement and the ongoing debates around it, for example – is also seen as a grave shortcoming for a UK organisation.

Scottish Youth Parliament

The Scottish Youth Parliament (SYP) functions as the link organisation for UKYP in Scotland. Around 20 Members of the Scottish Youth Parliament (MSYPs) are also MYPs. SYP’s relationship with the UKYP has developed over the past two or so years, with the equivalent of a Regional Coordinator now being funded in Scotland, by the UKYP.

Excepting concerns about the Englishness of the UKYP, the primary issue for the relationship between UKYP and SYP is the age difference between MSYPs (14-25) and MYPs (11-18). This difference means that, from the perspective of the SYP, the views of a considerable number of their constituents are not represented at the UK level and issues of importance to the SYP – for example, those affecting young workers – are not included in UKYP policy discussions or the Manifesto.

“The last Manifesto meant nothing to Scotland as much of it was not relevant.”
(Scottish Executive)
Consultation with MYPs

Conference

The conference with MYPs was organised to fulfil two main objectives

1. To provide MYPs with an opportunity to input into the Review
2. To allow MYPs to respond to the findings from Stage 1 of the Review

These objectives dictated the timing of the MYP conference, ensuring that the headline findings presented to them covered all of the key issues arising during Stage 1.

The Conference was held in Birmingham, on Saturday 7th February, from 10.30am – 4.30pm. During the morning session, headline findings were presented to MYPs, followed by a question and answer session and small group work to explore issues raised in further depth. During the afternoon, each MYP chose to work on one of seven key themes; each group of MYPs identified strengths or problems associated with their theme and developed recommendations for addressing these issues.

The seven themes are:

- Social and policy outcomes
- Engagement
- Funding
- Networking and partnerships
- Equal representation for the four nations
- Leadership and management
- Communication

Every group identified lack of funding as a major stumbling block to progress in their chosen area. Many issues raised cut across the themes too – in particular, when looked at from the funding perspective. For example, written communication to develop partnerships with a view to improving the social outcomes for young people requires stationary, stamps, access to telephones to follow up on letters: in some areas the funding is not available for even this minimal expenditure.
Presentation of headline findings

Key findings from the Review were presented to MYPs. In response to the presentation, MYPs raised the following questions:

Survey
- How was the sample for the survey selected?
- How were questionnaires distributed?
- How reliable is the data from the survey?
  - See Appendices for details on the quantitative survey

Consultation
- Why was the large event with MYPs not held earlier in the Review?
  - It was explained that MYPs were consulted as a body towards the end of the Review to give them an opportunity to respond to and discuss the issues raised by other stakeholders, as well as contributing their own views
  - This process meant that MYPs' views on the action needed to address issues arising during the Review could inform the final recommendations
  - Invitations for MYPs to contribute their individual views to the Review had been sent to UKYP at the start of the project

- Why was work with young people carried out in England only?
  - It was explained that budget and timing constraints precluded consultation with young people in the whole of the UK.
  - DfES agreed to fund additional work with MYPs in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Youth workers
- Why were youth workers excluded from the feedback on the presentation and the themed discussions?
  - In response to criticism, made by stakeholders in the Review, that UKYP was an adult-led organisation OPM decided that it was important for MYP’s own views to be heard during the Review, independently of those of youth workers, whose views had been included earlier in the process,

Fair Trade
- One MYP questioned why coffee provided during the Conference was produced by Nestlé and why MYPs were happy to drink it
  - This was felt to be at odds with UKYP’s policy on fair trade
Cost of Review

- What was the cost of the Review? Would these funds not have been better spent on UKYP?
  - The total cost of the Review was £54,450
  - This was a one-off expenditure by DfES designed to provide UKYP with information which would support and assist its growth in the future, by allowing it to take a step back from day-to-day issues and policy development and focus on its role and aims as an organisation and how to ensure its governance, management and strategic approach are suited to these aims

The seven themes

Overview

MYPs chose which theme they wished to discuss and the approach they wished to take. The views represented are those of small groups of MYPs and may not reflect wider thinking amongst MYPs on the issues covered. However, they capture some crucial points and support many of the recommendations developed in response to the views of other stakeholders.

Very broadly, MYP discussions fall under the following areas:

- **Outcomes** – eg, how to ensure that discussions lead to action, how to ensure that UKYP activities result in social outcomes for young people, how to ensure that UKYP campaigns influence policy

- **Best practice** - how to ensure that UKYP adopts best practice in youth participation and outreach? Who does UKYP need to make contact with on this issue?

- **Resolution of principle** – eg, should there be an English Youth Parliament or parliaments of the regions? Should UKYP seek corporate sponsorship and, if so, according to what criteria? Which organisations should UKYP have links with? Should MYPs shadow MPs? Should there be a specific mechanism for ensuring UKYP represents diversity? – eg, MYPs or Trustees drawn from specific interest groups (eg, organisations for young people with disabilities, young travellers, etc)

- **Image and branding** – eg, what is UKYP’s image? How is it expressed? Does the public face of UKYP represent the full diversity of MYPs?

- **Communication and publicity** – eg, what does UKYP wish to communicate and to whom? What are the most effective media to use?

- **Information systems and processes** – eg, what data needs to be collected, how should this be done, how are knowledge sharing systems to work, how regularly do we update systems etc? How do we ensure everyone has access to the information they need?

- **Training** - what training should MYPs have and how should it be delivered?

- **Support systems** – eg, what are the best ways of supporting MYPs and others? What support functions will management perform and how?
The above list is not exhaustive, but provides some indication of the range of issues that MYPs will need to consider over the next year. For MYPs to take forward their ideas, it may be useful to allocate responsibility for different topics to specific groups of MYPs. When they have explored their topic in detail, the outcomes of their discussion could be circulated more widely for further comment. This would provide an opportunity for a wider group of MYPs to get more fully involved. It would also allow UKYP to explore the approaches taken on these issues by its sister parliaments in the devolved nations.

There may also be a “natural” order to some of these discussions: for example, prior to developing best practice or a communications and publicity strategy, it may be beneficial to have had initial discussions with other organisations, who may be able to offer advice to UKYP in these areas.

### Social and policy outcomes

#### PRIORITIES

- Increased recognition from local and national government
- Inclusion in all discussions - not just on “young people’s issues”
- Making sure that discussions lead to action
- Publicise UKYP initiatives and successes, locally, regionally, nationally and UK-wide
- Greater consistency in support and funding across the regions
- Making sure that Select Committees function properly
- Develop communications strategy to promote UKYP as a brand
- Address the perception that MYPs are “not normal”

### Influencing UK government policy

MYPs discussing this theme agree that when they meet together they get their views across, complain and have fun. However, they are not sure what the outcomes are of their meetings, both in terms of policy and for UKYP more generally. A more focused approach on the benefits to young people of the work that UKYP does is perhaps necessary, ensuring that discussions are translated into action and the impact of this action on policy and on the lives of young people can be evaluated.

MYPs suggest that targets should be set, for action and influence, both for the UKYP as a whole and for the regions. These would include specific outcomes to be achieved: the example given was of the UKYP CD produced by the southeast region. It was pointed out that the differences in involvement and commitment amongst MYPs across the regions might result in some difficulties in implementing UK-wide targets. These difficulties might be added to by the variations in
support received from local authorities across the country. MYPs suggest that more funding is
given to MYPs in areas where support from local authorities is limited or non-existent.

**UKYP image and profile**

*Government*

MYPs would like to change the way local councils and the government think of young people and UKYP. They feel they should have a higher profile, locally, nationally and regionally and be included in all discussions, not just those categorised as “young people’s issues.” At the moment, MYPs feel that UKYP is somewhat at the beck and call of government and they would like to see a more consistent approach developed.

Ensuring that Select Committees function properly is seen as a crucial part of increasing UKYP’s influence on government policy. MYPs agree that 20 people, 2 from each region, should meet on a regular basis. They suggest that the relevant government department or Westminster Select Committee should fund UKYP Select Committees, which should work side-by-side with Westminster Select Committees.

*Wider audiences*

It is seen as very important to recognise that UKYP is a brand and needs promotion. MYPs suggest developing a communication strategy to help with this. The strategy would focus on media contacts, including television, local and pirate radio. Regions should be free to develop their own independent media strategies. Specific media and communications groups might be set up to take responsibility for this work.

The components of a communication strategy would include straightforward factual information on how UKYP works and easily understood details of the UKYP manifesto. For example, a bullet-point version of the Manifesto could be produced. In addition to this, UKYP successes need to be identified and publicised. Initiatives run on a regional level should be communicated both within that region and also UK-wide. This will help to raise the profile of UKYP and its relevance to all four nations and help to cement awareness of the organisation as a whole as capable of achieving change. MYPs suggest that a single, national youth vote day throughout the UK would help greatly with this.

*“MYPs are normal”*

There is also felt to be a need to develop “softer” messages, which would redress the current perception of MYPs as “posh public school people.” One MYP remarked: “friends laugh at me when I say I’m an MYP” and this attitude was familiar to most members of the group. This is not necessarily associated with being thought posh: being an MYP can also be associated with being “uncool” or “over-interested” in school. A higher profile with government and a demonstration that government takes their views seriously is seen as one way of changing this attitude.
MYPs suggest communication campaigns involving film, video or UKYP events could be used to tackle this “image” problem. Leaflets and increased contact with LEAs and schools could support these. MYPs feel that this would require further funding.

Outcomes for young people
In discussing UKYP’s impact on young people’s lives, MYPs focused on their own involvement with UKYP and the benefits to them of being an MYP. They felt that they had benefited in particular from learning how government works. Meeting MPs and others with whom they would not normally come into contact is also seen as an advantage. Finally, they thought that they had developed personal skills in public speaking and debating.

Engagement

**PRIORITIES**

- Draft letter to TV directors, BBC, ITV signed by MYPs,
- UKYP Party Broadcast
- Sustain existing links with BBC
- MYP Question Time
- Involve young people who are in care and supported accommodation through outreach peer advocacy
- Involving MYPs in training police
- MYPs making close contacts with youth workers
- Local newsletter for young people
- Youth café facilities (Dundee model)
- MYPs engaging with authority figures where there is discrimination
- Re-engagement of upper and middle-classes
- City-wide young people’s forums and Councils

MYPs looking at how to engage more young people and include a more diverse range of people in UKYP developed an approach targeted at a range of different audiences and working on different levels.

*Formal contacts*
A higher profile for UKYP is seen as an important part of widening participation. MYPs suggest a letter writing campaign, with formal letters from MYP sent, *en masse*, to the major TV broadcasters. This is seen as a way of gaining airtime and recognition for UKYP. Similar letters might be addressed to political audiences – the Prime Minister is mentioned as a key target.

Another approach to media coverage includes developing ideas for TV programmes involving young people: suggestions range from a programme involving a panel of important decision-
makers, with young people challenging them on key issues, a UKYP broadcast, along the lines of party political broadcasts, to an "MYP question time."

**Increasing diversity**
Outreach work is seen as the way to reach audiences who are currently not involved with UKYP. Visits by MYPs to care units, schools, colleges, youth centres and supported accommodation are suggested as a way of widening awareness of UKYP and encouraging young people to discuss the issues that affect them. Other suggestions include working alongside youth workers in combating anti-social behaviour, developing a peer advocacy scheme for young offenders and MYPs involving young people in police training.

It was noted too that the “upper and middle classes” should not be excluded from any scheme dedicated to increasing diversity amongst MYPs.

**Informal engagement**
The lack of facilities for young people is seen as a key issue on which MYPs might campaign. If local facilities could be organised through UKYP’s efforts, this would demonstrate to local young people that it has an impact. MYPs suggest campaigning for youth cafes, clubs or bars, which would have internet-access, be alcohol-free and lay on music and other events. Local newsletters for young people could publicise this and other issues, activities and events of interest.

---

**Case Study: The Shore, Dundee**
How did it come about? Why is it good?

*Because of the lack of facilities for young people, the council bought a city centre premises and had a selection of young people decorate it. It was completely designed by young people and it is so popular because people are proud of what they have helped create and it keeps them off the street and out of trouble. Bands can play there, sell non alco cocktails.*

[www.theshore.org.uk](http://www.theshore.org.uk)
Funding

PRIORITIES

Funding should be:

- Increased
- Long term
- At all levels (ie, national, regional, local
- Consistent – at present it changes when councils change
- Transparent – MYPs should be able to see accounts
- Governed by a strategy/guidance
- Allow all MYPs to participate equally
- Make UKYP accessible to all
- Raise the profile of UKYP

“The UKYP has the potential to be open, accessible and influential BUT at the moment it is: failing, under-valued, under-funded”

MYPs discussing this theme endorse the views of their peers in calling for increased funding. A more targeted approach is also seen as necessary, with budgets held by individual MYPs and by Select Committees. MYPs suggest that funding for Select Committees might be sought from the relevant linked government department.

Whether or not to seek funding from commercial sources is a matter of some debate amongst MYPs. Some feel that it is wrong in principle. If funding is sought from non–government bodies, MYP feel that there are both ethical and “image” issues to be considered. They think that general principles should be established to determine whether or not to accept corporate or other funding. The decision over whether it is appropriate to accept funding from any particular organisation would be made following specific criteria laid down within those principles. These criteria would need to take into account the “image” of UKYP and what the impact on it might be of accepting funding from a particular source – commercial sources in particular.

MYPs think that one of the benefits to funders might be allowing them a stall at Annual Sittings (perhaps along the lines of political party conferences). Whatever funding might be accepted, however, MYPs emphasise the need for UKYP to retain its independence.

MYPs identify a range of avenues to explore for potential funding. These include approaching local government, sharing or pooling resources with other organisations, at a local level, for “twinned” events and setting up a “rent-a-youth” scheme. Under this scheme, organisations using UKYP as a channel through which to reach wider audiences of young people would be charged for the service.
MYPs from other groups stress that UKYP shouldn’t “sell out to private business”. They question too whether UKYP is carrying out the work of government departments and feel that these departments should provide funding, rather than UKYP having to seek sponsorship from business.

They suggest too that alumni or friends of UKYP might be enlisted to help with fundraising activities – for example, ex-MYPs.

The question was also raised as to whether making decisions on funding should be the responsibility of MYPs and whether they shouldn’t instead be focusing on “the issues” and representing the people in their area, who have elected them.

**Networking and Partnerships**

**PRIORITIES**

- Have strong criteria for deciding which organisations UKYP should have links with
- Be clear about which organisations UKYP would not want to be linked to
- Enable MYPs to maintain/create outward-facing networks including appropriate resources and administrative support
- Establish a central database so that current links and contacts of MYPs can be built upon effectively and outward-facing networks be fully supported (and gaps identified)
- Support (particularly new) MYPs in making links with local politicians in their region, helping to raise their awareness of the UKYP agenda
- Facilitate external organisations to come into the UKYP structure to give their expert input (but guard against these organisations influencing UKYP policy)

MYPs feel that improved relationships with a range of organisations would be of great benefit to UKYP. In addition to forging new links there may also be a need to review existing relationships, for example, with the YMCA, in light of MYPs’ wish not to be associated with religious organisations.

MYPs see relationships working in a range of ways. When deciding what sort of relationship is most appropriate in any given case, they would want to consider:

- Is it a local, regional or national organisation?
- Is it an interest group, a commercial organisation with vested interests or a political body?
- What time, resources and interests do MYPs have?
Relationships might be ongoing or limited to specific campaigns. MYPs suggest the following possibilities:

- MYPs sitting on the Board of linked organisations
- MYPs attending Westminster Select Committees
- "Linked" observers from relevant organisations attending UKYP Select Committee meetings – eg, from NGOs, Westminster Select Committees, able to contribute to discussions
- Information and advice on specific issues (eg, as per the current relationship with Oxfam, on fair trade issues).

**Working with your local politician**

Some mechanism for reinforcing the links between MYPs and constituency MPs is seen as important: for example, making sure that they are informed when a new MYP is elected, with meetings set up at the earliest opportunity. Similarly, MYPs should be able to meet with new MPs shortly after they are elected. These processes would allow new MYPs to build on existing relationships rather than starting them anew each year. It is felt too that a knowledge store, accessible to all MYPs, would help to build confidence by providing them with information in advance of meetings.

**Information support**

Maintaining existing relationships and building new ones will require some support. MYPs suggest UKYP should hold a central database of organisations, communication and outcomes, meetings and follow-up. A central record of current local links and skills within a community is also seen as useful. New MYPs would be able to consult this and build on contacts made by previous MYPs.

MYPs think UKYP should have links with organisations working in the following areas:

- Transport
- Social issues / inclusion
- Education
- Sexual health
- Environment
- Children and young people
- Politics/government (ie, MPs and departments)
- Youth and disability
- Connexions
- Local organisations such as Edinburgh Youth Social Inclusion Partnership (EYSIP)

Specific organisations listed by MYPs:

- RAC / AA
- Brook
- Greenpeace
- Amnesty International
- Childline
MYPs feel that there are some organisations with whom it is not appropriate or necessary for UKYP to have links with. The primary reasons given are ethical and political. For example, whilst a relationship with the political party forming the government is seen as essential for influencing policy, there is concern amongst MYPs that building relationships with opposition parties might call UKYP’s apolitical nature into question.

Links with religious groups are also seen as inappropriate, either because this would jeopardise UKYP’s independence or because it could prove off-putting to some young people. Some MYPs feel the police do not listen to young people and that there is therefore little point in forging links with them. Finally, relationships with food industries are seen as inappropriate for ethical reasons: McDonalds, Coca Cola and Nescafé were mentioned by name.

**Equal representation for the four nations**

**PRIORITIES**

- Consultation on English Youth Parliament (EYP) with English MYP including:
  - Better communication between regions
  - No English parliament
  - Should it be the UKYP to set it up?
  - Regional autonomy is already in place
- Would UKYP be smaller if an EYP was set up?
- FUNDING - a key issue on ALL aspects of UKYP

Additional comments from other groups include the suggestion that consultation and voting on an English Youth Parliament should extend to all MYPs and show good practice.

MYPs discussed how to ensure that each of the four UK nations has equal representation within UKYP. They focused on whether there is a need for an English Youth Parliament. In addressing this question, they identified some relevant existing problems within UKYP and raised additional questions. As in all of the themed discussions, funding is seen as a key issue.

UKYP is seen as a forum that should focus on UK issues only. At present, however, MYPs suggest that it has an English bias. They support this view with a series of points:

- Some Manifesto items cut across the four nations, but much of it irrelevant to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland
- Lobbying takes place at a UK level, but the issues are framed within an English context
• All Sittings have been held in England
  o MYPs recognise that the logistics and cost of holding Sittings in each of the four
    nations are complex but think that the current situation adds to the perception that
    UKYP is biased towards the English.

To address their concerns, MYPs suggest the formation of an English Youth Parliament and
propose an initial framework:
• EYP would meet once every 18 weeks (ie, three times a year)
• The four nations would come together on an annual basis
• Since there is no English government equivalent to the Northern Ireland and Welsh
  Assemblies or Scottish Parliament, the EYP would be based on regions
• Regions would be autonomous
  o Much of the UK agenda is seen as regionally or locally specific
  o Regional autonomy would allow decisions to be taken at a regional level - this is
    currently seen as possible in theory but not always easily translatable into practice
  o This would need to be supported by improved communication between the
    regions, enabling sharing of ideas and development of best practice.

Proposals would need to be further developed by MYPs and sent out for consultation across the
UKYP. It should be noted that support for an English Youth Parliament is not unanimous
amongst this group, as can be seen from the priorities outlined at the start of this section.

A further background issue raised by MYPs is that of press coverage: there is a feeling that local
media in particular has a “bad news” approach to young people, which can, in itself, undermine
the work of UKYP in seeking to increase involvement and influence.
Communication

PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
<th>LOCAL (Most important)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Between MYPs, SWs, PG, Trustees</td>
<td>- Improve awareness (raise from 16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- E-group + website + virtual forum</td>
<td>- Knowledge of who an MYP is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Between regions / nations</td>
<td>- Decision-makers (Councillors, MPs etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL</th>
<th>LOGISTICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion and awareness</td>
<td>- 1 MP = 1 MYP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corporate identity</td>
<td>- More funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fundraising / ethical policy</td>
<td>- Handover (contacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Awareness raising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments from MYPs in other groups include disagreement with the note “1 MP = 1 MYP” – there is concern that shadowing MPs looks like a political move. There is also a suggestion for a bi-monthly newsletter emailed to all MYPs, with a hard copy option for those without access to a computer.

Internal communications

MYPs feel that UKYP internal communication needs attention in a range of areas. Contact between MYPs is thought to be limited; where communication is effective, as in the e-group, it can exclude MYPs who do not have easy access to a computer. There is also concern that where communication does take place, there is a lack of follow-up, which leads to interesting ideas and initiatives getting lost.

A fundamental problem affecting internal communication is the absence of a co-ordinated approach. MYPs suggest, therefore, that a full-time Communication Co-ordinator post should be created – a “UKYP spin doctor” is the way one MYP described the job. Their responsibilities could include:

- monitoring e-group conversations to flag issues that should be followed up in face-to-face meetings – this will help to ensure that ideas are followed up and translated into actions
- setting up on-line fora for MYPs to speak directly to each other, which would include a facility for private discussion between MYPs
- all MYPs to be assigned a UKYP email address
- removing the barriers to information – at present, there is a feeling that MYPs do not receive all information about UKYP.
Communication with MPs
Communication with MPs is seen as a crucial element in improving UKYP’s influence. MPs need to have greater awareness of the benefits to them of being involved with UKYP. MYPs feel that they might utilise MPs’ liking for positive publicity and include local MPs in media coverage of UKYP campaign successes or events, in exchange for support from that MP when this would be of benefit to an MYP.

MYPs question whether the current structure of working through LEAs links MYPs sufficiently closely with constituency MPs. However, there is some resistance to a more direct link with constituency MPs – for example, by re-structuring UKYP to reflect constituency rather than LEA boundaries. Some MYPs are concerned that this would lead people to view MYP involvement as political, rather than apolitical.

Best Communication – Local
Local communication is seen as most effective since it is local issues in which young people tend to be most interested and increasing participation needs to be done on a local level. Whilst national campaigns may be necessary on occasion, it is seen as crucial for MYPs to be known and recognised by the young people in their area and their work publicised locally, in schools, youth clubs and societies and local papers.

Communication with corporations
There are some concerns about how UKYP should communicate with business. Whilst the relationship and communication with BT is seen as very successful, MYPs question whether BT’s wishes and those of UKYP coincide and whether the relationship is really a partnership.

The key message on corporate sponsorship is “approach with caution”. It should be made clear in all communication with business that UKYP has specific policies on issues and particular standards that it wishes to maintain – for example on fair trade. These same standards would be expected of any business partners.
Leadership and Management

**PRIORITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLARIFICATION</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Clarification of interaction between all bodies within UKYP</td>
<td>- Newsletter from management to MYPs about upcoming and past events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More open Procedures Groups and Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Share best interests between all regions and nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Specific place for all minutes of PG and Trustee meetings to be published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Induction for MYP’s on a regional level for all regions/Nations</td>
<td>- More leadership opportunities through Select Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Should happen at start of term of Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Money provided to LEA’s so that standard training is given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priority message to the UKYP Review: More staff leading to better internal communication

MYPs began by developing a themed agenda to guide their discussions, so providing focus on specific issues within the overall theme of leadership and management

1. Clarification
2. Communication
3. Training
4. Other

They went on to explore existing problems and to develop priorities for change within each of these themes.

**Clarification**

Clarification is seen as necessary in several areas. One of the most fundamental areas to address is the role and responsibilities of those involved with UKYP. MYPs suggest that a range of approaches could be taken. For example, presentations could be given at the Annual Sitting and at local or regional UKYP training programmes, which would clarify different roles of those involved with UKYP, together with their job description. Written leaflets could support presentations.
MYPs raised the question of how accountable they and Deputy MYPs are to their electorate. They feel that maintaining records on voter turnout and clarifying MYP’s responsibilities on consulting with the young people in their local area would address this issue.

MYPs are uncertain about the nature of the relationship between Trustees and the Procedures Group and feel it needs to be clarified. They think that Procedures Group representatives should be held accountable by MYPs in their region. Finally, they are unsure about the relationship between the central office management and UKYP.

Communication
MYPs see communication both within UKYP and with outside bodies as an important element in discussions of management and leadership.

Internal
Communication between management and MYPs is thought to be in need of improvement: MYPs suggest that management should issue a newsletter to MYPs, to include details of upcoming events and feedback on previous events.

Greater openness on the part of both the Procedures Group and Trustees is seen as necessary. MYPs feel that the PG should communicate with them in a thorough and clear way, with MYPs determining how much information they require. This is seen as the only way in which the PG can be properly effective.

The E-groups are seen as an effective way of reaching a majority of MYPs.

External communication
MYPs see a need for improved external communication locally, regionally, nationally and UK-wide. They feel that UKYP as an organisation should communicate with its sister organisations in the devolved nations. They see too a need for UKYP to communicate directly with young people who are not involved with UKYP, since these are the people that UKYP represents. MYPs would also welcome increased communication with youth workers.

Training
The quantity, timing and consistency of training are key issues for MYPs. Currently, training for new MYPs is felt to be too remote from the election process. MYPs suggest training should be given immediately following election to a post. This could include an induction process, in which outgoing MYPs conduct a formal handover to incoming MYPs. Training should continue throughout the MYP’s year, on a regular basis, to help them contribute to UKYP as fully as possible.
MYPs in this group feel that it is not appropriate to carry out training during the Annual Sitting. Instead, they suggest a standard, annual, regionally delivered residential course, together with regional training days throughout the year, which would require additional funding. Peer-lead education is also seen as valuable, as are locally based training activities. To ensure consistency across the UK, MYPs feel UKYP should allocate funding for training to LEAs.

Information support
MYPs think that training activities should be supported by written information. They suggest developing a training pack, which outlines all roles and helps to ensure consistency across all the regions and nations.

Basic and accessible information for MYPs, on UKYP structure, frequently asked questions are also seen as necessary. The Scottish Youth Parliament Guide and the Sussex UKYP Guide were offered as examples.

Other issues
MYPs debated whether or not UKYP is “too adult.” Some feel that more opportunities need to be created for young people to lead, regionally and nationally. Others think that adult involvement is about right and that MYPs need the adult support.

Finally, MYPs see a need to develop a constitution for UKYP.

UKYP “in a nutshell”
At the close of the conference, MYPs developed single statements to encapsulate their view of UKYP, as follows:

- Power!
- Your Voice
- Young People First
- Young Views Count
- Your Views Count
- Putting you in the picture
- Putting youth in the parliament
- Putting youth in power
- Have your say

- Your views, your vision, your voice
- Youth! Youth! Youth!
- It's good to youth
- Because youth worth it
- Things can only get better
- Dude, where’s my voice?
- Youth today, future tomorrow
- Make your future real
- United Kingdom Youth Parliament
MYP Workshops

English MYPs

Most MYPs attending this workshop were from London and the South. Their views are supplemented by those of a member of the Procedures Group, interviewed by telephone.

Structure of the UKYP

English MYPs view the fundamental structure of UKYP as satisfactory, but see room for improvement in the following areas:

- Meetings need to be better structured (e.g., stick to agenda) and time management should be improved.
- A system is needed to translate decisions made in meetings into practice.
- Most Select Committees are “not working at the moment due to funding” (MYP). The only functioning SC, International Affairs, has made its own contacts with Oxfam, which has provided it with some help, in the form of leaflets providing an overview of Fair Trade. This kind of informal relationship with relevant interest group or groups and organised by MYPs, is seen as extremely useful.

The Procedures Group (PG) has recently reviewed its own structure, in the interests of becoming more effective. This has led to it splitting into two: a Strategy Group and an Organising Group. Each region will have one representative on each group and the groups will meet at the same time, spending time together at the end of their meetings. The rationale for the split is that it will allow more time to be spent on the organisation of events – for example, by having an Entertainments Committee - and for the organisational implications of policy decisions to be considered at an early stage. More time will also be available for considering strategic issues – for example, developing a proper constitution to replace the existing Operational Guidelines. (See Appendices for new PG structure and Operational Guidelines.)

Influencing policy

Some MYPs feel that they do an “excellent” job in putting their views to decision makers and that their influence is improving, though with some way still to go. The means of achieving greater influence are seen as “more money, publicity, people and time.”

The Procedures Group is also looking at how UKYP forms policy and how a more strategic approach might work. One suggestion made by the PG is that the Manifesto is developed over a two-year period, rather than the current one year. Policy would be developed in the first year, through consultation with young people, ratified at the Sitting and implemented in the following year. This is seen as a way of ensuring policy represents more than just the views of single MYPs, and of developing relationships with NGOs who have similar policy aims.
**Funding**

MYPs see the major funding issue as the variability of support across the regions and countries: some MYPs have their own laptops and in other areas, LEAs can barely afford to pay for MYPs’ travel expenses. This is seen as unfair on MYPs, since it leads to imbalances in their ability to participate. A lack of funding is also felt to impact on the wider development of UKYP: PG members are concerned that their ideas will not become practice due to lack of funding for the Select Committees, which are essential to the implementation of policy.

The PG sees increased funding as a way of creating a more grass-roots organisation. Part of the motivation behind the restructuring of the PG for 2004 is to allow it to spend more time developing best practice in terms of involving MYPs. With more support available to individual MYPs at a local level, the Group sees its role shifting, from its current somewhat dominant position to a more backseat one, from which it offers help and advice to MYPs when needed.

**Representation**

MYPs taking part in the workshop refer to UKYP statistics on the involvement of ethnic minorities, which indicate they are over-represented, in comparison with both Westminster and the general population, making up 20% of MYPs. However, they recognise that there are some groups of young people who are not represented by UKYP – in particular, homeless people and travellers – but point out that this problem also faces central government. The primary reason given for non-representation is that these young people tend not to use the same facilities as others: refugees and asylum seekers, who are seen as going to youth clubs and schools, are felt to be relatively easy to reach.

“There believe we have the same problems as central government with getting homeless people’s views, because short of going out on the street and talking to them they are very hard to reach unless they use young people’s facilities where the youth parliament is advertised. The same would go for travellers and we also thought that they do generally separate themselves from the rest of society.” (MYP)

“We believe there is a wide range in how many people each region represents. Some can go from only 5 votes up to tends of thousands of votes, although I think everyone can be represented if they take steps to get involved.” (MYP)

One MYP, making it clear he was speaking personally, also raised the question of how apolitical the UKYP is.

“My personal view of the organisation would be that it is predominantly ‘left-wing’ – the managers and/or workers must be un-biased.” (MYP)
Scottish Youth Parliament and Funky Dragon – general remarks

Many of the issues raised by Scottish and Welsh MYPs are similar. Most importantly, both emphasise their commitment to a UK-wide voice for young people and a desire to see UKYP succeed.

One of the most crucial issues appears to be knowledge sharing. Welsh MYPs feel that their experience and insights are not taken seriously by English MYPs whilst Scottish MYPs say that English MYPs often refer approvingly to SYP practices. Northern Ireland MYPs feel that English MYPs are ignorant of the context and history of their relationship with the UK and insensitive to its importance. From these three different perspectives a single message emerges, which is that the views of the devolved nations and the learning they bring to UKYP and the issues they face need to be given more consideration. Many of the recommendations made for UKYP in this Report need to be looked at in the light of current practice in the NIYF, Funky Dragon and the Scottish Youth Parliament, so that what is working there – and, importantly, would be transferable to UKYP – can be drawn upon.

The other issue in common to the three devolved nations is the age range of their MYPs. The sister parliaments to UKYP in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have an upper age limit of 25 or 26. The specific points raised in relation to this by each of the devolved parliaments are addressed separately, below.

Scottish Youth Parliament MYPs

The relationship between the SYP and the UKYP is stronger than that between UKYP and the youth organisations in the other two devolved nations, because of the Concordat and the funded “regional” co-ordinator post. Scottish MYPs are currently looking at how they can work in Scotland as MYPs - that is, as representatives of a UK perspective in addition to their role as MSPs, representing Scottish young people. They express strong support for the UKYP but, like Welsh MYPs, raise some issues that they think need to be resolved for UKYP to work more effectively and efficiently in the future.

Communication

MYPs from Scotland feel that they do not get all the information from UKYP that they should. For example, they do not think that UKYP holds their email addresses in its database and thus did not receive information sent out at the beginning of the Review process explaining its purpose and objectives. They feel too that an over-reliance on email can leave many young people out and that alternative ways of distributing information need to be devised, to ensure that everyone gets all information.

Difference in age range

The difference in the age range of Members of the Scottish Parliament (MSPs) and that of MYPs is at the root of many of the topics discussed by Scottish MYPs. The SYP is an organisation for young people age 14 – 25 whilst UKYP represents those age 11 – 18. They feel that the lower
age cut-off for MYPs may be a reason for the greater involvement of adults in UKYP than in its sister youth organisations in the devolved nations.

However, Scottish MYPs do not see the 18 age limit for MYPs as an excuse for not increasing youth involvement in the UKYP. For example, whilst they acknowledge that the number of younger Trustees on the Board has recently increased, they point out that they are not young people, according to the definition of UKYP: that is, they are not under 18. They feel that too the UKYP Board of Trustees “has too much say.”

They see two solutions to this issue: either include young people under 18 on the Board or raise the upper age limit of UKYP to match that of the Welsh, Scottish and Northern Ireland organisations. This second option would remove the need for any adult (ie, over 25) involvement in UKYP. It might be asked: why should young people age 18 – 25 be able to vote in both national elections and in the UKYP election – is that fair? The response of the Scottish MYPs involves two arguments. First, that childhood is defined as the time before a person reaches the age of 18: in which case, UKYP should more properly be called the UKCP – the UK Children’s Parliament. And secondly, they ask, if the voting age is lowered to 16 will UKYP lower the upper age limit to 16, to prevent 16 – 18 year olds being able to vote twice? Although the report of the Electoral Commission, released shortly after the workshop, recommended that the voting age should not be reduced, at the time of writing, there is still uncertainty about the direction the UK government will take on the issue and hence this question remains pertinent.

Scottish MYPs point out too that the age difference between the SYP and UKYP leaves MSPs and young people in Scotland, aged 19 – 25, whose interests are voiced through the SYP, without a voice in the UK.

This issue is one that has been raised during UKYP meetings in the past and is clearly an ongoing problem that needs to be addressed.

An English Youth Parliament?
Scottish MYPs debated some of the issues surrounding the creation of an English Youth Parliament (EYP). Most support this. An EYP would give English MYPs a forum in which to focus on English-only issues and policy and help to dispel the current perception of UKYP as essentially an English organisation. If an EYP were to be formed, Scottish MYPS think that there should also be an annual UK-wide meeting to ensure that the UK voice is not lost.

However, the debate amongst Scottish MYPs raises some questions about the consequences of an EYP that need to be explored further by MYPs.

1. Would an English Youth Parliament be any more than another layer of bureaucracy, requiring outlay of limited and precious funds?
2. Would an English Youth Parliament lead to a weakening of the UKYP voice – the concern is that MPs might listen more closely to an EYP and the views of the devolved nations on UK-wide topics might be lost or given less consideration.

3. There is no equivalent in England to the devolved assemblies/parliament. What would this mean for an EYP?

4. Would an EYP end up "versus" the SYP, FD and the NIYF? That is, would each one have to fight for its voice to be heard?

The MYP’s year

Scottish MYPs think that the organisation of the MYP’s year needs to be reviewed. They feel that the time between getting elected (generally between October and February) and the Annual Sitting is too long. The Sitting is seen as a great opportunity for MYPs to get a sense of UKYP as a whole: the current timing leaves new MYPs without this and with no knowledge of their fellow MYPs until well into their year of office. They suggest moving elections to just before the Sitting. This would need to be considered in detail: many MYPs may be tied up with exams during the summer and have little time to dedicate to campaigning. Moving the Sitting would be another option.

The process of developing the UKYP manifesto is also thought to be in need of attention. Scottish MYPs point out that Getting the Message Right, the manifesto of the SYP, took 4 years to develop and involved a period of extensive consultation with young people in Scotland. They feel that, at present, they have only a year to highlight issues in the UKYP manifesto and many end up getting thrown out due to lack of time and not followed up in succeeding years.

MYPs think too that more time could be given to training and suggest this is done at the Sitting. They describe the value to MSYPs of having MPs and MSPs to provide training at their Annual General Meeting. In addition to the training, they feel that it plays an important part in breaking down barriers between adult politicians and MSPs.

Access to information

MYPs in Scotland are not overly concerned about seeing financial information – for example, on managements’ salaries. However, they feel that this information needs to be available to MYPs on request.

An apolitical organisation?

The point raised by an MYP in the English MYP workshop was put to the Scottish MYPs. They do not agree that UKYP is biased towards the left in any explicit manner. However, they do feel that young people are, by inclination, more likely to hold left-wing views and that the issues with which UKYP is concerned - such as representation, equality and fairness - are more likely to be the focus of left-wing debate.

Funky Dragon MYPs

Young people from Funky Dragon (FD) have attended UKYP Annual Sittings as MYPs and have been enthusiastic about getting involved.
UKYP and the devolved nations

Welsh MYPs are committed to UKYP but feel that it is dominated by English and, specifically, southeastern, issues. They feel their concerns are shared by MYPs from the other devolved nations. They think too that the North East and North West regions of England feel more allied with the devolved nations than they do with the other English regions. However, they do think that the more formal relationship between the Scottish Youth Parliament (SYP) and the appointment of a part-time UKYP “regional” co-ordinator for Scotland has improved its position.

Welsh MYPs think that the problems with the devolved nations go back to the First Sitting. Whilst this was a UKYP sitting, FD, the SYP and the Northern Ireland Youth Forum (NIYF) were there as observers only and “weren’t allowed to say anything” (MYP, Wales). This set an initial impression of UKYP as an English-dominated organisation with the devolved nations having less input and less control over the formation of policy and over the way UKYP is structured and managed. Welsh MYPs do not think this has ever properly been addressed.

Another key issue identified by the young people is the difference in age range. The upper age limit for young people involved in Funky Dragon is 25. As mentioned above in relation to the SYP and below, in relation to the NIYF, this means that a high number of young people are excluded, leaving them without a voice.

UKYP structure

Welsh MYPs feel that UKYP will fail to thrive and grow in the future unless attention is paid to its basic structure. They see the foundations as unclear and think they were established by, not young people.

The structure of UKYP is seen as the root of other difficulties, also raised elsewhere in this report, in particular that of increasing representation. The structure of Funky Dragon is simpler than that of the UKYP but it has inclusion built into it on a formal basis, giving it much greater diversity and a wider representative base. Welsh MYPs feel that working through local youth fora and voluntary organisations, rather than schools, is one element in its success. They also think that the co-opted places on the Grand Council mean that vulnerable young people or young people who may face discrimination have a voice. (See Part 3 for diagram of Funky Dragon structure.)

Welsh MYPs think that a more flexible approach to committees might help UKYP. At the moment they feel that the structure takes precedence over the issues. They point out that many issues are cross-cutting and don’t sit neatly within the existing Select Committee structure. If an MYP is
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interested in a cross-cutting issue, it is felt that, at the moment, there is no way for them to get involved at Committee level, since membership is fixed. They feel that the failure of Select Committees to work means another approach should be tried.

Their suggestion is an issue-based approach. Committees would be formed to address specific policy announcements, new legislation, or anything else thought to be important. They feel this would allow greater involvement of more MYPs: for example, a particular issue might affect one region or local area more than others and more MYPs from that area might want to sit on that Committee. A more flexible approach is seen as a way of encouraging more young people to get involved and also more likely to achieve results. At the moment the Select Committees are seen as achieving very little.

“There’s no proper debate and no definite outcomes.”
Welsh MYP

“It’s better to do 1 thing well than 10 things not at all.”
(Youth Worker, Wales)

An English Youth Parliament?
At present, the Welsh MYPs feel that English MYPs do not take them seriously, either dismissing their input or speaking down to them. They feel that their input and experience with Funky Dragon gives them valuable insights that are not being recognised by UKYP. They support an English Youth Parliament, plus an umbrella forum made up of 20 MYPs from the four nations meeting in person on an annual basis to discuss non-devolved issues. They recognise that there are far fewer young people in the devolved nations – Wales and Northern Ireland in particular – but do not think that this should be reflected in the number of representatives they send to a UK Forum. They feel that the four nations should have equal voices and that this can be achieved only by having equal numbers of representatives.

Annual meetings would be rotated amongst the four devolved nations. The host nation would be responsible for the event and funding should be given directly to that nation. Any underspend would be returned following the event, whilst any overspend would be the responsibility of the host nation. This would allow young people in all nations to take some responsibility and ownership for work at a UK level and would help to make them feel an inclusive and integral part of the UK. This approach is seen as a way of resolving existing difficulties and giving Welsh MYPs a greater voice in the UKYP forum.

Welsh MYPs wish to stress their commitment to UKYP and to emphasise that their criticisms are made out of frustration and in the interests of making things work better.
Northern Ireland Youth Forum
At present, the level of involvement with UKYP from young people in Northern Ireland is very low, with only 3 MYPs representing the whole of the nation. The following is based on interviews carried out with two young people.

Many of the topics raised in relation to Northern Ireland are common to Wales and Scotland, though the solutions may differ. These include:

- establishing solid foundations for the organisation as a whole
  - debate current LEA-based structure
  - ensure flexibility across different nations / regions
  - consider inclusion of representatives from interest groups / other organisations
  - consider shadowing MPs
  - re-structure UKYP year: elections in September followed by Sitting prior to Christmas

- raising the upper age limit – and maybe the lower age limit too

- developing more effective internal communication

- developing mechanisms to allow more MYPs to get involved in decision-making

- increasing resources and better use of existing resources
  - more staff
  - offices within each of the four nations
  - coordinators with experience in youth work and the voluntary sector as well as awareness of policies within each of the nations
  - overseas trips (eg, to Bahrain) are seen as unwise use of resources in the current context

- more creative approach to fund-raising
  - drop reluctance to seek corporate sponsorship

Young people from Northern Ireland raise specific issues in addition to the above:

*The first questions to ask*
One of the young people suggested that two questions should be asked of the UKYP:

- If UKYP didn't exist in the morning, what would happen?
- Is UKYP effecting change for young people

The answers given were, respectively, “nothing much” and “not really”. They are not seen as permanent responses, however: the young people in Northern Ireland emphasise their wish to
remain involved with UKYP and help change these answers. Nonetheless, they feel that UKYP needs to take seriously the issues they raise and demonstrate its commitment to change.

It is recognised that the relative importance of UKYP to English MYPs is greater than it is for those in the devolved nations, where it is one of many channels. This is felt to provide an explanation of the difference in attitude towards its status amongst MYPs from Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, who are felt to accord it less importance than English MYPs.

**What does “UK” mean to young people in Northern Ireland**

There are complex historical and political factors which impact on the way in which young people in Northern Ireland view the United Kingdom and it is crucial that any organisation seeking to engage their support understands them. “UK” can be a very divisive concept and exclusive of around 45% of young people throughout Northern Ireland.

It is paramount that UKYP recognises this and is sensitive to the impact on young people of its behaviour in relation to Northern Ireland. Much of the initial support given to UKYP by young people within Northern Ireland is felt to have been withdrawn because of a lack of sensitivity. English MYPs and UKYP management are criticised for not being sufficiently aware of major dynamics in Northern Ireland politics and of their importance to the relationship between Northern Ireland and the UK as a whole — for example, the Good Friday Agreement, the concept of reserved issues and the changing relationship between the North and its neighbour in the south. It is felt that any UK organisation wishing to include Northern Ireland as an active partner will increasingly also need to engage with the Republic.

**More real politics**

It is seen as important for UKYP to forge relationships with the youth branches of political parties and become more involved with real political debates. There is some suggestion that, at the moment, involvement in UKYP is seen by English MYPs in particular as a “career move” rather than an opportunity to bring about positive change in the lives of young people. There is also felt to be a need to engage with the Irish Youth Parliament.

The reluctance to form relationships with religious organisations is also questioned: this may be of particular pertinence within Northern Ireland.

**A positive public face**

The equal inclusion of young people from all the nations within the UK in media coverage, meetings with politicians and positions of responsibility within UKYP is seen as crucial. At present, the UKYP “brand” is felt to play to the stereotype of the young, white English male “fogey” and this is seen as off-putting, in particular to young people from Northern Ireland.

**Critical but not unconditional support**

Young people from Northern Ireland support UKYP and wish to remain involved. However, for young people there to regain their interest, their criticisms need to be tackled. Northern Ireland
needs to be included in discussions about its future and to have its views listened to and addressed.
Consultation with Young People

None of the young people taking part in the consultation had heard of the UKYP. This includes those who sit on their School Council, young people aware of a “young mayor” scheme in their area and young people sitting Politics at ‘A’ level who participate in UN Youth fora. Amongst the young people taking part in the survey, 16% have heard of UKYP, most of who learned of it through youth councils, youth services or clubs (31%); 15% (6 people) heard of it through school.

Politics and democracy

The majority of those involved see politics as “boring”, irrelevant and remote from their lives: they see no relationship between their everyday activities and problems and political decision-making. Politicians are pictured as male, middle-class and “old” and, by some, as “hypocritical.” One or two see them as “fighting for their communities” but not doing a very good job. A majority of young people are able to name the Prime Minister and many do spontaneously, in response to being asked what is the first thing they associate with politics.

The views of politics expressed by the majority of young people are perhaps unsurprising: they have little or no access to the language, conventions or culture of political life and it appears to them that little effort is made to facilitate access. Some are unfamiliar with the word “democracy” – though very willing to engage in discussion about it once the concept is clarified. Those who are familiar with the word describe it in terms of “people working together” on “things that matter.” However, many feel that it is not the correct word to describe the political system in the UK and are bemused by the thought that they themselves might rule or have any power when they are 18 and able to vote. The young people studying politics are more knowledgeable, defining democracy as “government of the people, for the people, by the people.”

Chart 11: Who are young people willing to talk to and who do they think listens?
(Base: 367 – 242 YP, 64 MYPs, 61 stakeholders)
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Chart 11 shows that MYPs are significantly more likely than young people to contact local or national government or school councils on issues of importance to them. (It should be noted that this question asks what people think they would do, not what they have done.) Stakeholders’ views are most in line with those of young people. MYPs are also more likely to say that these bodies listen to young people. This is perhaps unsurprising: MYPs are more likely to have access to government and more likely to be listened to, because of their position within the UKYP and the positive relationship with the government enjoyed by UKYP. They are therefore more likely to be confident of their abilities to gain access and for their views to be acknowledged.

**Youth Politics**

Initially, the great majority of young people say that “nerd” or “geek” are the most apposite words to describe the sort of young person who is likely to be involved with the UKYP. They are seen as people who work hard at school, “do all their homework” and, for many, are people who “don’t have a life” or who want to go into politics “and make a name for themselves.” Overall, the young people who go into youth politics are seen as “not like us.”

However, further discussion can lead to revision of this view: when removed from the context and language of “politics” many grow more enthusiastic and adopt a different stance, seeing getting involved in terms of standing up for your rights, supporting friends and family and fighting for what you believe in. The sort of person who should be going into youth politics is seen as someone who understands young people’s lives, the problems they face and what they want.

“[Politics is] a bunch of old men arguing about stupid things.”
(Teenage pregnancy unit)

“If they’re not going to listen to us, why should we listen to them?”
(Teenage pregnancy unit)

“It’s telling people what they can’t do.” (PRU)

Some of the young people in one of the mainstream schools had been involved in an attempt to get a skate park in their neighbourhood and had organised fund raising events and media coverage to help them. However, it seems they had no part in decisions about the type of facilities that were eventually provided and, as a consequence, they felt that their fund-raising efforts had been betrayed by their lack of involvement in spending the money.

**UK Youth Parliament**

When the UKYP is described to young people, a majority see it as a good idea. They know that, as individuals, their voices are unlikely to be heard and recognise the need for an organisation that can bring them together to present a focused argument. However, few of those contributing to the consultation are able to see themselves involved. For some, this is because their lives are currently chaotic and they feel powerless; the conceptual leap from recognising that something is
a good idea to them being part of it themselves is too great. For others, the initial view of UKYP is that it probably has “an image problem” and could lack “credibility”.

The young people we consulted felt that the specifically political image would be particularly off-putting for younger people. They felt those at ‘AS’ / ‘A’ level would be more secure in their views and less likely to be swayed by their peers’ opinions – that is, less likely to be concerned by being called a “geek.” The relationship with national government is also a downside for many: the government is seen as something that does things to you, or gives you things, not as a body which you might influence or with which you could have a discussion.

**What would encourage you to get involved with UKYP?**

![Image of a diagram discussing UKYP]

Young men, ‘A’ level students, Plymouth

**Issues important to young people**

Predominant amongst the concerns of the young people taking part in the Review are local issues that affect them on a day-to-day basis. The young women in the teenage pregnancy unit are concerned with their financial situation and transport – both cost and the difficulty of getting buggies on the bus: young men in PRUs tend to focus on their relationship with the police and on the shortage of affordable, accessible and enjoyable activities: refugees and asylum seekers speak of racism, of poor relationships with the police and are unclear as to why many avenues are closed to them – for example, education and employment.
Young people living in areas with high numbers of asylum seekers and refugees have very negative attitudes towards them. Young women in Newcastle describe them as “rapists” and speak of “Kosovans who have free pine furniture, shopping vouchers, driving lessons and their rent paid.” Those in Lewisham would like to “kick out all the Afghans and asylum seekers.”

While most of the young people, with the exception of the refugees and asylum seekers, do not express their concerns in “traditional” political language, it is clear that all of their lives are bound up with decisions made in Parliament and that on some issues they have strongly held views. The following themes emerge as important to young people:

- **Having something to do**
  - Many speak of a lack of enjoyable and affordable activities
  - Young women feel that their interests can be more difficult to organise

- **People carrying weapons**
  - Guns (Birmingham and London in particular)
  - Knives

- **Bullying**
  - Peer support schemes are welcomed – allow for discussion of incidents and feelings can be discussed without having to talk to teachers

- **Racism**
  - This issue mentioned in Liverpool in particular

- **Relationships with the police**
  - Police are in general seen as “the enemy”
  - Accused of harassment and of moving young people on – this issue linked to lack of activities – young women would like “somewhere to chat” with groups of friends, without upsetting adults / police
  - A few said they know one or two “ok” police officers with whom they get on

- **Personal safety on the streets**
  - In some areas, young people feel there should be more police

- **More input into school curriculum**
  - Inconsistency in available options, depending on which school you attend, seen as unfair
- Greater choice in subjects studied

- **Finances**
  - Young women in the teenage pregnancy unit concerned about access to benefits – eg, milk tokens, maternity grants etc

- **Cinema / video classification**
  - Resentment amongst many at not being able to see films / videos they see as “harmless”

- **Sex education**
  - This is seen as “unbalanced” with limited information on infections and the emotional / psychological aspects
  - Should be available to young children
  - Teenage mothers would like more on the affects of alcohol and drugs on their willpower, in relation to sex
  - They would also welcome realistic information on just how much work it is having and bringing up a child

- **Drugs education**
  - Seen as delivered by people who know nothing (and some say, who lie)
  - Information should be given by someone who’s had experience of drugs

- **The Iraq war**
  - The great majority were against the war
  - Some said this was because no weapons of mass destruction had been found
  - Those who supported it did so on the basis of the safety of the UK

- **Decriminalisation of cannabis**
  - All of the young people supported this

- **Tuition fees for higher education**
  - ‘A’ level students particularly concerned about this issue

**Why get involved?**

A majority of the young people would welcome the opportunity to have more control over the things that affect their lives. However, the leap between awareness of and concern about the issues and getting involved is seen by many as too great for them to make: they cannot picture themselves “getting involved” and would not know how to go about it.
Chart 12: Why should young people be involved?
(Base: 367 – 242 YP, 64 MYPs, 61 stakeholders)

- Young people are citizens of this country and have a right to influence things that affect them (69%
  Young people are citizens of this country and should speak out on important issues (35%)
- The government said that it will listen to young people (36%)
- Involving yp in planning/decision-making will help become good citizens (23%)
- Young people use services; we need to understand their experiences to improve them (11%)

Encouraging involvement
Suggestions about what would encourage young people to get involved with UKYP focus on two key areas:
- Raising awareness of UKYP
- Providing evidence of its effectiveness

Chart 13 shows strong support for a range of methods by which involvement might be increased. Lower the voting age receives the least support, though it is still high, at around two-thirds of each audience. Amongst young people, some demonstration that their involvement actually makes a difference gains most support. This is interesting: in conjunction with the views on a lower voting age and the general scepticism about voting mentioned above, it suggests that voting, as a way of being involved with political process, is not seen by young people as a way in which to effect noticeable change.

Locally based outreach methods are seen as the most effective way of encouraging involvement. Young people already involved talking in schools about their experiences, providing local facilities for young people and building relationships between school councils and local youth groups all receive very strong support.
Chart 14 suggests, however, that voting as such may not be such a sticking point. A clear majority of young people see themselves as likely to vote for UKYP, with text and e-voting gaining the most support. This leaves the question of whether it is voting for national government or voting at a polling station that is unappealing to young people.

Chart 14: % agreeing that they are likely to get involved with UKYP by
(Base: 367 – 242 YP, 64 MYPs, 61 Stakeholders)
Raising awareness
This is a complex issue, demanding a range of approaches. Which approach is appropriate will depend on a range of factors: for example, which young people are being targeted, what the issue is, what the desired outcomes are. Reaching homeless young people will require a different approach to reaching ‘A’ level students; the channels for communicating with 11 year olds will be very different to those for communicating 18 year olds.

However, there are some constants, as the young people themselves point out. First, “use our language”: the language and references used must be familiar, whether written or spoken. Second, references to politics are off-putting to many young people; issue-based approaches may be more effective. Third, personal contact is most effective when it comes from “people like us”. Fourth, explain the “nuts and bolts” clearly – who gets involved, how do they get involved, how much time is needed, what do people do? Eliminating the unknowns is very important. Finally (though perhaps not exhaustively), getting involved needs to be fun: young people’s time is likely to be limited, for a range of reasons. Art, music, drama, sport or new technologies can be effective media for raising awareness whilst also interesting young people on a more general level.

There is also a debate amongst young people about the channels for raising awareness and involvement: for some, using schools is seen as ideal, since the audience is “captive” and UKYP can be explored as part of the citizenship agenda. Others feel that this formal approach is inappropriate and will alienate many of the young people that UKYP should be seeking to include – they feel that using youth clubs and other youth groups is more effective.

Providing evidence of effectiveness
Many of the young people showed more interest in UKYP when instances of successful campaigns were described to them. One factor in young people’s scepticism over the value of trying to change or influence issues is the length of time between effort and result, or the absence of any result. Wider dissemination of UKYP’s successes and the use of personal stories of the benefits of involvement might go some way towards overcoming this scepticism. This would have to be done with an eye to the other issues which young people find off-putting – eg, language use, appearance etc.
If I was a member of the UK Youth Parliament, I would.....

Make sure teenagers got enough help with pregnancy, drugs and S.A.D.'s and try and make SE London a better safer place.

Lewisham, young man, 14
Conclusion
UKYP is a young organisation with high ambitions and, over the three years of its life, has clearly had an impact on the lives of those who are involved with it. Despite limited and short-term funding and few full-time staff, it has achieved a considerable amount. MYPs are passionate about claiming their right to speak out and be heard. They have met MPs and Ministers, developed relationships with government departments and appeared on national news programmes. ‘Youth workers’ effort and dedication has led to huge increases in UKYP’s electoral base in some local authorities.

The Review has raised a series of issues that need to be addressed if UKYP is to build on its initial achievements. Support in some areas of the country has declined: in the North East, there is a question over the region’s continued involvement with UKYP. The devolved nations feel that the UKYP has a distinct English focus and fails to recognise the differences between them or take advantage of their experience. Relationships with other youth organisations are few and communication can be poor.

UKYP is at a turning point. Stakeholders and MYPs say that many of the points they have raised in the Review have been raised before. Some have been addressed. However, many remain outstanding and resolving them is crucial for UKYP’s future success. Building on the suggestions of stakeholders and MYPs, we have developed a series of recommendations, which we hope will prompt debate within UKYP and seed its future growth. If the opportunity for reform is not seized and UKYP fails to tackle the issues, its future is less secure. We hope the former route is taken.

Recommendations
Our primary recommendation is that UKYP reform should focus on outcomes. The policy consequences of UKYP's relationship with government and the social and political consequences to young people of their involvement with UKYP should guide the development of new structures, processes and protocols.

Our specific recommendations fall under the following headings:

- **Engagement**
  - Increase diversity of young people involved with UKYP, increased participation by non-MYPs
  - A multi-level approach to engagement
  - Increase opportunities for active involvement by all MYPs

- **Funding**
  - Increased funding targeted to specific needs
  - Uniformity of funding for all MYPs
• **Structure**
  – Ensure structure is sufficiently flexible to allow wide participation
  – Introduce greater autonomy at regional and local levels
  – Raise the upper age limit for MYPs to match that of the devolved nations

• **Networking and partnerships**
  – Formal and informal
  – Local, regional and national

• **English Youth Parliament**
  – Increase regional autonomy
  – Increase local consultation
  – Annual UK Summit, bringing together all four youth parliaments

• **Leadership and Management**
  – Develop young leaders
  – Management provides support and organisational back-up
  – Scrutiny committee of young people oversees management

• **Communication**
  – Develop internal and external communication strategies
  – Address inefficiencies in communication
Part 3

Desk Research and Literature Review

Part 3 describes the UKYP. Information is drawn from materials provided by UKYP, from desk research, the internet and other sources and from interviews with key stakeholders and was correct at the time of writing. However, it should be noted that UKYP and the other youth parliaments and organisations mentioned are developing and changing rapidly and so information may quickly become out of date.

The Aims of the UKYP

The 2003 Manifesto of the UK Youth Parliament (UKYP) states that it “aims to:

• give the young people of the UK, between the ages of 11 and 18 (inclusive) a voice, which will be heard and listened to by local and national government, providers of services for young people and other agencies who have an interest in the views and needs of young people. The UKYP has a rolling programme, meets nationally on an annual basis, and gives the young people of the UK a chance to express their views and concerns at the highest levels

• ensure that the young people of the UK are given a voice on any issue that affects them and as laid out in Article 12 of the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child

• give the young people of the UK an opportunity to be involved in a democratic process at a national level.

The UKYP is an a-political organisation, which seeks to represent no party political view and is therefore solely issue based.²

The MYPs

The UKYP is composed of members, known as Members of the Youth Parliament (MYPs). There are currently 415 MYPs from across the four countries of the UK and anyone between the ages of 11 to 18 is eligible to stand for election as long as they are a permanent resident of the UK.³

MYPs represent constituencies, or specific areas of the country, which relate to existing local education authority areas. The constituency of an MYP might be a borough, a city, a district or a county. The number of MYPs elected varies according to the proportion of young people in that particular area. For example the London Borough of Hackney has been allocated one MYPs, Derby City has been allocated two and the county of Derbyshire has been allocated four. Each constituency has been allocated a least one MYP.⁴

² p 2, UKYP Manifesto and Agenda for Action 2003
³ UKYP website
⁴ Figures from the UKYP
The UKYP aims to be representative of all young people in the UK. In the 2002/03 parliament, 77 of English local education authorities were represented by MYPs; in the current round of elections, this has increased to 87%, accounting for approximately 92% of the youth population aged between 11 – 18 inclusive, in England. (See Appendices for further background information on the UKYP.)

Identification & Election of MYPs

MYPs are elected for one year, with elections generally taking place between November and February. Elections are conducted locally and a timescale for each area/region is set prior to the election of the MYPs. Planning for the elections begins in the summer when information packs are sent to schools and youth workers asking if they wish to be involved in the youth parliament.

The first stage in the electoral process is to identify the young people who are interested in taking part, either as an MYP candidate or a delegate. All those who express an interest in standing for election go to a workshop, which is normally held around October, and must be attended by all potential candidates. The workshops are organised by the local authorities and are based around the ideas of citizenship, democracy, representation, the UKYP and the role of the MYP and the duties involved. Potential candidates are then asked to explain why they should be elected to stand; their proposals could take the form of a short paragraph, a poster or a video. Candidates are selected on the basis of these.

The elections that follow are conducted using ballot boxes and booths in order to ensure anonymity. The MYPs are announced a week later, normally at a ceremony held at the local authority offices. Those candidates who stood for election but did not win a seat as an MYP are appointed as Deputy MYPs.

The scale of election campaigns can vary from area to area and the amount of work that goes into the campaign depends on the teachers, youth workers and the young people involved. Some might involve the whole community, its councillors and MPs whilst others are much smaller, within a school or youth organisation. The voter turnout in elections also varies. The highest turnout recorded for the 2002 elections was in Blackpool, where 42% of all young people aged between 11 and 16 voted and 31% of all young people aged between 11 and 18 voted.

---

5 Figures from the Annual Report to Children & Young People’s Unit – 2002/03, p.6
6 Figures from the Annual Report to Children & Young People’s Unit – 2002/03, p. 3

Review of the UKYP Youth Parliament
OPM page 88
Final Report
Case Study: Cheshire, The Democratic Process for the Involvement of Young People
In Cheshire the MYPs were identified and selected in stages. The first stage involved a UKYP road show in November 2002 to promote UKYP Cheshire to young people, in which 39 representatives from Voluntary and Statutory Youth Agencies and High Schools attended. Those that wished to participate in the UKYP attended the second stage. The second stage comprised fun days in each of the six localities of Cheshire, the purpose of which was to enable the stakeholders to define the qualities and skills required to become an MYP. 167 young people took part in this stage and at the end of each fun day 14 representatives were selected for each locality, 2 to stand as candidates and 12 as delegates. The final stage was the election day which was held at County Hall and although only the 85 delegates attended, 1,200 votes were cast via the telephone from the participating Cheshire schools and pupils were able to watch the event by logging on to a live web cam. For next year’s elections schools and youth organisations will be able to cast their votes via the internet as well as the telephone, which will be controlled through usernames and passwords.

The Work of an MYP
It is the duty of MYPs and Deputy MYPs to represent all the young people within their area at a local level and a national level (although Deputy MYPs are not permitted to attend the national convening of the UKYP). To do this they need to collect views and opinions from youth and school councils and voluntary organisations such as scouts and guides, in their local area.

MYPs need also to communicate regularly with their local government and with their MP. Some MYPs have regular contact with their MPs; for example MYPs in Bournemouth and Norfolk have held joint surgeries with their MPs for young people and have worked together to address the issues facing young people in their constituencies. Other MYPs have spent up to a week shadowing their MP; those MPs who have participated include, Charles Clarke, David Jamieson, Patrick McCormack, Angela Smith and Oliver Letwin. Other MPs have offered MYPs the use of their facilities - for example David Milliband’s office was used to organise and hold the election of the MYP in the constituency of South Tyneside and Hilton Dawson offered MYPs from Lancashire the use of his office and its facilities.8 MYPs within the constituency also meet regularly, normally once every six weeks, to discuss issues that are then fed back to the UKYP.

The UKYP meets annually only once, at an event called the Annual Sitting, during which all MYPs discuss issues of policy and procedure. However, activities are organised for every month of the year (apart from June which is exam season), as follows:

---

7 From The Democratic Process for the Involvement of Young People, Election 2003, Summary & Results. Report compiled by Cheshire County Council
8 Information from the Annual Report to Children & Young People’s Unit – 2002/03, p. 2
January | Elections
---|---
February | "Express Yourself" which is an opportunity for new MYPs to meet with old MYPs to which all MPs are invited to attend,
March | Select Committees are organised
April | Regional meetings commence,
May | Select Committees meet
July | Convening of the UKYP
August | Ratification of the manifesto
September | Procedures Group Meeting and Regional Meetings are held
October | Meetings with Government Ministers to hear their responses to the manifesto
November | A National Debate, held in Portcullis House and led by MYPs and involves government ministers, MPs and voluntary groups.
December | The Year End, meeting of the Procedures Groups with old and new members, with skills training and handing over of the work load.

**Support for MYPs**

MYPs are supported regionally by the UKYP, through a Regional Coordinator and locally, by a Local Authority Support Worker. Regional Coordinators are appointed by the UKYP; some, though not all, Regional Coordinators have previous experience of youth work and participation.

The role of Regional Coordinators is to ensure that MYPs are supported, by:
- facilitating regular meetings of MYPs and their support workers
- developing media links for MYPs
- ensuring that MYPs accurately represent the views of the region
- identifying ways in which the UKYP can involve young people other than those elected
- identifying and supporting key workers for MYPs
- meeting training requirements for MYPs and their support workers
- coordinating the elections.

The remit of the local authority appointed Support Worker is to:
- provide safe travel arrangements for their MYPs
- organise suitable support for MYPs to attend UKYP regional, Procedures Group and Select Committee meetings
- assist in organising the elections
- support MYPs to develop the local networks in order to represent local young people
- support MYPs to make presentations and meet with their local government
• provide information to MYPs about areas that they can go to for support.

In the past year, UKYP has created a service level agreement (SLA) that has been sent to all participating authorities, to ensure that a minimum standard of provision is provided by all local authorities. The SLA outlines the role and the responsibilities of the local authority and the UKYP. Under its terms, the local authority is responsible for providing a support worker and a support mechanism to the MYPs as well as funding, whilst the UKYP in turn provides a national structure, a regional coordinator and guidelines on how to conduct the elections.

Financially, the UKYP is supported largely through Government funding from the Children’s and Young Person’s Unit, which for this financial year (2003/04) has given £110,000 to support the UKYP nationally and £55,000 to support its regional activities. The UKYP is also given money by local authorities, who last financial year (2002/03) contributed £49,200 and by grant making trusts and private sponsorship. The UKYP also receives the support of over 300 MPs from across all major parties as well as their leaders. See Appendices for SLA and details of UKYP finances.

Core Systems
Staff
Five members of staff run the UKYP nationally, all of who have a one year fixed term contract:
• General Manager (Peter Clarke)
• National Development Coordinator (Kate Parish)
• Strategic Coordinator (Joseph Poon)
• Two administrative staff who support the work of the General Manager and National Development Coordinator

The UKYP also provides Regional Coordinators for participating regions.

Management
The UKYP is a registered charity under the name of Democracy for Young People Ltd and is managed by a Board of Trustees who take responsibility for the overall work of the UKYP. The Board of Trustees comprises young people, including ex-MYPs, MPs, national organisations involved with young people such as the National Children’s Bureau and representatives from different areas of the UK. For example, the Scottish Youth Parliament Director and members of the Welsh Youth Organisation, Funky Dragon both currently sit on the Board of Trustees. One third of the board have their positions reviewed yearly and a Trustee’s term can last 3 to 4 years.

---

9 Figures from UKYP Financial Memorandum: Conditions Attached to Grant
10 Figures from Democracy for Young People Limited Trustees’ Report and Accounts for Year Ended 31 March 2003
Recent changes to the Board of Trustees have seen an increase in the number of younger trustees.

The UKYP also has an Advisory Group that consists of national charities and organisations that are involved with young people and local authorities. The Advisory Group is formed from the Steering Group that guided the UKYP to its first Sitting in 2001.

**Structures & Administration**

The UKYP works at a local, regional and national level. MYPs are drawn from Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and nine English regions: London, South East, South West, Eastern, Yorkshire and Humberside, North West, North East, East Midlands and West Midlands.

Nationally, the UKYP is overseen by a Procedures Group: two serving MYPs from each region are elected to sit on the Group, which aims to meet five times a year, with a minimum number of three meeting. The Procedures Group is directly responsible for ensuring communication between the UKYP nationally and the UKYP regionally. Members must provide regular feedback to their regional groups and assist their regional coordinator.

The Procedures Group also coordinates the work of the Select Committees which operate at a national level to formulate the manifesto for the UKYP. There are seven Select Committees, which mirror roughly government departments:

- Activities, Media and Fun
- Better Society
- Education and Opportunities
- Environment
- Health
- Law and Society
- UK and International Matters

Select Committees meet at least three times a year and are responsible for playing a leading role in developing the national UKYP Manifesto and Action Plan. They do this by collecting opinions and evidence from young people within the MYP’s region, which are presented to the relevant Select Committee. The outcomes of committee meetings are fed back to the regional groups on a regular basis. Select Committees must also be in frequent communication with the appropriate government department.

---

11 UKYP Operational Guidelines, p. 1
Links to Existing Youth Democracy

The UKYP has established links with the existing youth fora of Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, although at present it seems to have its strongest links with the Scottish Youth Parliament who have agreed a draft service level agreement with the UKYP\textsuperscript{12}.

The Scottish Youth Parliament (http://www.scottishyouthparliament.org.uk) was launched at Murrayfield Stadium in Edinburgh in 1999. It consists of a group of 200 democratically elected young people aged between 14 and 25 years and is funded by the Scottish Executive. The Scottish Youth Parliament meets three times a year and has links with the Scottish Executive and the European Youth Parliament. In its consultation document *Pointing the Way Forward* the SYP defined its relationship with the UKYP.

“The Scottish Youth Parliament supports the Concordat between the Scottish Youth Parliament and the United Kingdom Youth Parliament as a positive symbol of young people across the United Kingdom working together”\textsuperscript{13}

UKYP’s links with the Welsh youth forum Funky Dragon (http://www.funkydragon.org) are less strong than those with the SYP. Funky Dragon was set up for young people to voice their opinions on Welsh issues: its website states: “Our aim is to give 0 – 25 year olds the opportunity to get their voices heard on issues that affect them.” Whilst representatives of Funky Dragon sit on the Board of Trustees of the UKYP and some members of Funky Dragon are also MYPs, no service level agreement has been established between UKYP and Funky Dragon\textsuperscript{14}. Funky Dragon has direct links with the Welsh Assembly and meets with ministers for health, social services and education and lifelong learning twice a year.

The UKYP also has links with Northern Ireland through the Youth Council for Northern Ireland (http://www.youthcouncil-ni.org.uk), which focuses on “the provision for and interests of children and young people aged 4 -25 years.”\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Annual Report to Children and Young People’s Unit – 2002/3, p7
\textsuperscript{13} Pointing the Way Forward, p. 6
\textsuperscript{14} Taken from minutes of a meeting between Funky Dragon and the Welsh Affairs Select Committee on 9 April 2003.
\textsuperscript{15} Information from the Youth Council for Northern Ireland website
Funky Dragon Structure

Management committee
Four adult representatives
Four young people over 18
Four children and young people under 18

Grand Council
80 children and young people from across Wales coming from:
22 Local Authority Wide Youth Forums
22 Local Authority Otter
6 special interest groups
8 others who are co-opted

The Annual General Meeting

Local children and youth Forums
Other peer-led or representative groups of children and young people

Taken from [http://www.funkydragon.org/fe/textonly.asp?n1=2](http://www.funkydragon.org/fe/textonly.asp?n1=2).
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Appendices

Examples of Best Practice Within Youth Democracy

There are a number youth parliaments that exist around the world and the examples can broadly be divided up into those that are consultative, such as the UKYP, which actively promote the views of young people to the national government, those that are created for educational purposes with the aim of educating young people about democracy and the workings of their national legislature and those that are issue based dedicated to the promotion of one issue such as poverty and development.

Consultative Youth Democracies

Ontario Youth Parliament (http://www.oyp.on.ca)

Canada contains active regional youth democracies within all its provinces, one example is from Ontario where youth participation is organised through a youth senate and a youth parliament. The Youth Senate exists as an advisory board to the parliament to ensure long-term continuity of rules and procedures. The parliament is composed of 150 delegates from across the province and like the UKYP it is non-partisan in structure. The parliament meets once a year to discuss relevant issues and the decisions reached are then forwarded to the appropriate provincial agencies to action.

Youth Parliament of Albania (http://www.unicef.org/albania/what_we_do/yp.htm)

The youth parliament in Albania consists of six representative assemblies for young people aged between 14 and 18 years and was established by UNICEF with the aims of; ‘amplifying the voice of young people to the decision makers, reducing the gap between the institutions and young people’s priorities, creating a sense of solidarity among young people from various districts/regions/nations and optimise resources for young people’

The parliaments are regionally based and exist in six of the twelve Albanian prefectures: Tirana, Vlora, Korca, Kukes and Shkodra and Gjirokastra.

Elections were first held in schools on 23 May 2001 and were organised with the permission of the Education Departments in the regions and the cooperation of the school principals. Election campaigns were conducted and included school newsletters, TV debates and school electoral meetings. Around 35,000 young people voted, which is thought to be 90% of those that were eligible.

As a result of the elections there are now 200 democratically elected youth parliamentarians throughout the six regions, 60% of whom are female. Their role is to prepare youth action agendas whilst learning about civic affairs through working in partnership with municipal and
national officials. The action agendas are then presented to the individual municipal governments.

**Junior Council in Tanzania**
The Junior Council in Tanzania has 70 members who represent the views of young people from the 25 regions of Tanzania and prior to sitting on the council each person is given training on the importance of Article 12 of the UN Convention and the importance of political participation. The council works in partnership with the government to consult with young people on ways of developing children’s rights and Tanzania.

**Palestinian Youth Council**
The Palestinian Youth Council is a non governmental organisation set up by the United Nations with the aim of enhancing the role of young people in the process of development and decision making, as well as their participation in community-oriented activities. The Youth Council consists of 10 regional councils of children aged 16 to 18 throughout the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The youth council lobbies government and the United Nations.

**Educational Youth Democracies**

*Youth Parliament of New Zealand* ([link](http://www.youthaffairs.govt.nz/sec.cfm?i=8))
The New Zealand Youth Parliament is convened once every three years and the fourth parliament is due to be held in 2004. The parliament exists to give young people an understanding of as well as the opportunity to participate in the parliamentary process. Although, largely educational the youth parliament is partly consultative as the Youth MPs’ views are taken into account by elected MPs. However the youth MPs are not democratically elected by their peers, instead they are selected by their local MP to represent the views of their peers, although each sitting of the youth parliament has included Youth MPs from a range of cultural groups and those with disabilities.

Once selected as a Youth MP and prior to attending the youth parliament they meet with young people in their local area to listen to the issues that are affecting them so that they can accurately represent their peers’ views. Within the two days that the parliament is convened the Youth MPs participate in mock legislative debates in the House of Representatives, host select committees of government agencies and have the opportunity to put questions to cabinet ministers. The Youth Press Gallery in which young people take over the parliamentary press gallery taking the role of reporters, broadcasters, interviewing and writing articles, conducts media coverage of the event.

**Issue Based Youth Democracies**

*The International Youth Parliament* ([link](http://www.iyp.oxfam.org))
The International Youth Parliament (IYP) was created by Oxfam and is composed of a network of young people aged 15 to 28 years old from 150 countries. The parliament exists in order to create positive social change particularly in the developing world and their vision is of "youth building an equitable, sustainable and peaceful world".
The first sitting of the parliament was in Sydney in October in 2000 and the next sitting is due to be held in July 2004. Delegates are not democratically elected but apply to sit on the IYP. Each parliamentary sitting launches the next round of activities. The aims of the IYP 2000 included the development of individual action plans, exchange of best practice, consolidation of networks providing information, the attraction of the media and the broader community to youth related issues and the support and endorsement for the conventions and initiatives which empower young people around the world.

The parliament was based around action issues from which each delegate formulated an individual action plan and upon returning home they begin to implement it at a local, regional and global level. At present 72% of delegates’ Action Plans generated at IYP2000 are either ongoing or have been completed. In between the sittings of the IYP all delegates are linked electronically through the use of thematic e-lists and fortnightly electronic newsletters.

African Youth Parliament (http://www.ayparliament.org/)

The African Youth Parliament (AYP) was established by the 2000 IYP, during which the African delegates decided that they would like to have their own parliament to discuss African issues and develop strategies around those issues. The AYP’s vision is to “harness the cumulative energies of African youth to engage them in continuous action and dialogue, directed at building a peaceful, equitable and sustainable Africa.”

The AYP is a growing network of young Africans ranging from 18 to 28 years of age. The first sitting of the AYP took place in Nairobi in March 2003 and focused on breaking the cycle of poverty, youth in conflict, youth fighting HIV/AIDS, leadership and governance in Africa and socio-economic development.
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Democracy for Young People Limited
Report of the Trustees for the year ended 31 March 2003

The trustees, who are also directors of the charity for the purposes of the Companies Act, submit their annual report and the financial statements for the Year Ended 31 March 2003. The trustees have adopted the provisions of the Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) “Accounting and Reporting by Charities” issued in October 2000 in preparing the annual report and financial statements of the charity.

The charity is a charitable company limited by guarantee and was incorporated on 24 January 2001. It is governed by a memorandum and articles of association. Its objects are to advance the education of children and young people in the principles and practice of parliamentary democracy and the promotion of good citizenship by the establishment of a youth parliament.

The charity is organised so that the trustees meet regularly to manage its affairs.

Trustees
All directors of the company are also trustees of the charity, and there are no other trustees. All of the trustees listed on page 2 served throughout the year, unless appointed or resigned as shown. Trustees are appointed at the Annual General Meeting in accordance with the Memorandum and Articles of Association and the board has the power to appoint additional trustees as it considers fit to do so.

Review of activities and future developments
The Statement of Financial Activities for the year is set out on page 10 of the financial statements. A summary of the financial results and the work of the charity is set out below:

2002/3 has been a year of great progress and challenge for UKYP. It was a year marked by increased involvement of young people in UKYP activities, increased acknowledgement of UKYP by Government and the major political parties at Westminster, but also increased expectations which our very limited resources were not always able to meet as we would like.

The report first looks at the main political activities of UKYP and then looks at progress in relation to each of the objectives in the UKYP Business plan for the year.

1. The main political and youth agenda developments
Ministerial and Westminster based Political Activities
The year saw a particularly positive development in terms of contact between Members of the Youth Parliament (MYPs) and Ministers and opposition front benches. These have a useful role for each party – it gives politicians the opportunity to hear at first hand the views of young people who carry their own democratic validity, and for young people it indicates that their views are being taken seriously. There is still an issue to be addressed about feeding back to young people about how their views and influence are actually bringing about change.

Amongst others, dialogue was held with Tony Blair, Prime Minister; John Prescott, Deputy Prime Minister; Tessa Jowell, Secretary of State for Culture Media & Sport; Patricia Hewitt, Minister for Women and Secretary of State for Trade & Industry; Ian Duncan Smith, Leader of the Opposition; Michael Ancram, Shadow Secretary of State for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs; Damian Green, Shadow spokesperson on Education; Charles Kennedy, Leader of the Liberal Democrats; Phil Willis MP, Lib Dem Spokesperson on Education & Skills.
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Relationships with MPs:
A growing number of MYPs are establishing a regular working relationship with their MPs. MYPs in Bournemouth and Norfolk, for example, have held joint surgeries with their MPs for young people, and work together to address the problems faced by young people in their constituencies.

In addition many MYPs have also spent up to a week shadowing their MP. MPs to have been shadowed by MYPs have included Charles Clarke, David Jamieson, Patrick McCormack, Angela Smith and Oliver Letwin.

Angela Smith was also the first MP to ask a question in the House of Commons on behalf of her MYP – Amy Cox from Thurrock.

David Miliband’s office was instrumental in organising and holding the election of the MYP in his North East constituency of South Tyneside, and Hilary Danson, MP for Lancaster, offered MYPs from Lancashire the use of his office and its facilities.

Debates and other Parliamentary Activities
During 2002/03 the UKYP developed a strong working relationship with the All Party Parliamentary Group for Children (APPGC). The UKYP helped the secretariat to the APPGC prepare a bid for funding to enable young people to regularly take part in APPGC meetings, and supported MYPs and Trustees in attending APPGC meetings, although meeting times can be difficult for young people. MYPs were involved in the launch of the APPGC’s Annual Report however.

In January 2003 12 MYPs attended the first Cross-Cutting Debate On Youth Affairs. The format for such a debate was proposed under the House of Commons Reforms, and the UKYP welcomed the fact that the first debate was on Youth Affairs.

Alongside the meetings with Ministers and MPs, UKYP organised a Transport Debate in the House of Commons in November 2002. The event was oversubscribed by MYPs, youth workers, MPs and Transport Service Providers, etc and was particularly successful. Several transport providers and user committees subsequently contacted the UKYP regarding further consultation with young people; Ministers from both Transport and Health departments offered to work with MYPs and the Countryside Agency has been setting up a project with UKYP for 2003/4 on rural transport.

In February, UKYP held its 2nd Express Yourself event at which new MYPs met with their MPs at the Commons and several “old” MYPs talked about what they had done during their term of office. This was followed by a Question Time session but with MPs in the audience and MYPs on the panel.

Links with Government Departments
The UKYP’s main contact with Government during the year has been with the Children & Young People’s Unit and we particularly welcomed the creation of a dedicated post for liaison and contact with UKYP. A key development during the year was the requirement for Government Departments to develop Action Plans on the involvement of young people in policy development. Progress was hampered in several cases by the lack of appropriate funding within Departments to carry out the work that they had identified and disappointed MYPs wished to pursue issues identified at the Sitting in July which several Departmental representatives attended.

That said during 2002/03 UKYP worked specifically with DEFRA, the Home Office, the Department for Transport, Department of Health and the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) to enable MYPs to maintain a regular dialogue with officials. The links with DWP led to them sponsoring a consultation event in February 2003 to discuss with MYPs around four key areas from the UKYP’s 3rd Manifesto, such as Health & Safety at Work and Housing, etc. The UKYP has subsequently worked with officials at DEFRA, DfE and the Treasury to try to organize similar events.
2. Progress Against Business Plan Objectives

In addition to its main political activities, UKYP was working to a series of objectives in its Business Plan – these relate to quality, operational and organisational activities. The following looks briefly at progress and challenges in each objective area.

Objective 1: Increasing the numbers of young people involved in UKYP.

There is very promising progress here but with several caveats. We have as many as 27,000 young people voting in one local education area (Kent) and as high a proportion as 42% of 11 to 16 year olds voting in another (Blackpool). There is a lot of work to be done however and as with many aspects of our work, UKYP is hampered by scarce resources. Another challenge has been to gather information to show progress. It was more difficult than anticipated gathering standardised or “like for like” data from local authorities – some of local authorities held staged elections, from schools to areas to LEA level, others were organised through Youth Councils; Scottish Youth Parliament “pyramid” approach; and one region, the North East, did not hold new elections but reapportioned the previous year’s MYPs. Where there is clear data on elections, the percentages of the total number of young people voting were as follows for the 2002/03 UKYP Elections: % of young people aged 11-16 75.0% % of 11-18 86.3%

The highest known percentages were in Blackpool where the respective figures were: % of young people aged 11-16 42% % of 11-18 30.8%

Where figures are known, voting increased by over 50% over the previous year’s, (with reductions in voting numbers only apparent in two known cases) and 40% more young people stood for election as MYPs.

Objective 2: Encouraging representative numbers of young people from minorities and of each Gender in UKYP

UKYP has undertaken an Equal Opportunities survey of Members of the Youth Parliament (MYPs) from the 2002/03 election round. Without being complacent, the results are very encouraging and do show some interesting comparisons with the House of Commons in some instances.

45% of MYPs were female (against 18% amongst MPs); 3% of MYPs had disabilities and 0.5% had been in care and 1.9% homeless at some stage. 22% came from rural areas (including urban settlements in predominantly rural areas), 60% from urban areas, and 15% from inner city areas distinct from the last category. 4% reported irregular attendance at school in the past. 4% of MYPs were aged 11-12 yrs, 18% 13-14 yrs, 50% 15-16 yrs and 21% 17-18 yrs.

The table below sets out the ethnic background of MYPs and the population as a whole – the figures for the House of Commons are 2% non-white, 98% white.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>% of UK Population</th>
<th>% of MYPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (MYPs = 80% White + 2% Irish)</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 3: To ensure that all areas within the UK are involved in UKYP,
in 2002/03 144 of the 149 (or 97%) of Local Authorities in England participated with the UKYP. A further
13 Local Authorities agreed to participate in 2003/04, and had young people as observers at meetings and the
sitting, bringing the total to 87%. As many of those not participating are smaller local authorities, this
represents a potential 92% of the 11 to 18 year old population. The biggest challenge continues to be London
with 51% of the local authorities not participating in 2002/3 (nearly 50% of the total), although these are amongst the smallest authorities.

During the year, there were particular issues identified regarding the full involvement in UKYP of young
people in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. As a result there is a series of continuing discussions leading
to clear agreements with the established or emerging organisations representing young people in the nations
which we hope will allow their full involvement in the context of devolution.

Objective 4: To hold co-ordinated annual elections across the UK.
Some of the issues relating to this objective have been mentioned above. We are grateful to local authorities
and other partners who have the responsibility for organizing elections and try to work in partnership with
them to hold these in the same timeframe. This has not always proved possible as local partners have their
own timetables to fit in with. 2002/03 elections were therefore held over a number of months – a few as late as Easter. This has a bearing on the timing of the Annual Sitting amongst other issues. We are currently
encouraging partners to hold elections in January where possible but the ultimately voluntary nature of
involvement will always be a factor affecting the achievement of this aim.

The debate on whether the term of election should be one year, as it is currently, or extended to two, will
continue and will be the subject of votes at the Annual Sitting and it is hoped that local partners would respect
the decisions of young people about this.

Objective 5: To hold an Annual Sitting of all MPs.
The 2002 sitting took place between 15th to 18th July at the University of Leicester. The event for the
overwhelming majority of young people was both successful and enjoyable. The greatly developed sense of
regional group identity was particularly noticeable and highlighted interesting differences between regional
groups.

The sitting was not, however, without its challenges and there were several issues which arose at the time and
from the post-event evaluation, including pre-planning and preparation, and, as mentioned, the need to involve
the nations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland more closely. Planning for the 2003 sitting was therefore
produced by a consultative exercise giving everyone (young people, youth workers, MPs) the opportunity to
make their views known. Directions for the sitting was given by the young people of the Procedures
Group, which has members elected from each region/section to decide on policy direction for UKYP.

Also linked to the sitting, UKYP with Children’s Express and the Mirror Group Newspapers produced a
supplement to the Mirror Newspaper, produced and written by young people about young people and their
active involvement in community life. This had a circulation of over 300,000, and was also sent to every MP
and member of the House of Lords and, with the help of UNICEF, to every secondary school.

Objective 6: Support for MYPs throughout the year.
Through the year, UKYP developed a more comprehensive series of Terms Of Reference for MYPs, Deputy
MYPs and support workers. These formed the context for a Service Level Agreement setting minimum
standards of support for young people elected to UKYP. This was sent out to local authorities in England and
partner organisations in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales in the latter part of the year. At year end, prior
to negotiations beginning with local authorities, 18 had already signed up to the SLA, a draft had been agreed
with Scottish Youth Parliament and discussions begun with Funky Dragon in Wales and Northern Ireland.
Youth Forum Limited funding meant that regional support and co-ordination was limited but praise should go
to Regional Co-ordinators and volunteers who have enabled such progress to be made. We are particularly
grateful to Regional Action West Midlands as the first region to field a regional co-ordinator post, linked to
the emerging regional agenda.
Objective 7: Training and accreditation for MYP’s and other young people.
Progress has been much slower than hoped for, almost exclusively due to a lack of resources. Local arrangements to acknowledge achievement and to identify and meet training needs have been achieved, often at regional level. Awards certificates were presented in the North West, disability awareness training was developed in the West Midlands and some young people are already accredited for their participation through Millennium Volunteers.

The UKYP is also working with the Awarding Body Consortium (ABC) in the South West to develop accreditation for participation activities and involvement at a local and regional level. The UKYP and ABC aim to pilot the scheme in the South West in 2003/04, and hope to make the scheme available to the rest of England in 2004/05.

Objective 8: Communicate UKYP and the Youth Manifesto to stakeholders.
The Manifesto emerged from the sitting and was presented to Government via the Children & Young People’s Unit. Government response was particularly welcome both in format and content and was perceived as an indication that Government was taking the views of young people seriously. There is still work to be done to prioritize and develop more specific policies from the Manifesto and to contribute to the UKYP’s reflection on issues. It has been difficult, and perhaps premature, to identify specific changes in Government or Opposition policy that have resulted from MYP’s arguing their case with politicians through the Manifesto and in person. The series of face to face meetings with Ministers and Opposition Spokespersons focused on Manifesto issues and helped towards a focusing of young people’s agenda. There is some scope however to develop better follow up so that key issues can be progressed.

On a wider level, communications have been an issue for UKYP for a number of reasons. There was a lack of adequate control over its two websites at the end of the year as the two domains were held by other organisations for historical reasons and ownership had changed or was disputed. This has since been resolved but during 2002/3, UKYP established regional groups for all elected MYP’s and their Deputies, to aid regional and national communication, and following the 2003/04 elections new MYP’s will be able to have their own UKYP email addresses.

Overall however UKYP did not make as much progress as it would have liked during the year.

Objectives 9 & 10: Administrative, management and financial arrangements.
The board recognised that staff resources were inadequate, particularly at the centre and for 2003/4 another full-time member of staff has been authorised to assist in regional support and other issues.

The move to extend membership of the Charity from the founding members was delayed by several technical difficulties and several options were explored. A corporate membership model based on regional groups whilst retaining the overall structure of the board was eventually agreed to be implemented for 2003.

All the UKYP’s procedures were brought together in a manual but there is still work to expand and develop some areas, over and above normal updating.

There was limited success in gaining non-public sector funding as will be seen from the accounts. Despite the help of professional fund raisers, UKYP did not present an attractive proposition for private sector sponsorship generally and some funding organisations were still wary of UKYP being such a young organisation without an established track record. We are therefore particularly grateful to Government for its continued support.

The charity’s funds have all been applied in accordance with its objectives. The charity’s assets are still being maintained in the furtherance of these objectives.
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Investment policy and returns
Under the memorandum and articles of association, the charity has the power to make any investment which the trustees see fit.

Reserves policy
The trustees and directors will establish a policy in the near future whereby unrestricted funds not committed or invested in tangible or intangible fixed assets (i.e. free reserves) held by the charity should be sufficient to maintain the operation of the charity for the foreseeable future. As the charity has only recently completed its first two years of activity this policy is in development.

Risk management
The major risks, to which the charity is exposed, as identified by the trustees, are being considered and systems have been and are being established to mitigate against those risks.

Tangible fixed assets for use by the charity
Details of the movements in fixed assets are set out in note 8 to the accounts.

Trustees’ responsibilities in relation to the financial statements
The trustees are required by company law to prepare financial statements that give a true and fair view of the financial activities and of its financial position at the end of that year. In preparing these financial statements, the trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent; and
- Prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in operation.

The trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Companies Act 1985. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Auditors
A resolution will be proposed at the Annual General Meeting that Morgan Griffiths be reappointed as auditors to the charity for the ensuing year.

The above report has been prepared in accordance with the special provisions of Part VII of the Companies Act 1985 relating to small companies.

Approval
This report was approved by the trustees on 4th December 2003 and signed on its behalf by

[Signature]
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Report of the Independent Auditors to the Members of Democracy for Young People Limited

We have audited the financial statements of Democracy for Young People Limited for the year ended 31 March 2003 on pages 16 to 16, which have been prepared under the historical cost convention and the accounting policies set out on page 12.

This report is made solely to the company’s members, as a body, in accordance with section 235 of the Companies Act 1985. Our work has been undertaken so that we might state to the company’s members those matters that we are required to state to them in an auditor’s report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the company and the company’s members as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of trustees and auditors

As set out on page 8 the charity’s trustees, who are also the directors of Democracy for Young People Limited for the purposes of company law, are responsible for the preparation of financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards.

Our responsibility is to audit the financial statements in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and United Kingdom Auditing Standards.

We have been appointed as auditors under Section 43(2) of the Charities Act 1993 and report in accordance with regulations made under section 44 of that Act.

We report to you our opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view and are properly prepared in accordance with the Companies Act 1985. We also report to you if, in our opinion, the Report of the Trustees is not consistent with the financial statements, if the charitable company has not kept proper accounting records, if we have not received all the information and explanations that we require for our audit or if information specified by law regarding trustees’ remuneration and transactions with the company is not disclosed. We are not required to consider whether the statement in the trustees’ report containing risk management covers all existing risks and controls or to form an opinion on the effectiveness of the charity’s risk management and control procedures.

We read the Report of the Trustees and consider the implications for our report if we become aware of any apparent misstatement within it.

Basis of opinion

We conducted the audit in accordance with United Kingdom Auditing Standards issued by the Auditing Practices Board. An audit includes examination, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. It also includes an assessment of the significant estimates and judgements made by the trustees in the preparation of the financial statements, and of whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the charitable company’s circumstances, consistently applied and adequately disclosed.

We planned and performed our audit so as to obtain all the information and explanations which we considered necessary in order to provide us with sufficient evidence to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or other irregularity or error. In forming our opinion we also evaluated the overall adequacy of the presentation of information in the financial statements.

Opinion

In our opinion the financial statements give a true and fair view of the state of the charitable company’s affairs as at 31 March 2003 and of its incoming resources and application of resources, including its income and expenditure, in the year then ended and have been properly prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act 1985.

[Signature]

Morgan Griffiths
Chartered Accountants
Registered Auditor
Cross Chambers
Newtown
Pwys
SY16 2NY

Date: 4th December 2003.
## Statement of Financial Activities

*Democracy for Young People Limited*

*(incorporating an Income and Expenditure Account)*

*for the Year Ended 31 March 2003*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,469</td>
<td>59,469</td>
<td>295,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>136,574</td>
<td>164,274</td>
<td>45,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incoming resources</strong></td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>196,043</td>
<td>222,743</td>
<td>342,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Resources expended

**Charitable expenditure**

Cost of activities in the furtherance of the charity’s objects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual sitting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,346</td>
<td>46,346</td>
<td>179,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>67,132</td>
<td>94,832</td>
<td>159,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,941</td>
<td>45,941</td>
<td>34,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,210</td>
<td>39,210</td>
<td>5,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>198,629</td>
<td>226,329</td>
<td>339,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net incoming resources/ (resources expended)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,586)</td>
<td>(2,586)</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net gains on investment assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net movement in funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds carried forward</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>3,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement of financial activities includes all gains and losses recognised in the year. All incoming resources and resources expended derive from continuing activities.

The notes on pages 12 to 16 form part of these financial statements.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20,732</td>
<td>23,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank and in hand</td>
<td>29,464</td>
<td>6,743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,196</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors' amounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falling due within one year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51,894</td>
<td>30,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,698)</td>
<td>(158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets less current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted funds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report has been prepared in accordance with the special provisions of Part VII of the Companies Act 1985 relating to small companies.

Approved by the trustees and signed on their behalf by:

[Signature]

Date 4th December 2003

The notes on pages 12 to 16 form part of these financial statements.
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Notes to the Financial Statements for the Year Ended 31 March 2003

1. Accounting policies

a. Basis of preparation

The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention. The financial statements have been prepared in accordance with the Statement of Recommended Practice, Accounting and Reporting by Charities (SORP 2000) issued in October 2000, applicable accounting standards and the Companies Act 1985.

b. Fund accounting

General funds are unrestricted funds which are available for use at the discretion of the trustees in furtherance of the general objectives of the charity and which have not been designated for other purposes.

Restricted funds are funds which are to be used in accordance with specific restrictions imposed by donors or which have been raised by the charity for particular purposes. The cost of raising and administering such funds are charged against the specific fund. The aim and use of each restricted fund is set out in the notes to the financial statements.

c. Incoming resources

All incoming resources are included in the SORP when the charity is legally entitled to the income and the amount can be quantified with reasonable accuracy. This includes donations and grant income received during the year. Donations, legacies and similar incoming resources show resources of a voluntary nature and include grants which provide core funding or are of a general nature. Incoming resources from activities in the furtherance of the charity’s objects include grants which carry a service requirement.

d. Resources expended

All expenditure is accounted for on an accruals basis and has been classified under headings that aggregate all costs related to the category. Where costs cannot be directly attributed to particular headings they have been allocated to activities on a basis consistent with the use of the resources.

Fundraising costs are those incurred in seeking voluntary contributions and do not include the costs of disseminating information in support of charitable activities. Support costs are those costs incurred directly in support of expenditure on the objects of the charity and include project management. Management and administration costs are those incurred in connection with administration of the charity and compliance with constitutional and statutory requirements.

e. Tangible fixed assets and depreciation

Depreciation is provided on all tangible fixed assets at rates calculated to write off the cost on a straight line basis over their expected useful economic lives as follows:

- Office equipment and start up costs: 25% and 33% on cost
- Computer equipment: 25% on cost

f. Taxation

The charity is exempt from corporation tax on its charitable activities.

g. VAT

The charity is not registered for value added tax and all costs accordingly are stated inclusive of value added tax where incurred.
# Democracy for Young People Limited
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## 2. Donations, legacies and similar incoming resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education and Skills</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Voluntary Youth Organisation</td>
<td>33,861</td>
<td>33,861</td>
<td>33,861</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Youth</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Trust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Bank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Jeremiah Colman Trust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Borough of Havering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan McGowan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedars Upper School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A C Sweetland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 4 Television</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.F.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Water</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infolog</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority donations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Children’s Bureau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGWU</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mercers Company</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Jones</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagn Railway Limited</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Telecom</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,469</td>
<td>54,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Incoming resources from activities in furtherance of the charity’s objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service contracts</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>44,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services provided</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAWM</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifesto</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation fees</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual net income</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential courses</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>16,157</td>
<td>16,157</td>
<td>16,157</td>
<td>1,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>136,274</td>
<td>164,274</td>
<td>45,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Activities for generating funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express yourself dry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fundraising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Resources expended  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Total 2003</th>
<th>Total 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project co-ordinator</td>
<td>26,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,281</td>
<td>29,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional co-ordinator</td>
<td>21,453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,055</td>
<td>27,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue hire</td>
<td>41,218</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,613</td>
<td>169,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>13,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and subsistence</td>
<td>19,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,826</td>
<td>20,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation costs depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,444</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,444</td>
<td>8,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors' remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy fees</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>4,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional costs</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,928</td>
<td>9,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences and meetings</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential courses</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer school reg. fees</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondment</td>
<td>33,356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis charges</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post and stationery</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stundies</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46,346</td>
<td>94,822</td>
<td>45,941</td>
<td>59,210</td>
<td>226,329</td>
<td>339,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Net incoming resources (resources expended)
This is stated after charging:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees' remuneration and expenses</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>8,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy fees</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>4,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors' remuneration</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Trustees' remuneration and expenses
The trustees neither received nor waived any emoluments during the year.
Out of pocket expenses were reimbursed to trustees as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Gemmell</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Moody</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Keeney</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Road</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B McGowan</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Whitaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P F Clarke</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>6,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Skinner</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Brandell</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>9,538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Democracy for Young People Limited
Notes to the Financial Statements for the Year Ended 31 March 2003

8. Tangible fixed assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formation Costs £</th>
<th>Office Equipment £</th>
<th>Computer Equipment £</th>
<th>Total 2003 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>5,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 1 April 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 31 March 2003</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>6,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 1 April 2003</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge for year</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 31 March 2003</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>3,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net book value at 31 March 2003</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net book value at 31 March 2002</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>3,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Debtors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade debtors</td>
<td>5,732</td>
<td>12,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other debtors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayments</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,732</td>
<td>20,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Creditors: amounts falling due within one year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade creditors</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>19,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accruals and deferred income</td>
<td>45,892</td>
<td>11,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51,894</td>
<td>30,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Statement of funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At 24.01.02 £</th>
<th>Income £</th>
<th>Expenditure £</th>
<th>Investment Gains £</th>
<th>At 31.03.03 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAWM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(27,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(27,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total restricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>(27,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital fund</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>(1,781)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General fund</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>195,508</td>
<td>(196,848)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,391)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unrestricted funds</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>196,043</td>
<td>(198,629)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>223,743</td>
<td>(225,329)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The general reserve represents the free funds of the charity which are not designated for particular purposes.

The restricted grant of £27,700 was received from Regional Action West Midlands (RAWM) Regional Strategic Engagement Fund. The total grant approved was for £218,900, £1,200 of which was received during the year ending 31 March 2002.

12. Analysis of net assets between funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted Funds £</th>
<th>General Funds £</th>
<th>Total £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances as at 31 March 2003 are represented by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,196</td>
<td>50,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>(51,894)</td>
<td>(51,894)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Related party transactions

Peter Clarke, who acts as both Company Secretary and trustee to the charity, is employed by the Government. During the year a Department of Government entered into service contracts with Democracy for Young People Limited totalling £110,660 (2002 £44,212), none of which was outstanding at the year end (2002 £10,848).

14. Share capital

The company is limited by guarantee and therefore has no share capital.
THE GOVERNMENT

UKYP TRUSTEES
(Democracy for Young People)

UKYP
Central: Peter Clarke, Kate Parish
Regional: UKYP Co-ordinators work on behalf of central team within UK regions to link with MYPs

MYPs (Members of the Youth Parliament)
Regional: Youth Workers/Youth co-ordinators nominated by the LEA/authority

THE PROCEDURES GROUP
(Similar to Government Cabinet structure – made up of representative MYPs from each region and oversees the running and organisation of UKYP)

REGIONAL MVP GROUPS
Co-ordinated by UKYP Regional Co-ordinators
(One group for each Region of the UK
LEA Region. Scotland, Wales & N Ireland join in 2002

SELECT COMMITTEES
(One for each topic heading of The Manifesto) made up of MYPs from each
MYP representatives nominated by their regional colleagues in that)

MEETINGS AND CONSULTATIONS
THE UKYP NATIONAL SITTING (annual)
REGIONAL MEETINGS (termly)

OTHER MEETINGS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR DETERMINED BY THE CONTENT OF THE MANIFESTO OR OTHER ISSUES

NB This is NOT an organisation flow chart but an attempt to show who is involved with MYPs and meetings that take place. The meetings are not conclusive and may change in content and number.
MYPS - Terms of Reference

Person Specification

It would be helpful if an MYP had the following attributes:

1. Be committed, lively and outgoing
   To have an interest in relevant issues and be prepared to have a view on topical issues.
   Be able to listen to and respect the views of his/her peer group.
   Take their responsibilities seriously
   Not be afraid to speak their mind.
   Not be afraid to ask for support, advice and help if required.
   To have a sense of humour!

Membership

1. Anyone is entitled to stand as an MYP providing they are a resident of the UK, and are aged between the ages of 11 and 18 (inclusive).
2. All MYPs must have been elected by a public election process.
3. The UKYP is an independent national body, and as such its members should not represent a “party” political view.
   1. The discussions of the UKYP should be solely issue based.

Terms Of Office

1. The term of office for MYPs is for one year from 1st February to the 31st January.

Areas Of Responsibility

1. The UKYP will ensure that the young people of the UK are given a voice on any issue that affects them and as laid out in Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, as long as it does not affect the rights of others.

   As an elected MYP your duty is towards:
   - The young people who voted for you;
   - The young people who didn’t vote for you;
   - Every young person in your LEA/Constituency
The UKYP will respect the issues as laid out in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, to ensure that every young person who is participates in the work of the UKYP, has his/her rights respected and protected.

Any young person up to and including the age of 18, has the right to have his/her views heard and listened to by the UKYP.

As an MYP it is important that you take your role and duty seriously when you are representing the UKYP, both in and outside the UKYP meetings and events.

To establish a line of regular formal communication with local government structures, eg – Parish/Town Councils, District Councils and County/Borough Councils, and MPs; and equivalent structures in all UKYP Regions.

To liaise with locally established groups, such as youth and school councils and branches of voluntary organisations, eg – scouts, guides, etc.

It is important to respect and listen to what others are saying and to continue to respect someone’s point of view at all times.

**Discipline Procedure**

1. If the elected members of the UKYP feel that an MYP has broken the guidelines as laid out in the Terms Of Reference, a committee will be formed at a regional level of MYPs to discuss that person’s behaviour and to decide as to what action should be taken/reprimand be given. The Committee must consist of the two Procedures Group representatives, the Regional Co-ordinator and two other MYPs from the regional group. The Committee will follow the guidelines as laid out in the UKYP’s Complaints Procedure.

**Meetings**

1. An MYP should attend any local/regional meetings as organized by the UKYP.
2. An MYP should attend the annual sitting of the Youth Parliament.
3. MYPs have a duty to arrive at meetings on time, and to make sure that there are transport arrangements to and from the place of meeting.
4. If an MYP is unable to attend a UKYP meeting they should inform their adult support worker, and or the Regional Co-ordinator.
5. Regular breaks will be contracted into all UKYP meetings. It is important that you try to wait until a break before leaving the meeting room, as it can be very disruptive to the meeting.
6. When an MYP wishes to make a point or ask a question, they should indicate their intention by raising their hand and waiting for the Chair to invite them to speak.
7. When talking, an MYP should try not to take over the meeting or prevent others from speaking. It is important to give everyone a chance to talk and take part in the meeting.

It is the duty of the individual MYPs to actively support the work of the UKYP Select Committees and Procedure Group.

**Voting**

1. Each MYP is entitled to one vote at regional meetings and the national sitting.
Deputy MYPS – Terms of Reference

Person Specification

It would be helpful if a Deputy MYP had the following attributes:

1. Be committed, lively and outgoing
2. To have an interest in relevant issues and be prepared to have a view on topical issues.
3. Be able to listen to and respect the views of his/her peer group.
4. Take their responsibilities seriously
5. Not be afraid to speak their mind.
6. Not be afraid to ask for support, advice and help if required.
7. To have a sense of humour!

Membership
1. Anyone is entitled to stand as a Deputy MYP providing they are a resident of the UK, and are aged between the ages of 11 and 18 (inclusive).
2. All Deputy MYPs must have been elected through the public election process.
3. The UKYP is an independent national body, and as such its members should not represent a “party” political view.
4. The discussions of the UKYP should be solely issue based.

Terms Of Office
1. The term of office for a Deputy MYP is for one year from 1st February to the 31st January.

Areas Of Responsibility
1. The UKYP will ensure that the young people of the UK are given a voice on any issue that affects them and as laid out in Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, as long as it does not affect the rights of others.

As an elected Deputy MYP your duty is towards:

1. The young people who voted for your;
2. The young people who didn’t vote for you;
3. Every young person in your LEA/Constituency
The UKYP will respect the issues as laid out in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, to ensure that every young person who is participates in the work of the UKYP, has his/her rights respected and protected.

Any young person up to and including the age of 18, has the right to have his/her view heard and listened to by the UKYP.

4. It is important to respect and listen to what others are saying and to continue to respect someone’s point of view at all times.

As a Deputy MYP it is important that you take your role and duty seriously when you are representing the UKYP, both in and outside UKYP meetings and events.

The main duty of the Deputy MYP is to support their MYP at a local level.

Deputy MYPs are not entitled to be elected to the UKYP Select Committees and, or the Procedures Group.

**Discipline Procedure**

1. If the elected members of the UKYP feel that a Deputy MYP has broken the guidelines as laid out in the Terms Of Reference, a committee will be formed at a regional level of MYPs to discuss that person’s behaviour and to decide as to what action should be taken/reprimand be given. The Committee must consist of at least two Procedures Group representatives, the Regional Co-orderator and two other MYPs from the regional group. The Committee will follow the guidelines as laid out in the UKYP’s Complaints Procedure.

**Meetings**

1. Deputy MYPs are entitled to attend all local and regional meetings organised by the UKYP.

Deputy MYPs are not entitled to attend the national meeting of the UKYP, unless the MYP is unable to attend.

Deputy MYPs have a duty to arrive at meetings on time, and to make sure that there are transport arrangements to and from the place of meeting.

If a Deputy MYP is unable to attend a UKYP meeting they should inform their adult support worker, and or the Regional Co-orderator.

Regular breaks will be contracted into all UKYP meetings. It is important that you try to wait until a break before leaving the meeting room, as it can be very disruptive to the meeting.

When a Deputy MYP wishes to make a point or ask a question, they should indicate their intention by raising their hand and waiting for the Chair to invite them to speak.

When talking, a Deputy MYP should try not to take over the meeting or prevent others from speaking. It is important to give everyone a chance to talk and take part in the meeting.

Deputy MYPs are not entitled to chair Regional meetings.

**Voting**

1. Deputy MYPs are only entitled to vote at a UKYP meeting if they are attending in the absence of their MYP.
The Procedures Group – Terms of Reference

Membership
1. Each Region of the UK is entitled to elect two representatives, who must be serving MYPs.

A designated member of the Board Of Trustees can be invited to attend Procedures Group meetings with observer status only.

The UKYP National Development Co-ordinator/General Manager will attend Procedures Group meetings to provide administration and advice where appropriate.

Accompanying youth workers have observer status only.

Term Of Office
1. Members will serve on the Procedures Group for 18 months, and have a right to attend Regional meetings.
2. Members will be elected to the Procedures Group annually in November and will serve 18 months allowing time to provide a hand-over period.
3. For 2002, to enable the above to be implemented, the serving members of the Procedures Group will continue in office until February 2003.

Areas Of Responsibility
1. To oversee the national organisation of the Youth Parliament, to include the roles and responsibilities of the MYPs and their deputies, the Select Committees and the national sitting of the Youth Parliament.
2. To ensure two-way communication between the UKYP nationally and regionally. Members of the group must ensure that they are aware and bring forward issues of a national nature to the Procedures Group.
3. It is the duty of the members of the group to provide regular reports, either written or verbal, to their Regional Groups.
4. Members of the group should be prepared to assist their Regional Co-ordinator as and when required.

Meetings
1. The Procedures Group will meet a minimum of three times a year.
2. The meetings will be held at an agreed time and venue.
3. The UKYP will ensure that no young person attending UKYP events will be out of pocket.
Voting

1. Each Region, no matter how many representatives attend, will be entitled to one vote.

2. If the results of a vote are evenly divided, the chair of the meeting will have the right to cast the deciding vote.
Procedures Group Structure and Action Plan 2004

UKYP’s Procedures Group is made up of 2 groups: Strategy Group and the Organising Group.

**Strategy Group**
- Membership: x 12 Reps (1 per Region)
- Term of Office: 18 months (November-April)
- Remit: To decide how to best achieve the aim of UKYP: to democratically represent young people
  - Constitution
  - Policy (Creation & Implementation)
- Plan of Action for 2004
  - Terms of Reference
  - Structure
  - Operational Guidelines
  - Discipline Procedure
  - Manifesto
  - Role of Select Committees
- Interaction
  - SG requirements for meetings/events/communication (e.g. time slots for presentations, consultations etc)
  - Joint Session at end of every meeting (30mins)
- Long-Term (when funding available)
  - Membership: As above + 1 Rep. from each Select Committee

**Organising Group**
- Membership: x 12 Reps (1 per Region)
- Term of Office: 18 months (November-April)
- Remit: Organisation of the Annual Sitting and other UK Events
  - Communication
- Plan of Action for 2004
  - Express Yourself Day
  - Annual UK Sitting
  - Develop Communications
- Long-Term (when funding available)
  - Membership: x 24 Reps (2 per Region)
The Select Committees – Terms of Reference

Membership
1. Each Region of the UK is entitled to elect two representatives, who must be serving MYPs, for each of the seven select committees.
2. A designated co-ordinator will attend select committee meetings to provide administration and advise where appropriate.
3. Accompanying youth workers have observer status only.
4. All Select Committee members will be required to attend a skills training course in March.

Term Of Office
1. Members will serve on the Select Committee for a period of one year.

Areas Of Responsibility
1. Each Select Committee will focus on establishing a two-way line of communication with appropriate Government Departments, MPs and Ministers.
2. Each Select Committee will play a leading role in formulating the national UKYP manifesto and action plan.
3. Each Select Committee will provide opinions and evidence from young people to relevant government consultative processes.
4. Each Select Committee will monitor the progress of the national manifesto and agenda for action in the regional and national arena, with particular reference to their relevant Government Department.
5. Each Select Committee will ensure two-way communication between the UKYP nationally and regionally. Members of the group must ensure that they are aware and bring forward their regional issues to the relevant UKYP Select Committee.
6. It is the duty of the members of the group to provide regular reports, either written or verbal, to their Regional Groups.
7. Members of the group should be prepared to assist their designated and regional co-ordinator as and when required.
Meetings
1. Each Select Committee will meet a minimum of three times a year.
2. The meetings will be held at an agreed time and venue.
3. The UKYP will ensure that no young person attending UKYP events will be out of pocket.
4. Each Select Committee will have the right to invite an advisor(s) to attend meetings and provide “evidence”.

Voting
1. Each Region, no matter how many representatives attend, will be entitled to one vote.
2. Advisors, observers and facilitators are not entitled to vote at Select Committee meetings.
3. If the results of a vote are evenly divided, the chair of the meeting will have the right to cast the deciding vote.
Regional Co-ordinators – Terms of Reference

Person Specification
It would be helpful if a Regional Co-ordinator had the following attributes:

1. Be committed, lively and outgoing
2. To have an interest in relevant issues and be prepared to have a view on topical issues.
3. Be able to listen to and respect the views of young people.
4. Take their responsibilities seriously
5. Not be afraid to speak their mind.
6. Not be afraid to ask for support, advice and help if required.
7. To have a sense of humour?
8. To have experience of youth empowerment and participation work.

Membership
1. All regional co-ordinators must have Police Criminal Check clearance with the UKYP.

Areas Of Responsibility
Regional Co-ordinators will:
1. Aim to ensure participation from every Local Authority in their Region in the Youth Parliament.
2. Work towards ensuring the co-ordination of elections across the whole of the region, ie - that they all take place in January.
3. Ensure that MYPs are supported locally and regionally to carry out the work as defined in the MYPs’ Terms of Reference.
4. Facilitate regular Regional Meetings of MYPs and their support workers.
5. Develop links with the media and press in the region to assist MYPs in the promotion of young people’s issues in the area.
6. Identify ways in which the UKYP can involve young people, other than those elected as MYPs at a regional level.
7. Identify and support key workers for MYPs based in their constituencies.
8. Identify and meet training requirements for both MYPs and their support workers.
9. Ensure that MYPs accurately represent the views of the region at a national level.
Trustees – Terms of Reference

Person Specification
It would be helpful if a UKYP Trustee had the following attributes:

1. Be committed, lively and outgoing
2. To have an interest in relevant issues and be prepared to have a view on topical issues.
3. Be able to listen to and respect the views of young people.
4. Take their responsibilities seriously
5. Not be afraid to speak their mind.
6. Not be afraid to ask for support, advice and help if required.
7. To have a sense of humour!

Membership
1. Under Charitable Law, UKYP Trustees must be 18 years old or over.
2. UKYP Trustees will be appointed at the Annual General Meeting (AGM).

Terms Of Office
1. The term of office for Trustees is for one year from the date of the AGM.

Areas Of Responsibility
1. To ensure the UKYP works within the guidelines as defined by the Charitable Constitution.
2. To be involved in the recruitment process for UKYP members of staff.
3. To ensure the AGM is organised on an annual basis.
4. To monitor the accounts on a regular basis and endorse the annual accounts, as produced by the company accountant.
5. To receive written reports from the General Manager/National Development Co-ordinator.
6. To assign one representative to attend the National Procedures Group meeting as an observer.

Boundaries
1. Trustees will not be involved with the day to day management of the UKYP.
2. Trustees will attend the annual sitting as observers only.
3. Trustees will respect the role of elected MYPs to decide the work and development of the UKYP.

Local Authority Support Workers – Terms of Reference

Person Specification
It would be helpful if support workers had the following attributes:

1. Be committed, lively and outgoing.
2. Have an interest in relevant issues.
3. Be able to listen to and respect the views of young people.
4. Not be afraid to ask for support, advice and help if required.
5. Have a sense of humour?
6. To have experience of youth empowerment and participation work.

Membership
1. All local authority support workers must have Police Criminal Check clearance, undertaken by their local authority.

Areas Of Responsibility
All support youth workers will have responsibility for:
1. Organising safe traveling arrangements for MYPs according to their local authority guidelines.
2. Ensuring suitable support for MYPs to attend UKYP Regional, Procedure Group and Select Committee meetings, as appropriate.
3. Offering their opinions and ideas as and when appropriate and to recognize when help may be required.
4. Sharing local good practice in the regional youth workers’ meetings.
5. Organising a democratic election process for the MYPs within their local authority, following UKYP election guidelines.
6. Supporting local MYPs to develop the local networks to collect, collate and represent local young people.
7. Support MYPs to make presentations and meet with their local government/councils.
8. Providing information to MYPs about areas that they can go to for support.

Service Level Agreement with Local Government in England

Introduction
Over the last ten years Local Authorities have invested a great deal of resources in developing young people’s involvement in local government. During this time thousands of youth forums/councils have been established, ensuring that young people’s views have been heard and acted upon at a local level. In 1996, Andrew Rowe the then MP for Faversham and Mid Kent, organised a conference which was held in Coventry Cathedral. The young people who attended the conference praised the organisers for “listening” but challenged them to set up a UK Youth Parliament to ensure that the views of young people at a local level, were given a national voice.

The UKYP provides a formal structure for young people from every local authority in the UK to feed their local issues into the national arena, whilst providing evidence of local government formally engaging young people in the democratic process.

Definition
The service agreement will set the agreed content for securing the support from local government as a stakeholder, and the UKYP as a service provider to MYPs (young people). It recognises that Government and the voluntary and community sector have different forms of accountability and are answerable to a different range of stakeholders. But common to both is the need for integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership – as defined by the shared principles which underpin the Compact. There is added value in working in partnership towards common aims and objectives, in this case ensuring that young people participate in local democratic processes and that their voices are heard locally, regionally and nationally. Meaningful consultation builds relationships, improves policy development and enhances the design and delivery of services and programmes.
Aims
The service agreement will define clearly the roles and responsibilities of local government and the UKYP in the support of the MYPs.

Roles And Responsibilities:

1. Local Government
   - To identify an officer to provide a support mechanism to their MYP within the local government policy.
   - To identify an officer (preferably the same person who is providing support to the MYP) to liaise with the UKYP's Regional Co-ordinator.
   - The support officer will undertake to accompany, as required, the MYP(s) to all meetings and implement the local government's guidelines with regards to Child Protection and “Visit and Journey”.
   - To organise an annual public election for MYP's based upon the guidelines as provided by the UKYP.
   - Provide funding for the MYP(s) to attend the regional meetings, Procedures Group and Select Committee meetings and the national sitting, to include any residential costs and travel expenses.
   - Arrange for MYP(s) to make presentations, at least once a year, to the full local council.
   - Help to implement relevant sections of the UKYP’s Manifesto and Agenda for Action locally.
   - Present a certificate to the MYP(s) at the end of their term of office.
   - The local authority will pay an affiliation fee of £100 per MYP to support the national and regional communication network amongst MYPs.

2. The UK Youth Parliament
   - Will provide a national structure to support the work of the MYP locally, regionally and nationally.
   - Will provide a Regional Co-ordinator for each of the nine regions of the UK, to support and liaise with the MYPs and their support workers.
   - The UKYP will provide each local authority with guidelines for holding annual elections.
   - UKYP Regional Co-ordinators will provide support for local elections.
   - The UKYP Regional Co-ordinators will develop a working partnership with regional organisations, to bring the local issues to a regional arena.
   - The UKYP will organise regional meetings and the annual national sitting to ensure that local issues are presented at a national level.
   - The UKYP will organise a series of Select Committee meetings to enable the MYPs to hold all levels of government to account on the issues that they identify.
The UKYP will co-ordinate regular meetings with MPs, Government Ministers and Departments to enable the MYPs to present their opinions and evidence on a wide range of subjects.

The UKYP will send a Welcome Pack to all newly elected MYPs and their Deputies.

The UKYP will undertake to ensure that MYPs are given the opportunity to lobby, in addition to government, the providers of services for young people and associated Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), eg - the NHS, Childline, the Connexions Service, etc.

The UKYP will ensure that local MYPs and support workers receive all regional and national correspondence.

The UKYP will involve, wherever possible, MYPs in the development and management of activities and services.

The UKYP will put in place policies for promoting best practice and equality of opportunity in activities, employment, involvement of volunteers and service provision.

The UKYP will undertake to co-ordinate a minimum of two national debates on issues raised at the annual national sitting, to enable the MYPs to air their views to politicians but also to service providers, eg - transport.

The UKYP will undertake to ensure that each MYP keeps a record of achievement, which will be presented in the local, regional and national arenas.

The UKYP will review the operation of the SLA annually in conjunction with the Local Authority, MYPs and Regional Co-ordinators.

Attached to this document the UKYP has provided a copy of its Annual Work Programme and copies of the Terms of Reference for its:

- MYPs
- Deputy MYPs
- UKYP Select Committees
- UKYP Procedures Group

These documents, along with the SLA, provide the basis for the formal support structure of the UKYP and define its basic operations.

Local Authority agrees to work in partnership with the UK Youth Parliament in respect of the Compact, and to provide support to its MYPs and therefore the UKYP, as determined by this Service Level Agreement.

The UK Youth Parliament agrees to work in partnership with Local Authority in respect of the Compact, and to provide the structure and mechanism that will enable the young people from the UK to have a voice that is heard locally, regionally and nationally.
Signed by .................................................. Position ...........................................

On Behalf Of .................................................. Local Authority. Date ......................

Signed by .................................................. UKYP Chair Of The UKYP Trustees,

For And On Behalf Of The UK Youth Parliament. Date ............................................
Service Level Agreement - Financial Implications for local government

The following analysis is to illustrate the financial implications for each local government in relation to the Service Level Agreement for one Member of the Youth Parliament.

Committed Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Membership to the UKYP</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Attend 6 - 8 regional meetings estimated average 200 miles @ 38p per mile x 8</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Attend Annual Sitting</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other support for local activity</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>958</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional Expenses

If your MYP is elected and involved with National groups eg select committee or procedures group, the travelling cost will be an average of 4 times annually. Even this expense, if agreeable within the region, can be shared among the region. At the same time, the central team is continually negotiating with different government departments, aiming in the future to ask all government departments to fund the running costs of all select committees and procedures group.

In conclusion, at basic level, to support one MYP annually will be approximately £1000, and the optional expense is under your Council and your MYP's control. For example, if your MYP is committed to putting the local voice into the National level, then your council needs to be fully aware of the travelling implications which could be incurred.
UK Youth Parliament - Operational Guidelines

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Operational Guidelines lay out the procedure and arrangements for the election of the Members of the Youth Parliament (MYPs), their duties between their election and the sitting of the UKYP. As decisions on procedures have to be ratified by the MYPs themselves, these may be subject to change following each UKYP sitting.

2.0 NAME

The UK Youth Parliament (UKYP)

3.0 ADMINISTRATION

3.1 Staff

The work of the UKYP is currently managed by the UKYP's General Manager, the National Development Co-ordinator and the Strategic Co-ordinator. The work in each of the nine English regions is overseen by a Regional Co-ordinator, whose time commitment is dictated by funding available in each area.

3.2 The Procedures Group

The UKYP’s Procedures Group makes the decisions that guide the development of the UKYP, and agree the arrangements for each sitting. The Procedures Group is made up of two MYPs from each region of the UK, who have been nominated by their Region to represent the views of their MYPs at a national level. It aims to physically meet five times a year, whilst discussing and agreeing urgent issues using the latest telecommunications.

3.3 The Trustees

The work of the UKYP is overseen by a body of Trustees who bear the ultimate responsibility for the work of the Trust, one third of whom have their positions reviewed each year. A Trustee’s term can last between 3 - 4 years. The Trustees are bound in their actions, by the rules of the Charity Commission. The board of trustees has a balanced make-up of young people, representatives of Parliament and national organisations involved in working with and representing young people throughout the United Kingdom and professional expertise.
3.4 The Advisory Group

UKYP has been supported by a large number of national charities and organisations working with young people, together with local authorities and young people, who formed the Steering Group which guided the UKYP to its first sitting. These parties are brought together in the context of an advisory group, through which mechanism their views, suggestions and help can be sought in the development of the UKYP.

4.0 AIMS

The UKYP aims to give the young people of the UK, between the ages of 11 and 18 (inclusive) a voice, which will be heard and listened to by local and national government, providers of services for young people and other agencies who have an interest in the views and needs of young people. The UKYP has a rolling programme. It meets on an annual basis, and gives the young people of the UK a chance to express their views and concerns at the highest levels.

5.0 OBJECTIVES

The UKYP:

5.1 Is composed of representatives aged between 11 and 18 years old (inclusive) from across the UK. The UKYP particularly encourages the involvement of young people who are socially excluded, but also representation from established groups such as local youth councils, and individuals.

5.2 Ensures that the young people of the UK are given a voice on any issue that affects them and as laid out in Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

5.3 Gives the young people of the UK an opportunity to be involved in a democratic process at a national level.

5.4 Empowers young people to take positive action within their local communities based upon their issues of concern. The UKYP encourages community action for social change.

5.5 Is an a-political organisation, which seeks to represent no party political view. The UKYP is therefore solely, issue based.
6.0 OUTCOMES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

6.1 The UKYP meets nationally on an annual basis to create a Youth Manifesto/Agenda for Action, which is presented to the Government, the major political parties and service providers for young people. It is intended that these agencies consider the views of the UKYP when reviewing and creating new policies that will have a direct impact on the young people of the UK.

6.2 The UKYP is increasingly being recognised at a local and national level. Some local authorities have given their MYPs equal status to their MPs, and the UKYP works hard to enable MYPs to meet regularly with Government Ministers and Civil Servants.

6.3 The UKYP works to promote the role and influence of MYPs to service providers, to ensure that it is not just the Government who is listening to their views, eg - the transport industry.

7.0 OUTCOMES FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES

7.1 By involving young people at a local level to influence decision makers nationally, it is hoped that local decisions makers will also recognise the value of young people as part of their local communities. The UKYP will encourage them to work in partnership with young people, raising awareness of the means by which local communities can effect change for themselves and taking positive action for social change at a local level too, eg - through the establishment of Youth Councils, Drop-In Centres, Community Gardens, urban and rural regeneration and other projects which are a positive reaction to the concerns of young people.

8.0 OUTCOMES FOR THE DECISION MAKERS

8.1 The UKYP enables the “Decision Makers” of the UK, ie - the Government, the political parties, pressure groups, non-governmental organisations, etc to have a nationally recognised body of young people, which has been democratically elected by its peer group, to consult with on issues that are of concern to the youth of the UK.

The fact that the recommendations of the UKYP will have been made by democratically elected representatives for young people, places a far greater responsibility on the “Decisions Makers” to listen and act upon these views.
9.0 STRUCTURE

9.1 The UKYP is constantly developing support mechanisms in the English Regions and with the national youth agencies in Scotland - the Scottish Youth Parliament, Wales - Funky Dragon and Northern Ireland - the Northern Ireland Youth Forum. These are based on the regional and national boundaries adopted by Government - Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland and the 9 English regions - London, South East, South West, Eastern, Yorkshire and The Humber, North West, North East, East Midlands and West Midlands.

The UKYP has created 9 English regional groups whose core base is made up of the MYPs in that region. It is intended that as the UKYP develops, these groups will increasingly be able to be accessed by any young person in that area who wishes to be involved in the work of the UKYP, or bring to light a specific issue of concern, eg - like an MP's surgery.

9.2 Each of the 9 English Regions are supported by a Regional Co-ordinator, and the UKYP is developing agreements to establish working partnerships with the Scottish Youth Parliament, Funky Dragon and the Northern Ireland Youth Forum, to ensure the young people in these countries are given a voice in Westminster, whilst respecting their devolved status.

The role of the Regional Co-ordinator is to support the work of the elected MYPs in their region, and as the UKYP develops to draw together other young people from the region who are interested in the UKYP and want to have some direct involvement.

Since the first sitting, the UKYP has recognised the needs of the youth workers, who are doing a fantastic amount of support work at grass roots level. The UKYP intends to continue to develop its work with youth workers, via the Regional and National Development Co-ordinators and to provide them with support and training as required/requested.

In the longer term it is proposed that retiring MYPs act as mentors to their successors for 12 months, adopting the Millennium Volunteers standards and approach where appropriate.

9.3 The UKYP uses Local Education Authorities (LEAs) in England and their equivalents in the other countries, to define the constituency boundaries for the MYPs. Each LEA area has a minimum of one MYP elected as a representative to the UKYP. Areas with a larger population of young people are entitled to return a larger number of MYPs - for exact allocation numbers please see the Appendix 1. The UKYP is in the process of agreeing local arrangements in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales.
9.4 To ensure that MYPs are provided with a minimum level of support by their LEA the UKYP has introduced a Service Level Agreement (SLA). Through the SLA the UKYP hopes to ensure that local youth workers are given a mechanism to ensure adequate funding is provided to facilitate youth participation work, and that MYPs receive the support they require in order to carry out their roles.

10.0 THE ELECTION OF MYPs

10.1 The MYPs are elected at a series of Election Days which are facilitated locally in each constituency.

A timescale of dates for regional/country and UK meetings is set prior to the election of MYPs, in order that every young person who gets involved in the UKYP will be aware of the commitment required of them (these may be subject to minor changes once the MYPs have been elected and discussed the suitability of the dates). Regional/country meetings may vary according to area.

10.2 Election Days are held across the UK and are open to any young person between the ages of 11 and 18 (inclusive) who is interested in becoming a MYP.

In outline, the election process involves a series of “fun” workshops around the themes of Citizenship, Democracy, Representation and the UKYP. Young people attending the Election Days will be given the chance to discuss and learn about these issues, whilst meeting other like-minded young people from across their area.

At the end of this process, the young people present will be asked if they are still interested in becoming an MYP; those that do will have their names placed on a ballot paper, and an election may be held from amongst those present.

In areas where funding is available, more open and inclusive elections have been developed, so that once potential MYPs have been identified, elections are co-ordinated across schools, colleges, voluntary youth associations and youth clubs in the area. Kent, Norfolk, Leeds and Hertfordshire are all areas in which a more inclusive voting system are used.

Dependent upon the size of the constituency - relative to the number of young people in each area, a minimum of one MYP will be elected in each constituency area across the UK, that being the young person with the most votes.

The total number of MYPs will be not more than 450.
11.0 TIMETABLE OF EVENTS FROM THE ELECTION DAYS TO THE NATIONAL SITTING OF THE UKYP (See Appendix 2)

11.1 The UKYP operates a rolling programme in order to ensure that its MYPs are given every opportunity to make a visible difference in their local and national communities.

11.2 January & The Elections

The UKYP is encouraging all participating local authorities to hold their elections for MYPs during the last two weeks of January.

The Procedures Group will meet to consider the success of the elections, the number of LEAs participating in the UKYP (87% of all LEAs across England are expected to participate with the UKYP in 2004) and work that needs to be undertaken to improve the election system.

11.3 February – Express Yourself!

The UKYP holds an annual event in the House of Commons called Express Yourself. It is an opportunity for “old” MYPs to talk about their achievements, and for new MYPs to say what it is they hope to achieve! Every MP is invited to attend the event, and a Question Time Panel of MYPs is formed to answer MPs questions.

At a regional level, the Regional Co-ordinators bring together the newly elected MYPs in their regional groups for the first time to provide skills training and to begin to identify the key areas of concern. Where funding is available these meetings will be held as a residential.

It is at the February regional meetings, that each region appoints two members to sit on each of the UKYP’s Select Committees

11.4 March – Select Committees

The UKYP has seven Select Committees one for each heading of its Manifesto, which broadly correspond with the work of the following Government Departments:

- Better Society – The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Department for Transport
- Law & Society – The Home Office
- Health – the Department for Health (DoH)
The UKYP aims to enable most of the MYPs from each of its Select Committees to have regular contact and meetings with the relevant Government Ministers and Departments.

As and when funding is available, we will be able to empower the Select Committees to hold the Government to account on the issues raised in the Manifesto/Agenda for Action, through a series of residential meetings to which they can invite expert witnesses to give evidence, and directly with civil servants and Government Ministers.

11.5 April – Regional Meetings

The Regional Co-ordinators bring together the MYPs in their Regional Groups to collate the region’s annual work objectives for the year and to begin to identify the issues they wish to raise at the annual sitting. Each region’s Select Committee members should note the areas for action relevant to their Committee.

11.6 May – Select Committees

The Select Committees come together to discuss the issues raised by their regional groups and to identify their priorities for the remainder of the year.

The Procedures Group will meet.

11.7 June – Exam Season

Throughout an MYPs’ term of office the UKYP always stresses that their school/college work must come first. From the middle of May through to the end of June, the UKYP tries not to involve its MYPs in national/regional events in order that they may concentrate on their exams.

11.8 July – The National Sitting

The UKYP holds a national sitting on an annual basis, where it brings together the MYPs from across the UK to discuss the issues that are important to them and their electorate. The MYPs use these discussions to create a Youth Manifesto/Agenda for Action which is presented to the Government, the opposition parties and service providers.
11.9 August – Regional Ratification Of The Manifesto

Towards the end of August, early September the Regional Co-ordinators bring together their regional groups to ratify the Manifesto/Agenda for Action before it is distributed to the Government on its return from summer recess.

11.10 September – Procedures Group Meeting/Regional Meetings

In September the Procedures Group meets to evaluate the success of the national sitting, and to address any issues that may arisen at the sitting regarding the organisation and development of the UKYP.

If Regional Groups have not met at the end of August, the Regional Co-ordinators will bring them together at the beginning of September.

11.11 October – Meetings With Government Ministers

Prior to the national sitting, the UKYP will have written to Government Ministers to ensure they are aware of the sitting and to be prepared to respond to the outcomes. Part of this response will take the form of physical meetings with the MYPs - where the MYPs will be given the opportunity to hold the Government directly to account on the issues that they have raised.

At a regional level, October is when the Local Government Association holds its “Local Democracy Week”. MYPs will be encouraged to hold local/regional events in line with whatever the “theme” is for that year.

11.12 November – A National Debate

The UKYP will use one of the key themes from the national sitting to organise a national debate in Portcullis House, the Government Offices for MPs. The debate will be led by the MYPs, and will aim to involve (where appropriate) service providers, government ministers, MPs and voluntary groups, etc.

In the Regions the Regional Groups will meet to discuss the plans for the following year’s elections, and to consider how they will pass on their work-load to newly elected MYPs. Elections will be held for the UKYP’s Procedures Group.

11.13 December – The Year End
The Procedures Group will meet with its old and newly elected members, for skills training and to begin the hand-over of the work-load.

At a local level MYPs should be working with their local authorities to help deliver the elections for the new year.

12.0 Terms Of Reference

The Operational Guidelines should be read in conjunction with the UKYP’s Terms of Reference for MYPs (Appendix 3), Deputy MYPs (Appendix 4), the Select Committees (Appendix 5), the Procedures Group (Appendix 6).

For further information about the UK Youth Parliament please have a look at our website - www.ukyouthparliament.com
3rd Annual Sitting – Youth Worker Programme

What Does The Youth Worker Really Want?

Issues For The UKYP

1. General

The UKYP is only a small part of some LA workers’ remit and youth workers questioned whether the UKYP was a product, process or brand name? The UKYP recognises that it is part of the process for young people to engage with local, regional and national democratic structures.

Local youth workers expressed concern that they did not know enough about the UKYP and felt that the UKYP did not have enough understanding of LA structures and councils. Getting over staff turnover. The UKYP sends out information about its election process on an annual basis and the website - www.ukyouthparliament.org.uk, to enable youth workers to log on and download information about the organisation, including guidance for the elections.

Concerns were expressed about the UKYP being an adult structure and the need to ensure that the Manifesto is produced in plain English, is fun and lively.

The Manifesto is a document written by young people, for young people and about young people. The UKYP utilises the experience of skilled youth workers to facilitate each of the seven working groups to deliver each section of the Manifesto.

UKYP Trustees – those who have moved onto universities may not be in touch with young people anymore. In 2003 and subsequent years, each region of the UK will be entitled to elect a “young” person between the ages of 18 and 25, to the Trustee Board, to be elected by the region’s MYPs. This process will enable trustee’s to maintain a regular dialogue with the young people they have been elected to represent, and will also be able to feedback to each region on the work of the UKYP’s Trustee Board.
UKYP turn its on its head. Could local authority staff do training for UKYP national staff? The UKYP would welcome the opportunity to learn of training sessions run by local youth workers.

2. **STRUCTURES**

The UKYP is trading on good will and existing networks, eg - schools. The UKYP, like many charities, trades on the good will of a wide variety of organisations, without whose support the UKYP could not claim to be representative of the youth population of the UK.

UKYP needs openness regarding staff and pay and skills. Full training pack needed on UKYP structure, staffing, finance, calendar, etc. Organisation plan needed with roles and responsibilities. Single source of information “idiots guide.” An organisation plan and annual calendar will shortly be available on the Website – it is our aim that the website will become “the idiots guide” to the UKYP.

Local Authorities need to understand expectations and to have information – the UKYP needs to provide. The SLA clearly defines the UKYP’s expectations of local authorities and also outlines the role of the UKYP.

Why do they not plan funding bids and organise partnerships, etc? The UKYP does regularly bid for money and need more support from local youth workers.

3. **UKYP At A Regional Level**

UKYP communication lacking in some regions. Regional differences – why? The UKYP has established regional egroups which ensure that every region receives the same information when emailed by the central team.

Regional Co-ordinators need to have a base. Some staff have been in post a year and have no base point for UKYP. All UKYP staff have a fixed postal and email address.

What power have staff got? NE showed their power – what if the others did that – implications for the UKYP? The UKYP is not about “power” it is about giving young people a voice.

Could Youth Worker staff training run in parallel to UKYP regional meetings? Staff often have nothing to do. This is an excellent suggestion and should be followed up by Regional Co-ordinators in the regions to ensure that the training that is delivered is the training that youth workers require.

4. **Service Level Agreement & Funding**

LA concern at service level agreement – it is a blank cheque. LA’s don’t sign as a result and the UKYP won’t survive without LAs. Costs of UKYP are high – venues for meetings, preparation with young people before events, travel and support at events. The UKYP
has discussed the concerns around writing a “blank cheque” and will provide an appendix to the SLA giving examples of the costs which we hope will alleviate the concerns around providing a blank cheque.

Staff often have to use their own money to fund youth travel/activities. LA staff sometimes have little or no funding. The signed SLA will provide the resources required to provide the support to the MYPs – this includes the cost of youth travel/activities.

5. **Select Committees & Meetings With Ministers**

UKYP needs to set dates early – flexibility of meetings and times needed, eg – school days not convenient. Often notified at short notice, yet high expectation we will deliver young people. Consider travel times and costs for non-London regions.

The UKYP appreciate travel costs and time into and out of London are a factor for many of you. However, there is nothing to prevent regional groups of MYPs inviting Ministers and MPs to meetings in the regions to discuss specific regional areas of concern relevant to their area.

Select Committees – these meetings are not young people’s agenda. The UKYP is determined that the agenda of the Select Committee will be determined by the MYPs.

6. **STR8 UP Events**

Concern that some MPs stated UKYP was not an effective body? Brainchild – organisers paid more than full participation budget in some areas!

The STR8 Up Events were not organised by the UKYP.

7. **Specific Issues On National Sitting**

Youth Workers – involve youth workers, they feel disempowered. Involve host regions in organising the national event – use their local knowledge, skills, networks. Value YWs use our skills. We want to be part of the planning process. Create space for worker input.

The UKYP would very much like to use the local knowledge, skills and networks of local youth workers to help deliver the annual sitting.

Programme – all language (especially the manifesto) should be in plain English, fun and lively. A feedback/suggestion/evaluation process is required. The pace was too fast – more breaks and fun needed.

The programme for the 3rd Sitting was devised by young people (the Procedures Group) for young people (the MYPs). All feedback and evaluation is considered when planning the following sitting, and issues raised at the 2003 are already being incorporated into the planning for the sitting in 2004, eg – youth worker involvement, the need for more “free” time, etc.

Press releases each day from the sitting would be useful.
Two deputy MYPs produced a newsletter for each day of the 2003 Sitting – this was available on-line and to everyone at the event.

Voting on age/term of office could be done in own regions, with results brought to Sitting. Would leave more time to debate relevant issues. Topical debates would be good, eg – antisocial behaviour bill.

The Procedures Group felt that the decision on the voting age/term of office should be made by the whole UKYP and that the most effective way of doing this would be at the Sitting.

No national sitting next year? Instead take a break and re-evaluate. Have a national event to celebrate achievements and good practice?

The Annual Sitting is the event in the UKYP’s calendar which brings everyone together to discuss the issues that matter to them.

8. **How To Move Forward?**

A debate, and the process to plan next year’s sitting should start now.

The UKYP has already begun this debate.
Research methodology
The Review was in two Stages:
- Stage 1: Description and evaluation of UKYP
- Stage 2: Evaluation (continued) and recommendations

Research: (Description)
- Review literature provided by DfES / UKYP
- Desk research (internet and other sources)
- 6 telephone depth interviews

Consultation (Evaluation)
- 8 discussion groups with young people in England, including young women in teenage pregnancy unit, refugees and asylum seekers, young men in PRU, students in schools
  - Discussion groups lasted 1 – 1 ½ hours and involved between 3 and 10 people
- 3 workshops with MYPs
  - London
  - Glasgow
  - Bala
- 1 face-to-face interview with Northern Ireland Trustee (ex-MYP)
- 1 telephone interview with Northern Ireland MYP
- 8 face-to-face interviews with stakeholders
- 9 telephone depth interviews with stakeholders

Survey (Evaluation)
- On-line and paper survey amongst key audiences

Stakeholders involved in the consultation include:
- MYPs
- UKYP (Management, Trustees, Regional co-ordinators)
- Youth workers / participation officers
- MPs, civil servants (including Scottish Executive and Welsh Assembly Members)
- Other youth fora (eg, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales)
- Voluntary / charitable organisations
Consultation was carried out between November 2003 and March 2004.
Discussion guide: Groups with young people

BACKGROUND AND GROUND RULES
Why we are doing the research
Moderator introduction.

Explain project in terms of wanting to understand views on how young people can get involved in issues that affect their lives, what they think are the most important issues for young people to focus on, what they think of young people who do get involved. Do not mention UK Youth Parliament at this stage.

Ground rules
Brief discussion of ground rules- suggest a couple of things - eg respect for others’ views, not interrupting, talking one at a time, polite, etc – ask if they have any others they would like to include. Gain consensus to ground rules.
Assure of confidentiality.
Ask for mobiles off etc.

WARM-UP
Young people talk in pairs for 2-3 minutes: in addition to name and age they are asked to find out from their partner:

i) one word that they associate with politics
ii) what they think democracy means
iii) if they think that young people have a voice in political issues

Responses to be posted on large feedback sheet. Once in, moderator to probe on:
• general perceptions of / attitudes towards politics – what does it make them think of?
• Perceptions of young people who get involved in youth politics
• awareness / perceptions of any groups / organisations (youth councils in schools, youth forums, etc)
• any involvement they have / have had with youth groups (including youth clubs, community groups etc)

UKYP – initial views / mood boards
Explain that project they’re involved in is on behalf of the UK Youth Parliament. Ask if anyone has heard of it. Stakeholders are given brief overview of the UKYP.

Young people work in pairs to produce mood boards of UK Youth Parliament based on information they have so far.
Analyse mood boards: why have they chosen particular images – probe for any differences in attitudes to politics and attitudes towards young people in politics / the UKYP. Explore: what influence they think UKYP has over issues that are important to young people.

Have you got a voice?
Whole group: brainstorm issues that affect them: locally, regionally, nationally, internationally (flipchart findings). Issues on post-it notes to be stuck to feedback board, under “Local”, “National” and “International” headings.

(TOTAL SAY NO SAY (may be appropriate to younger groups – moderator to use their own discretion)
For each issue, young people remain seated if they have “no say”, stand if they have “some say”, stand with hands in the air if they have “total say” over this area. Moderator to probe on a few issues over which they feel they have “some say” and “no say” and ask for suggestions on how they might be able to influence these issues (this is to set up the next activity).

Working in fours: young people select one issue from each category (local, national, international) and make a list of all the different ways in which they might be able to influence these issues. Moderator to provide guidance where necessary. For each entry on the list, consider:
- How easy or difficult is it for young people to have influence in this way?
- Would you need support or resources to help you if you wanted to use your influence in this way? This could be from other young people or from adults (eg, youth workers, teachers, parents, others)
- How could other young people be encouraged other people to support you on this issue? (This can be things they do themselves, or things that would need to be done by relevant adults – eg, keeping them up-to-date with progress.)

Getting involved
Moderator provides information on UKYP as organisation that provides a voice for young people and a way in which they can influence issues that affect them, at a local, national and international level. Stress that UKYP wants to make sure that it represents the views of all young people. How do you think you could be encouraged to get involved with the UKYP?

Working in groups of four, young people explore 3 levels of involvement:
1. Voting – methods, ways to encourage people to vote, ways/places to publicise elections
2. Supporting Members of the Youth Parliament – ways to interest young people in helping MYPs (eg, helping out on campaigns, publicising elections, setting up discussions – consider places, means of communication, etc)
3. Becoming a Member of the Youth Parliament
Feedback to moderator and discussion of issues raised. Moderator to probe on reaching “hard to reach” audiences (young homeless, young people in care etc)

**Designing a poster**
Working in pairs, young people design posters that would encourage *them and their friends* to get involved in the UKYP.

**Closing**
Young people explain their posters. Final discussion to explore whether their views on young people getting involved in this way:
- Have been changed now they know more?
- Would be changed if their suggestions were followed?
- Would be changed if they knew more about UKYP’s successes

Final bubble drawing: If I was a member of the Youth Parliament I would ……

Thank and close
Incentives & signatures
If they would like to have a summary copy of the findings from the review?
**Information on sample for quantitative survey**

**Young people**

1000 questionnaires were sent out to 26 representatives working with young people across the UK as a whole. These included schools, youth clubs and organisations. Each representative was sent around 50 surveys to pass on to young people, proportionate to the area covered. To try to achieve a spread across the ages (11 - 18), we asked each school to focus on particular year groups.

Out of the 1000 questionnaires sent out, 242 completed questionnaires were returned as follows:

- Wales - 68
- Scotland – 25
- England – 149
- Northern Ireland – 0

Responses to the survey were self-selected which means that it is not possible to assign a confidence level to the findings or determine how representative they are of the population of young people in the UK.

**MYPs**

The MYP survey was on-line. The survey link was sent to UKYP for distribution to MYPs and for inclusion on the UKYP website. The survey was online from November 21st to January 4th.

Approximately 16% of all MYPs responded to the survey. Eleven of the respondents were members of the Procedures Group. This represents almost 50% of the PG membership and 17% of the total MYP sample. However, only 6% of all MYPs are also members of the PG. Thus, amongst our MYP sample, the representation of PG members is almost three times greater than it is amongst MYPs as a whole. This suggests that the MYPs who responded to the survey may be more closely involved with UKYP as a whole than a more “typical” MYP.

**Stakeholders**

The stakeholder survey was on-line. The link was distributed to youth workers, participation leads in government departments, charitable and voluntary organisations and MPs, as well as UKYP management and Trustees.

The following charts provide further details of the survey sample.
Age
(Base: 306. Young people: 242. MYPs: 64)

Sex
(Base: 306. Young people: 242. MYPs: 64)
**Ethnicity**
(Base: 306: 242 young people, 64 MYPs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Young People</th>
<th>MYPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disabilities**
(Base: 242 young people, 64 MYPs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYPs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stakeholder sample (Base: 61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth worker</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s charity / voluntary group</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP Management</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKYP Trustee</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UKYP staff (eg, regional coordinator, support staff)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional distribution –
(Base: 135 - MYPs, Stakeholders and 24 of young people sample who have been MYP in the past.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Midlands</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Midlands</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S West</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S East</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Young people’s questionnaire

UK Youth Parliament: Have your say!

This questionnaire is part of a survey being carried out by the Office for Public Management. We want to learn about what young people think about politics, how interested they are in getting involved in local and national youth politics and what sorts of things might help to get more young people involved.

The survey is part of a review of the United Kingdom Youth Parliament (UKYP) which the Office for Public Management (OPM) is carrying out on behalf of a government department called the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). We will tell you a bit about the UKYP later on in the survey. If you want to learn more, you can visit their website at www.ukyp.org.uk.

The questionnaire will be filled in by young people age 11 – 18 throughout the country. It will also be sent to young people who are involved with the UK Youth Parliament, to politicians, children’s charities and other groups working with young people.

About you

We would like to have a picture of the different young people who have taken part in the survey. Could you put a tick in the box that applies to you and write in any other information we ask you for?

Q1 How old are you? ______________

Q2 Are you:

☐ Male

☐ Female
Q3 Please tell us which of the following groups you belong to:

☐ White

☐ Asian or Asian British

☐ Black or Black British

☐ Mixed Race

☐ Chinese

☐ Other, please write which group you belong to:

_____________________________________

Q4 Do you have a disability?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q5 If yes, could you tell us what this is?


Q6 Please tell us if you are now or have been an MYP (Member of the Youth Parliament):

☐ Am currently an MYP / Deputy MYP

☐ Have been an MYP / Deputy MYP in the past

Q7 If you are or have been an MYP or a Deputy MYP, please tell us which region or country you represent(ed):

☐ North West

☐ Eastern

☐ North East

☐ South West

☐ Yorkshire and Humberside

☐ South East

☐ West Midlands

☐ London

☐ East Midlands

☐ Scotland

☐ Northern Ireland

☐ Wales
Who listens to young people?

Q8 Please put a tick in the box that indicates how much or how little you agree with the following sentences. For example, if you think very definitely that 'Politicians listen to the views of all young people', you would tick the 'agree a lot' box next to that sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Not sure/ don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would be happy to write to a politician about an issue that worried me

Politicians listen to the views of all young people

I would be happy to talk to someone from my local council about an issue that worried me

People from my local council listen to the views of young people in my area

I would be happy to talk to my school council about an issue that worried me

School councillors listen to the views of the young people in their school
Q9 Why is it important for young people to have a say in the issues that affect them?

Please put the following statements in order. Put a number “1” next to the sentence that you think is the most important reason for young people to have a say, put a “2” next to the next most important reason, and so on.

It is important that young people have a say in the things that affect them because...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people use a lot of services (eg, public transport, education, health) and we need to understand their experiences of these services if we’re going to improve them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If young people get involved in planning and making decisions about things that affect them, that will help them to become good citizens in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government has said that it will listen to young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are citizens of this country and should speak out on important issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are citizens of this country and have a right to influence things that affect them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please use this box to write down any other reasons why young people should have a say in things that affect them.

Q10 What do you think are the best ways of getting young people involved in the things that affect them? Please put a tick in the box that describes what you think.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Not sure/ don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give young people proof that getting involved makes a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get celebrities that young people admire to speak out on those issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the voting age to 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask young people who are already involved to come into school to talk about their experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good local places where young people can learn about the issues that affect them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Set up more links between schools or school councils and local youth clubs / groups

Please use this box to write down any other ideas you have for how young people can get involved or make a difference to the things that affect them.

The UK Youth Parliament

Q11 Have you heard of the United Kingdom Youth Parliament (UK Youth Parliament)?

☐ Yes (GO TO QUESTION 12)

☐ No (GO TO QUESTION 13)

Q12 If you have heard of the UK Youth Parliament, please tell us how you found out about it.

The United Kingdom Youth Parliament wants to give young people in this country, aged between 11 and 18, a voice. They want this voice to be heard and listened to by local and national government, people who provide services for young people and other organisations interested in the views and needs of young people. Young people can
become Members of the Youth Parliament (MYPs) by being elected by young people age 11 – 18 who live in their area.

Q13 The UK Youth Parliament would like to get as many young people as possible involved in its work. Please tick in the box that describes what you are most likely or unlikely to do:

| Agree a lot | Agree a bit | Disagree a bit | Disagree a lot | Not sure/don’t know |

Vote for someone who wanted to become a Member of the UK Youth Parliament by:

- Text voting
- E-voting (voting on the internet)
- Voice-mail voting
- Voting in person at school
- Voting in person at a youth club / community centre

Support someone who is a Member of the UK Youth Parliament (e.g. organise election campaigns, put up posters, encourage your friends to vote)

Become a Member of the Youth Parliament
Q14 Please write down one idea for something the UK Youth Parliament could do to get you involved in the things that affect you. *It might be helpful to think of the things you enjoy doing (for example, art, music, drama, discussion). Could the UK Youth Parliament use any of these activities to encourage you to get involved?*
MYP questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of a survey being carried out by the Office for Public Management. We want to learn about what young people think about politics, how interested they are in getting involved in local and national youth politics and what sorts of things might help to get more young people involved.

The survey is part of a review of the United Kingdom Youth Parliament (UKYP) which the Office for Public Management is carrying out on behalf of a government department called the Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

The questionnaire will be filled in by young people age 11 – 18 throughout the country, including MYPs and Deputy MYPs. It will also be sent to politicians, children’s charities and other groups working with young people.

SECTION ONE – ABOUT YOU

We would like to have a picture of the different young people who have taken part in the survey. Could you put a tick in the box that applies to you and write in any other information we ask you for?

Q1 How old are you? ______________

Q2 Are you Male

Female

Q3 Please tell us which of the following groups you belong to:

Pre-codes

Q4 Do you have a disability? Yes

No

Could you tell us what this is? ______________
Q5 Please tell us if you are now or have been an MYP / Deputy MYP

Am currently an MYP / Deputy MYP

Have been an MYP/Deputy MYP in the past

Q6 If you are or have been an MYP or a Deputy MYP, please tell us which region or country you represent(ed):

Northern Ireland
Scotland
North East
North West
Yorkshire and Humberside
East Midlands
West Midlands
Wales
Eastern
London
South East
South West
SECTION TWO: WHO LISTENS TO YOUNG PEOPLE?

Q7 Please put a tick in the box that indicates how much or how little you agree with the following sentences. For example, if you think very definitely that “Politicians listen to the views of all young people”, you would tick the “agree a lot” box next to that sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Not sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I would be happy to write to a politician about an issue that worried me</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politicians listen to the views of all young people</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I would be happy to talk to someone from my local council about an issue that worried me</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>People from my local council listen to the views of young people in my area</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I would be happy to talk to my school council about an issue that worried me</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>School councillors listen to the views of the young people in their school</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Why is it important for young people to have a say in the issues that affect them?

Please put the following statements in order. Put a number “1” next to the sentence that you think gives the most important reason for young people to have a say, put a “2” next to the next most important reason, and so on until you have given each of the sentences a number.

It is important that young people have a say in the things that affect them because...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people use a lot of services (eg, public transport, education, health) and we need to understand their experiences of these services if we’re going to improve them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If young people get involved in planning and making decisions about things that affect them, that will help them to become good citizens in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government has said that it will listen to young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are citizens of this country and should speak out on important issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are citizens of this country and have a right to influence things that affect them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please use this box to write down any other reasons why young people should have a say in things that affect them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 What do you think are the best ways of getting young people involved in the things that affect them? Please put a tick in the box that describes what you think.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Not sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give young people proof that getting involved makes a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get celebrities that young people admire to speak out on those issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the voting age to 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask young people who are already involved to come into school to talk about their experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good local places where young people can learn about the issues that affect them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up more links between schools or school councils and local youth clubs / groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION THREE : The UK Youth Parliament

Q11 How did you find out about the UK Youth Parliament?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Q12 As you will know, the UK Youth Parliament would like to get as many young people as possible involved in its work. Please tick the box that describes what you think young people who are not involved with the UKYP are most likely or unlikely to do:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very likely to do this</th>
<th>Quite likely to do this</th>
<th>Not very likely to do this</th>
<th>Not at all likely to do this</th>
<th>Not sure / don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Vote for someone who wanted to become a Member of the UK Youth Parliament by:**

- Text voting
- E-voting (voting on the internet)
- Voice-mail voting
- Voting in person at school
- Voting in person at a youth club / community centre

**Support someone who is a Member of the UK Youth Parliament (e.g., organise election campaigns, put up posters, encourage your friends to vote)**

**Become a Member of the Youth Parliament**

---

**Q13** Please write down one idea for something the UK Youth Parliament could do to get more young people involved in the things that affect them.

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

---

**SECTION FOUR – These questions are about the UKYP**

**Q14** How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the UK Youth Parliament?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>No sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP provides a voice for all young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UKYP does not reflect the cultural diversity of the UK

The UKYP makes the best use of the resources available to it

The UKYP has effective links with other UK Forums

The UKYP has effective links with local government

The UKYP has effective links with national government

The UKYP has a good public image amongst young people

The UKYP reflects the very best practice in youth democracy

The UKYP is effective at presenting young people's views to policy makers in such a way that they are influential?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>people in the United Kingdom</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP does not reflect the cultural diversity of the UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP makes the best use of the resources available to it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP has effective links with other UK Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP has effective links with local government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP has effective links with national government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP has a good public image amongst young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP reflects the very best practice in youth democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP is effective at presenting young people’s views to policy makers in such a way that they are influential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15a  Do you think that there should be an English Youth Parliament, which represents the English regions only?

Yes

No
Q15b Why do you say that?
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

Q16 Of the two choices outlined below, which do you think is the most important?

a) The most important thing to consider when thinking about the organisation of the UK Youth Parliament is how effective it is in influencing policy-makers

b) The most important thing to consider when thinking about the organisation of the UK Youth Parliament is how well it represents the views of young people

Q16a Could you explain why you have chosen that one?
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
Q17 Please put a tick in the box that describes you best. For example, if you have heard of Select Committees, put a tick in the first column. If you haven’t heard of any of these meetings then you won’t need to tick any of the boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I have heard of this</th>
<th>I have been to one of these meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Procedures Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Annual Sitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal regional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal local meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 How effective do you think the different types of meetings are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Quite effective</th>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>Don’t know / not sure / don’t know what is this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Procedures Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Annual Sitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal regional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal local meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19 What do you think is the most important issue facing the UK Youth Parliament at the moment?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
The last few questions are about the different sorts of support given to MYPs and Deputy MYPs. We have also asked some questions about how the UKYP communicates with MYPs and other young people.

**Q20** How strongly do you agree or disagree with the sentences below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't know/not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get enough support to carry out my responsibilities as an MYP/Deputy MYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth workers are available when I need their support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP management gives me all the support I need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have all the information I need to carry out my responsibilities as an MYP/Deputy MYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP does all that it can to tell young people in this country about the work that it does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q21** Please complete the following sentences:

a) As an MYP / Deputy MYP, my three most important sources of support are

i. ________________________________________________

ii. ________________________________________________

iii. ________________________________________________
b) As an MYP / Deputy MYP, my three main sources of information about what's happening in the UKYP are:

i) _____________________________

ii) _____________________________

iii) _____________________________

Q22 Please write down the one thing that would most help you to be an effective MYP / Deputy MYP.

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
Stakeholder questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of a survey being carried out by the Office for Public Management. We want to learn about what young people think about politics, how interested they are in getting involved in local and national youth politics and what sorts of things might help to get more young people involved.

The survey is part of a review of the United Kingdom Youth Parliament (UKYP) which the Office for Public Management is carrying out on the Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

This questionnaire is being sent to politicians, children’s charities and other groups working with young people. A similar questionnaire will be filled in by young people age 11 – 18 throughout the country, including MYPs and Deputy MYPs.

SECTION ONE – ABOUT YOU

Please provide the following information about you and your organisation.

Q1a Please indicate which of the following describes you best: it would be helpful if you could indicate specifically which organisation you belong to.

| Youth worker |  |
| MP |  |
| Civil servant |  |
| Children’s charity / voluntary group |  |
| UKYP Management |  |
| UKYP Trustee |  |
| Other UKYP staff (eg, regional co-ordinator, support staff) |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |
2a It would be helpful if you could indicate specifically which organisation you belong to…

Q3 Please indicate in which region or country you work.

Northern Ireland
Scotland
North East
North West
Yorkshire and Humberside
East Midlands
West Midlands
Wales
Eastern
London
South East
South West

SECTION TWO: WHO LISTENS TO YOUNG PEOPLE?

Q4 Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Not sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people are happy to write to politicians about issues that worry them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians listen to the views of all young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are happy to talk to someone from their local council about an issues that worry them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from local councils listen to the views of young people in their area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are happy to talk to their school councils about issues that worry them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School councillors listen to the views of the young people in their school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5 Why is it important for young people to have a say in the issues that affect them?
Please rank the following statements, using a “1” to indicate the statement you feel best represents your view and a “5” to indicate the statement that least represents your view.

It is important that young people have a say in the things that affect them because...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people use a lot of services (eg, public transport, education, health) and we need to understand their experiences of these services if we're going to improve them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If young people get involved in planning and making decisions about things that affect them, that will help them to become good citizens in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government has said that it will listen to young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are citizens of this country and should speak out on important issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people are citizens of this country and have a right to influence things that affect them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please use this box to indicate any other reasons why young people should have a say in things that affect them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 What do you think are the best ways of getting young people involved in the things that affect them? Please indicate in the box how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a bit</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>Not sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give young people proof that getting involved makes a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get celebrities that young people admire to speak out on those issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the voting age to 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask young people who are already involved to come into school to talk about their experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good local places where young people can learn about the issues that affect them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up more links between schools or school councils and local youth clubs / groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use this box to suggest any other ways in which young people can get involved or make a difference to the things that affect them.
SECTION THREE : The UK Youth Parliament

Q7 Have you heard of the United Kingdom Youth Parliament (UK Youth Parliament)?

Yes  (GO TO QUESTION 12)

No  (GO TO QUESTION 13)

Q8 How did you find out about the UK Youth Parliament?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Q9 The UK Youth Parliament would like to get as many young people as possible involved in its work. Please indicate how likely or unlikely you think it is that young people not involved with the UKYP will do the following things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Quite likely to do this</th>
<th>Not very likely to do this</th>
<th>Not at all likely to do this</th>
<th>Not sure / don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote for someone who wanted to become a Member of the UK Youth Parliament by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-voting (voting on the internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice-mail voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in person at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in person at a youth club / community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UKYP Report – Part 4**

**Support someone who is a Member of the UK Youth Parliament (eg, organise election campaigns, put up posters, encourage your friends to vote)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>No sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Become a Member of the Youth Parliament**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>No sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q10 Please suggest one thing the UK Youth Parliament could do to get more young people involved in the issues that affect them.

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

SECTION FOUR – These questions are about the UKYP

Q11 How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the UK Youth Parliament?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree a lot</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a lot</th>
<th>No sure / Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP provides a voice for all young people in the United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP does not reflect the cultural diversity of the UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UKYP makes the best use of the resources available to it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UKYP has effective links with other UK Forums

The UKYP has effective links with local government

The UKYP has effective links with national government

The UKYP has a good public image amongst young people

The UKYP reflects the very best practice in youth democracy

The UKYP is effective at presenting young people’s views to policy makers in such a way that they are influential?

Q12 Do you think that there should be an English Youth Parliament, which represents the English regions only? Need to explain that Scotland, Wales and NI have their own orgs which are part of UKYP

Yes

No

Why do you say that?

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

Final Report
Q13 Of the two choices outlined below, which do you think is the most important?

c) The most important thing to consider when thinking about the organisation of the UK Youth Parliament is how effective it is in influencing policy-makers

d) The most important thing to consider when thinking about the organisation of the UK Youth Parliament is how well it represents the views of young people

Could you explain why you have chosen that one?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q14 Please indicate which of the following meetings you have heard of and whether you have attended any of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I have heard of this</th>
<th>I have been to one of these meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Procedures Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Annual Sitting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal regional meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal local meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 How effective do you think the different types of meetings are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Quite effective</th>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>Don’t know / not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Procedures Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Annual Sitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal regional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal local meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16 What do you think is the most important issue facing the UK Youth Parliament at the moment?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

The last few questions are about the different sorts of support given to MYPs and Deputy MYPs. We have also asked some questions about how the UKYP communicates with MYPs and other young people.

Q17 How strongly do you agree or disagree with the sentences below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don’t know/not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYPs / Deputy MYPs get enough support to carry out their responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth workers are available when MYPs / Deputy MYPs need their support

The UKYP management gives MYPs / Deputy MYPs all the support they need

MYPs / Deputy MYPs have all the information they need to carry out their responsibilities

The UKYP does all that it can to tell young people in this country about the work that it does

Please complete the following sentences:

Q18 The three most important sources of support for MYPs / Deputy MYPs are:

i. _________________________________

ii. _________________________________

iii. _________________________________

Q19 The three most important sources of information about what's happening in the UKYP are:

iv) _________________________________

v) _________________________________

vi) _________________________________

Q20 Please suggest one thing that you think would help MYPs / Deputy MYPs to play their role most effectively:

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
MYP Conference Agenda

10.30 – 10.45  Welcome and Introductions

**Session 1: Presentation and response to findings**
10.45 – 11.15  Presentation of headlines from Review
11.15 – 11.30  MYP question and answer session

    11.30 – 11.45am – Break

**Session 2: Filling in the gaps**
11.45 – 12.20  Small group sessions – facilitated
    Discussion of Review findings
    Identifying issues not raised during Review
12.20 – 12.30  Plenary: each group feeds back on two of the issues they discussed

    12.30 – 1.30pm - Lunch

**Session 3: Recommendations and Solutions**
13.30 - 14.30  Breakout groups: (art materials, tape recorders, etc will be provided):
    Social outcomes
    Engagement
    Funding
    Networking and partnerships
    Equal representation for the 4 nations
    Leadership
    Management
    Communication

    PLUS other ideas suggested by MYPs

14.30 – 15.00  Plenary: Presentation of “stalls”
15.00 – 15.15  Circulation: MYPs visit each “stall”, adding suggestions, posting questions

    15.15 – 15.30 - Break

**Session 4: Where to now?**
15.30 – 16.00  Small group discussions
16.00 – 16.15  Plenary: feedback on small group discussions
    Thanks and Close
16.15 – 16.30  Small groups: Expense claims and post-conference questionnaire completion
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