Tired of hanging around

Using sport and leisure activities to prevent anti-social behaviour by young people
The Audit Commission is an independent watchdog, driving economy, efficiency and effectiveness in local public services to deliver better outcomes for everyone.

Our work across local government, health, housing, community safety and fire and rescue services means that we have a unique perspective. We promote value for money for taxpayers, auditing the £200 billion spent by 11,000 local public bodies.

As a force for improvement, we work in partnership to assess local public services and make practical recommendations for promoting a better quality of life for local people.
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Summary

Six key messages for local and national government

- Sport and leisure have an important role in preventing anti-social behaviour.
- Most councils, and many other local agencies, provide or commission some good targeted activities. But there is little evidence of comprehensive area-based approaches.
- A general lack of data on costs and performance constrains effective commissioning.
- Young people are rarely consulted when planning new activities. Young people want activities that are accessible, reliable, and relevant.
- National funding arrangements are inefficient. Projects have to deal with unreliable short-term funding that is expensive to administer.
- Effective solutions engage the young people at risk; they are delivered through local joint working, and national and local funding is coordinated.

Adults and young people see anti-social behaviour differently

- Adults’ main concern is about young people hanging around.
- Eight out of ten young people say they hang around to socialise cheaply and to keep safe – only 2 per cent think it is anti-social.
- Young people are concerned about being victims of anti-social behaviour.
- For young people having nothing to do can be the trigger for anti-social behaviour.
- Councils need to challenge community views about anti-social behaviour and its solutions.
Sport and leisure can prevent anti-social behaviour

- Sport and leisure can engage young people, attracting those at highest risk of anti-social behaviour into more intensive developmental projects.
- Anti-social behaviour cannot be isolated from other social problems: resources must target deprived areas where perceptions of anti-social behaviour are highest.
- Preventive projects are cost-effective. A young person in the criminal justice system costs the taxpayer over £200,000 by the age of 16, but one given support to stay out costs less than £50,000.
- Projects must be accessible, reliable and relevant, and reflect the diversity of young people’s needs.
- Young people value approachable project staff who take an interest in them and offer advice and support.

Government policy now links prevention and enforcement, but this has yet to lead to coordinated local action

- Two-thirds of the 150 local area agreements signed in 2008 included targets for increasing young people’s participation in positive activities or for reducing the number of first-time entrants into the criminal justice system.
- Funding arrangements do not reflect the research evidence about how to change behaviour: too many projects are short term with limited impact.
- Consultation with young people about new projects or activities is rare. Consultation with those young people likely to use them is rarer.
- Few councils, children’s trusts, or crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs) know where activities are available or, where there is wasteful duplication or, gaps in provision, or where young people have choice.
- Councils, children’s trusts and CDRPs lack the performance data to make intelligent commissioning decisions about new or repeat schemes – 48 per cent of projects did not have evidence of their outcomes.
- Only 27 per cent of projects collected evidence in a way that allowed an assessment of value for money.
National funding arrangements are wasteful, inefficient and bureaucratic

- Over half of the funding for preventive projects comes from central government, but arrangements are complicated and there is little local coordination.
- A typical project leader spends a third of their time chasing new funds and reporting to their current funders.
- The full cost of applying for smaller grants can exceed the value of the grant.
- Most funding arrangements last for fewer than three years: this limits the effectiveness and sustainability of projects.

Councils, children’s trusts, and CDRPs must provide leadership and work together

- Anti-social behaviour must be tackled as part of a response to problems that include teenage sexual health, drug and alcohol abuse, and community cohesion.
- Agencies need to build a strong evidence base about what is needed and what is working as the basis for intelligent commissioning.
- All agencies that can contribute to preventive projects for young people must engage in developing the strategy as well as delivering it.
- Young people and communities should be partners in preventing anti-social behaviour.
- Longer-term funding is a precondition for value for money, proper planning, and for relationship building.
- Local agencies need support in getting funds and in managing, monitoring and evaluating projects.
- Local efforts to involve partners and communities can be very effective without spending a lot of public money.
Recommendations

Councils, working with their local strategic partnerships (LSPs), should:

- Engage with local young people, parents, and communities by:
  - listening to young people when designing new activities;
  - giving older teenagers opportunities to design their own solutions;
  - telling young people about activities available in their area; and
  - working with communities to improve their understanding of anti-social behaviour and how to respond to it.

- Ensure an integrated, coordinated and comprehensive programme of sport and leisure activities by working with other organisations and:
  - agreeing a local strategy to address youth anti-social behaviour;
  - engaging all relevant partners;
  - promoting schools’ role in tackling anti-social behaviour;
  - mapping local activities;
  - prioritising provision according to need;
  - providing activities that are accessible, reliable and relevant;
  - ensuring activities are free or at low cost to young people; and
  - meeting the needs of all young people, including young women and minority ethnic groups.

- Train staff to:
  - implement a strategic commissioning process of analysis, planning, implementation and review;
  - review projects and use findings to improve provision; and
  - identify ways to build long-term sustainability into projects.
Recommendations

- Assist local projects by:
  - providing support in seeking funding and making bids;
  - coordinate applications for funding and funding streams; and
  - promoting project management, monitoring and evaluation training for project staff.

- Make evidence-based decisions when commissioning activities by:
  - building and using a strong, local evidence base;
  - drawing on research evidence about effectiveness to specify and commission activities;
  - supporting longer-term local programmes;
  - using light-touch measures to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of activities; and
  - recording project achievements.

Central government should:
- support longer-term programmes in preference to short-term projects;
- reduce the number of funding streams by making increased use of pooled funding for youth anti-social behaviour and associated activities;
- improve communications about, and marketing of, the available funding streams;
- provide a simple template for project and programme evaluation to reduce reporting burdens and increase knowledge about successful interventions; and
- ensure that future surveys to measure anti-social behaviour focus on types of behaviour or its effects, rather than age specific activities such as young people hanging around.

The Audit Commission will:
- produce guidance and tools to help councils and their partners improve their provision of activities; and
- work with other inspectorates to use the lessons from the study in developing and delivering Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).
Introduction

1. Anti-social behaviour is a major cause of concern in England. Public interest focuses on adults’ views of young people, but young people also worry about anti-social behaviour and are often victims of it. Government agencies in England and Wales spend an estimated £3.4 billion a year dealing with anti-social behaviour (Ref. 1). In addition, the government spends around £1.6 billion on the youth service and programmes to engage young people in activities and prevent them from becoming involved in crime or anti-social behaviour (Ref. 2).

2. Anti-social behaviour is a complex and multifaceted issue. Both adults and young people behave anti-socially, but this report focuses on anti-social behaviour and young people. Anti-social behaviour cannot be solved in isolation from other social problems. The solutions, however, are well researched and documented. Councils and other local stakeholders must work together to deliver an appropriate balance between enforcement actions against those that commit anti-social behaviour and preventive measures that help to reduce the risk of young people getting involved in the first place.

3. Councils have a statutory duty to provide access to recreational and educational activities for young people.¹ This duty recognises the many benefits that young people can get from taking part in such activities. The national indicator (N110) on young people’s participation in positive activities gives a measure of the volume of activity taking place. So far there has been no assessment of the quality of councils’ progress in responding to the duty.

4. This study focuses on the role of sport and leisure activities in preventing anti-social behaviour in young people aged 8 to 19 years. These activities are part of the actions that councils and their partners can use to tackle and prevent anti-social behaviour. This study recognises, but does not cover, local agencies’ work with families and young children or the role of schools in helping to prevent or address anti-social behaviour.

5. The study aims to help councils and their partners get the best outcomes from sport and leisure activities for young people at risk of anti-social behaviour. It also:
   - assesses the impact and efficiency of current funding arrangements; and
   - includes the perspective of young people on what they want and what they value from projects.

¹ Education and Inspections Act 2006. The duty came into effect on 1st January 2007.
This report builds on findings from Audit Commission research during winter 2007/08 and summer 2008. The Audit Commission interviewed 113 stakeholders in 14 case study areas, received 56 survey returns from projects for young people, and held 17 focus groups with young people. Details of the study methods are in Appendix 1.

There are six key messages from the study:

- Sport and leisure activities have an important role in preventing anti-social behaviour.
- Most councils, and many other local agencies, provide or commission some good targeted activities. But there is little evidence of comprehensive area-based approaches.
- Lack of data on costs and performance is a constraint on commissioning decisions.
- Young people are rarely consulted when planning new activities. Young people want activities that are accessible, reliable and relevant.
- National funding arrangements are inefficient. Projects have to deal with unreliable short-term funding that is expensive to administer.
- Effective solutions engage the appropriate young people; they are delivered through local joint working, and national and local funding is coordinated.

There are five chapters in this report:

- Chapter 1 – Anti-social behaviour is a local concern
- Chapter 2 – Sport and leisure activities can tackle anti-social behaviour
- Chapter 3 – What is happening locally?
- Chapter 4 – Funding arrangements inhibit preventive schemes
- Chapter 5 – The way forward

Practical advice is available to download from the Audit Commission website and includes:

- self-assessment checklists for coordinating, delivering and reviewing activities;
- principles for evaluating projects;
- guidance on accessing young people for consultation and sample focus group questions;
- questions for councillors to include in scrutiny; and
- case studies of good practice.

www.audit-commission.gov.uk/hangingaround
Anti-social behaviour is a local concern

It is difficult to define and measure anti-social behaviour

Anti-social behaviour includes a mixture of criminal and non-criminal activity. This study uses the definition of anti-social behaviour in the Crime and Disorder Act (Ref. 3):

‘... acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as [the perpetrator].’

The lack of specificity in the definition, the mix of criminal and non-criminal activities, and the role of perception mean that anti-social behaviour cannot be measured easily. There is no single, comprehensive dataset of anti-social behaviour incidents and the data that do exist are flawed. Up to 80 per cent of some types of anti-social behaviour go unrecorded (Ref. 4). But a single incident can be recorded by more than one agency. Councils, registered social landlords (RSLs), police, fire and rescue authorities, and transport providers all receive and record complaints about anti-social behaviour. Data quality is also a problem. In 2007 nearly half of police forces were poor at recording incidents (Ref. 5).

Comparisons between the data sources are difficult (Table 1). The British Crime Survey (Ref. 6) has collected data on seven types of anti-social behaviour since 1992. It specifically defines ‘young people hanging around’ as anti-social behaviour.

In contrast, the Home Office One Day Count of Anti-social Behaviour (Ref. 7) focused on types of problematic behaviour, rather than the age of the perpetrator. It deliberately did not gather information about young people hanging around.

The 2006 Offending Crime and Justice Survey found that 22 per cent of young people aged 10 to 25 admitted to at least one act of anti-social behaviour in the previous 12 months (Ref. 8). This survey excluded ‘hanging around’ but did ask about being noisy or rude in a public place.
## Table 1

### Different definitions of anti-social behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of behaviour</th>
<th>One Day Count of Anti-social Behaviour</th>
<th>British Crime Survey</th>
<th>Offending, Crime and Justice Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter or rubbish</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle related nuisance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burnt-out cars</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage, vandalism, or graffiti</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax calls</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation or harassment – including racially or religiously motivated</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaving in a way that resulted in a neighbour complaining</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance behaviour</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy behaviour</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being drunk or rowdy in a public place</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street drinking or begging</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug use or drug dealing</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around on the street</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control and welfare related problems</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution, kerb-crawling, or sexual acts in public</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home Office
15 Difficulties with measuring the incidence of anti-social behaviour also make it difficult to put a figure on how much anti-social behaviour costs. The Home Office *One Day Count of Anti-Social Behaviour* estimated the cost to English and Welsh public agencies of responding to and dealing with reports of anti-social behaviour is £3.4 billion a year (Ref. 1).

**Hanging around – normal or intimidating?**

16 Anti-social behaviour remains a major cause of concern in England (Ref. 6). There is a strong link between areas of multiple deprivation and high perceptions of anti-social behaviour. Public concerns often focus on anti-social behaviour committed by young people. The public has consistently registered concerns about teenagers hanging around on the streets (Figure 1).

---

**Figure 1**

**Teenagers hanging around is, just, the greatest concern**

Concerns about anti-social behaviour in 2007/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-social Behaviour</th>
<th>Percentage Concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers hanging around</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish lying around</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and graffiti</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing drugs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdiness or drunkeness</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt-out cars</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Crime Survey, 2007/08
Anti-social behaviour is a local concern

Almost all (96 per cent) of the adults who perceive young people hanging around to be a problem are commenting from experience. Half of this group (51 per cent) say they see young people hanging around every day. They also mention particular times and places: evenings (7-11pm), and around local shops and street corners (Figure 2).

Adults are concerned about a range of behaviours associated with young people hanging around (Figure 3). They see these young people as disrespectful, inconsiderate noisy, drunk, and threatening (Ref. 9).

**Figure 2**
**Young people hang around in public spaces**
Adults see young people ‘hanging around’ in different public spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Space</th>
<th>Percentage of Adults Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local shops</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local streets/street corners</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds, other open spaces</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents own street</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home Office
Figure 3
A range of issues go with ‘hanging around’
Adults link a range of problem behaviours to young people hanging around

- Swearing
- Being noisy or rowdy
- Being a general nuisance
- Drinking alcohol
- Littering
- Blocking pavements
- Blocking shop entrances
- Being abusive or harassing
- Fighting with each other
- Being intimidating or threatening
- Taking drugs
- Graffiti

Source: Home Office
Many young people have concerns about anti-social behaviour: they too are victims. They report seeing and experiencing anti-social behaviour as part of their everyday lives. But adults and young people have different opinions about the same behaviour. Young people hanging around might intimidate adults – but the young people (particularly 12 to 15 year olds) see this as normal behaviour (Figure 4).

**Figure 4**
Adults and young people have concerns about anti-social behaviour; but their perceptions differ
The same behaviour triggers different responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults’ perceptions</th>
<th>Reality</th>
<th>Young people’s perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour can be lack of respect, inconsiderate behaviour and/or criminal activity</td>
<td>22% of young people report engaging in anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Young people experience anti-social behaviour as part of their everyday lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% of adults think anti-social behaviour is a problem in their area</td>
<td>39% of anti-social behaviour orders are on young people</td>
<td>Young people feel safer in groups and see the street as ‘their’ space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% of adults are concerned about young people hanging around</td>
<td>71% of press coverage of young people is negative</td>
<td>80% of young people say they hang around; 2% view this as anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home Office, Youth Net and the British Youth Council, Ipsos MORI, and Audit Commission
For many young people, hanging around is a chosen social activity. It makes them feel safe and independent; it gives them somewhere to go; and it is an opportunity to socialise with friends that is free and unsupervised by adults.

Some young people feel that they have nowhere else. Many do not want to be at home. Others feel that their parents or carers force them out and onto the streets.

‘Kids round here get kicked out of their houses and they’re not allowed to come back until 10 or 11 at night.’
Young person

It is difficult for young people to find alternatives to hanging around. Barriers include the cost of accessing activities or lack of awareness by young people of what is available locally. A recent survey of young people aged 16 to 19 years found that many (72 per cent) would rather get involved in activities than be hanging around at home or on the streets. But they feel there is not enough for them to do (Ref. 10). Peer pressure can be a powerful obstacle to involvement in the alternatives.

‘None of my mates go to Youth Club now. They hang out on the streets.’
Young person

Young people feel their actions are misunderstood and that they are all judged because of the poor behaviour of a few.

‘They all see us in a bad light.’
Young person

‘All young people out to have a good time are treated as yobs.’
Young person

This lack of understanding between adults and young people can create a self-fulfilling prophecy: young people consider they are justified in reacting to adults’ complaints about them by behaving anti-socially.

‘People take photos of us hanging around. You know if you do that you’re going to end up with a brick through your window. They shouldn’t be taking photos.’
Young person

‘The bigger deal they make of it the more kids will do it.’
Young person

Seventy-one young people took part in 17 focus groups in three of the case study areas during early 2008.
Anti-social behaviour is a local concern

25 In contrast, young people value adults who make an effort to get to know them and do not pre-judge them. Positive relationships with neighbourhood policing teams (community police officers (CPOs) and police community support officers (PCSOs)) show this. ‘The CPOs are all right. They stop and have a chat, they try to get to know you.’
Young person

26 This report focuses on how councils can use sport and leisure to help engage young people in productive activities, develop them as individuals, and help prevent them drifting into anti-social behaviour. But they don’t have a monopoly on good practice. The first case study shows how members of Gateshead Golf Club worked to get to know local young people and overcome problems with anti-social behaviour.
Case study 1

Gateshead Golf Club moves from demonising young people to engaging with them

There were problems with anti-social behaviour around the golf course and graffiti and rubbish in the underpass and on the bridge that joined the two areas of the course. There were incidents of young people intimidating or attacking players and stealing golf balls and equipment.

The golf club’s first reaction focused on calling the police to deal with each incident. Sometimes the club members chased any young people away. The problem intensified as more young people targeted the golf course and players as they felt unfairly blamed.

Eventually the club’s chairperson decided to change the approach. Young people in the area were asked what they wanted. Many were interested in playing golf: so the club provided free lessons and equipment.

There was also a project that involved young people working with a local graffiti artist to repaint a tunnel between two parts of the golf course. Young people have taken ownership of this art and regularly visit it and check that it has not been vandalised.

These successful approaches involved several partners as well as the golf club. Partners included the police, Wrekenton Communities Matter and neighbourhood management teams, the council’s youth service and anti-social behaviour team, and community and voluntary sector groups. The local councillor was instrumental in putting the golf club in touch with partners who could help.

By summer 2008 there were nearly a hundred young people involved with the club. Some of them are good enough to become future professionals. Others have agreed to become ambassadors and to show their peers how golf can help change their lives. Graffiti, violence and intimidation by young people have stopped and the club has won an award for its contribution to the community.

The cost to the club has not been quantified. The chairperson reports they have saved money that would have been spent on maintaining security and a perimeter fence. The golf club is private and sought no external funding for the venture. The cost to the public purse has been negligible.

Source: Audit Commission
Anti-social behaviour is a local concern

27 The media play a significant role in influencing perceptions of anti-social behaviour, especially when it comes to young people. Indeed, most adults say they get their information about anti-social behaviour in their area from local newspapers. Adult concerns about the behaviour of young people are driven, in part, by stories about ‘hoodies’, gangs and knives. Most press coverage of young people, 71 per cent, is negative (Ref. 11).

Anti-social behaviour can’t be solved in isolation from other social problems

28 The broad risk factors that lead to children and young people engaging in anti-social behaviour are the same as those that can lead to underachievement, criminality, poor long-term health and unemployment (Ref. 12). These risk factors include:

- social and economic disadvantage;
- low educational attainment;
- poor social and emotional skills;
- living in a deprived neighbourhood;
- poor parenting; and
- poor parental mental health.

29 There are other, specific triggers that can lead to anti-social behaviour. For some young people, anti-social behaviour is a response to feeling threatened, to the stresses of family life or to peer pressure. For others, it is a source of distraction, entertainment and a channel for letting off steam, showing off, ‘having a laugh’ or ‘getting a buzz’.
Anti-social behaviour is not confined to deprived areas, but young people in deprived neighbourhoods say that a general sense of dejection can increase the likelihood of involvement in anti-social behaviour. The three contributory factors to this are bullying, ugly surroundings, and having nothing to do (Figure 5).

**Figure 5**

**What triggers anti-social behaviour?**

Young people report four factors that can increase anti-social behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullying/threatening behaviour of others</th>
<th>Ugly surroundings</th>
<th>(Perception/reality) Nothing to do</th>
<th>Dejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By older age groups/older teenagers/authority figures/media and adults (with manifest dislike/fear of young people)</td>
<td>Dog excrement Poor turf Vandalism; graffiti; broken buildings/facilities/floodlights</td>
<td>Where I live For my age group (especially 14-17 years)</td>
<td>Low self esteem Poor support structures Bleak outlook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Eight out of ten parents or carers and six out of ten teenagers say there is not enough for young people to do in their area (Ref. 13). Seven out of ten teenagers believe that young people are involved in anti-social behaviour because they are bored (Ref. 2).

Most boredom is experienced immediately after school. A third (34 per cent) of 11 to 16 year olds regularly returns home to an empty house (Ref. 2). Boredom can lead to drug and alcohol abuse. A fifth of school pupils aged 11 to 15 who had taken drugs on more than one occasion gave their reason for drug taking as ‘I had nothing better to do’. Forty-three per cent of pupils took drugs to ‘get high or feel good’, and 29 per cent did so to ‘see what it was like’ (Ref. 14).

‘If I wasn’t here [at the project] I’d be hanging around the streets getting pissed. I’ve only had one drink this week.’

Young person

Small-scale incidents of anti-social behaviour among young people hanging around on the streets have the potential to escalate quickly into more serious, criminal conduct. Young people recognise that things can get out of control, particularly when drugs and alcohol are involved, when weapons are available, or when there are tensions between different groups.

‘You don’t think about it when you are doing it at the time. When I did it, I didn’t think it was that bad. Only when I got to court I realised how bad it was.’

Young person

Some young people find it difficult to resist peer pressure to engage in anti-social behaviour and need support to develop tactics and skills to avoid it.

‘It’s hard to stay away from it [anti-social behaviour] if your mates do it. They’d turn against you if you didn’t do it.’

Young person

The solutions are in long-term measures that will help young people to recognise the personal and social benefits of belonging to a wider civil society, and help them to overcome the challenges associated with their upbringing, socialisation, and experience. Factors that assist young people in developing emotional and social skills, developing academically and staying out of trouble include:

• strong, encouraging relationships with family, school, or peer groups;
• clear behavioural boundaries;
• acceptance of responsibility; and
• sport and leisure activities (Figure 6).

Government policy and investment increasingly focuses on these areas. Programmes to support relationship building include family intervention projects and Sure Start (Ref. 15).
37 Sport and leisure pursuits are positive activities that can offer young people an alternative to anti-social behaviour. These activities provide them with clear frameworks that can help them to improve behaviour and develop good relationships with and mutual respect for other young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More likely to stay out of trouble</th>
<th>Close influences</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive family influences</td>
<td>Parental restrictions/rules/supervisions</td>
<td>Homework/commitments/pets</td>
<td>Sports and leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group motivated towards positive behaviour</td>
<td>Fearful of getting into trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships with school and authority generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mindset**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More likely to get into trouble</th>
<th>Close influences</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Catalysts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parental guidance/support</td>
<td>No boundaries</td>
<td>Anti-social behaviour commonplace in neighbourhood</td>
<td>Alcohol/drugs/weapons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrong crowd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor/no relationship with school and authority figures</td>
<td>It’s a laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing else to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger/frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection/self preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mindset**

Source: Audit Commission

38 The next chapter considers how sport and leisure activities can tackle anti-social behaviour. It outlines:

- the case for prevention;
- the characteristics of effective activities;
- what young people want from activities; and
- government policy.
This chapter reviews the published research evidence, the case study sites and the views of young people to build the case for sport and leisure activities’ role in reducing and preventing anti-social behaviour. A more detailed review of the research evidence is available on the Audit Commission website: www.audit-commission.gov.uk/hangingaround.

The case for prevention

There are three ways to address anti-social behaviour:

- enforcement – punish the perpetrators and stop anti-social behaviour by issuing anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) and other such powers;
- support – help those engaging in anti-social behaviour to change; or
- prevention – address the causes of anti-social behaviour to prevent it happening.

The three approaches are not mutually exclusive, but national measures to deal with anti-social behaviour have tended to focus on enforcement. Adults generally want to see young offenders punished for their criminal or anti-social behaviour. Public support for the use of ASBOs for people engaging in anti-social behaviour is high (82 per cent). Just over half of adults (53 per cent) see ASBOs as an effective means of demonstrating that something is being done (Ref. 11).

Enforcement can stop young people’s anti-social behaviour. But the efficacy of different intervention varies (Ref. 16):

- Warning letter: 62 per cent success.
- Acceptable behaviour contracts (ABC): 40 per cent success.
- ASBO: 39 per cent completion (Ref. 17).
The use of enforcement measures is changing. In 2001, young people received more ASBOs than adults did (Ref. 17). Since 2003 this has reversed and the use of ASBOs has reduced (Figure 7).

**Figure 7**
The use of ASBOs is changing
More ASBOs are issued to adults than to young people

![Graph showing the number of ASBOs issued to young people and adults from 2001 to 2006.](image)

Source: Home Office
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44 Enforcement is an expensive way to stop anti-social behaviour in young people. An ASBO costs £2,500 to get (Ref. 18). When a breached ASBO triggers more intensive youth justice interventions, costs rise sharply. A typical supervision order costs a youth offending team (YOT) over £4,000 (Ref. 19). The cost of placing one young offender in custody for a year is £45,000 (Ref. 20).

45 A young person who starts showing behavioural problems at age five, and is dealt with through the criminal justice system will cost the taxpayer around £207,000 by the age of 16. Alternative interventions to support changes in behaviour would cost about £47,000. Over £113 million a year would be saved if just one in ten young offenders was diverted towards effective support (Ref. 21). American research estimates the savings from diverting an individual from a lifetime of crime and anti-social behaviour is about $2 million (Ref. 22).

46 Enforcement measures often do not address the underlying reasons why young people commit anti-social behaviour, or help young people to change. Preventive and enforcement measures should complement each other. Individual support orders (ISOs), for example, combine enforcement with support. An ISO, attached to an ASBO, requires an offender to address the underlying causes of their anti-social behaviour by, for example, attending counselling sessions with a YOT worker. In 2006, only 8 per cent of ASBOs had an ISO attached (Ref. 17).

The right programmes can change behaviour

47 Sport and leisure activities are part of a range of interventions to mitigate and manage the risk factors that contribute to anti-social behaviour. Their value has long been recognised (Ref. 23). Sport and leisure activities are popular with most young people. They are exciting and worthwhile alternatives to anti-social behaviour.

---

1 These figures are based on those calculated in the 2004 Audit Commission Youth Justice report, but have been updated to reflect the cost of inflation.
But the right programmes must reflect levels of need. For those young people at high risk of engagement in anti-social behaviour, sport and leisure activities alone are not enough. Long-term impact will only be achieved by addressing some of the risk factors linked to their engagement in anti-social behaviour. Effective prevention programmes combine sport and leisure activities with developmental components supporting young people to improve their personal and social skills and to change their behaviour.

Developmental activities include mentoring, role modelling, and opportunities for them to volunteer and, eventually, to coach others. These activities can increase self-esteem and self-confidence, reduce impulsivity and risk taking, and improve educational and employment prospects. But they must be available over the medium- to long-term to have impact.

Some young people need support and encouragement to engage with activities. Outreach work is an important means of taking the activities and opportunities out to young people and starting to connect with them.

Young people most likely to engage in anti-social behaviour tend to be attracted to informal, short-term, unstructured activities: those who are most disadvantaged are least likely to get involved. A major challenge for providers is to find activities that will attract and engage these young people, and then introduce elements of structure and development at the right point.

‘[They want] somewhere that is safe, that is secure, but not over managed, and […] opportunities to develop activities as they go. Eventually the experience suggests that they do want to become involved in structured and constructive courses. But the way that [the courses] are presented to them is not conventional, so they won’t identify immediately that they’d want to do something like that.’

Extended schools coordinator

Young people need accessible, reliable and relevant activities

Young people consistently report not having enough to do, or places to go. Simply investing in activities will not solve the problem, as young people will only make use of activities that are accessible, reliable and relevant to them. They sometimes view the activities provided as inappropriate or unattractive. Consulting young people before deciding on new provision will increase the chance of their engagement. Once projects are running, continued involvement and participation of young people in decisions about activity design will influence future levels of attendance.
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Young people face barriers to accessing activities

53 Cost is a key determinant of accessibility. Charges can be a barrier for families on low incomes. They either prevent attendance, or lead to sporadic attendance.

‘It costs £8 to hire a football pitch. You might as well get pissed, it’s cheaper.’
Young person

‘There’s always money stamped to things. Everything is too expensive.’
Young person

54 This problem increases when young people also face transport costs. It is a particular challenge for rural communities.

Case study 2

Ensuring access to activities and support in rural areas

Calderdale mobile rural detached team uses a bus to deliver youth work to young people in remote areas where there are no local authority buildings available. There are six sessions a week across Calderdale, each session lasting for three hours. Sport, music, and film-making are offered. Project staff offer information, advice and counselling during sessions. There are discussions on a range of issues relevant to young people such as healthy eating, substance misuse, sexual health, careers and education and staying safe.

The typical session attracts 17 young people and costs the council £96. There have been improvements in levels of anti-social behaviour and fewer calls to the police.

Source: Audit Commission
Young people want activities to be available in their local area. They feel this makes their neighbourhood a better place to live. Safety concerns prevent young people attending projects, particularly if they have to go home later in the evening, or if the activity is in the ‘territory’ of an unknown group or gang. The safety of young people is important, and project workers should work with the police and other partners to reduce anti-social behaviour when young people leave activities.

‘I wouldn’t go there because of the groups of people. That’s how you get influenced, in gangs like that.’

Young person

Projects need to be reliable to gain the trust of young people

Young people are more likely to engage with projects they can rely on to open regularly, and at suitable times. This should mean extended opening hours. Projects closing at 9pm can leave young people hanging around on the streets for another two hours. Weekend opening is essential.

‘I think the problem is that we’re geared too much still to Monday to Friday, a particular identified evening. The amount of weekend work is limited. I think the level of provision is disproportionate – I still think it’s geared around what agencies want rather than what young people want.’

Youth service manager

Without regularity, young people will engage with projects on the nights they are open, but then resort to committing anti-social behaviour on the nights that projects are closed. They feel let down by projects that close down suddenly and can be reluctant to re-engage with new ones.

‘Everything gets closed down. Apart from youth centres, that are only open a few hours a week, there’s nothing to do.’

Young person
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‘If someone’s there for them one day and then the next they feel like they’ve been dropped like a ton of bricks how are they going to build proper relationships?’
Young person

59 Young people value:
• strong relationships with project staff;
• project staff who can give them advice and support; and
• staff who take a genuine interest in them.

60 It helps if staff are youthful, streetwise, in touch and dependable. Authoritarian figures are off-putting, but staff do need to set boundaries and keep to them.

‘Kids need to know that it’s not just a job to them.’
Young person

‘You need someone older in the community that you can relate to.’
Young person

61 Young people respect and value project rules as long as they are involved in developing, agreeing and reviewing them. Rules and boundaries help young people to feel safe while attending projects.

‘People should be checked before they come in to see if they smell of drink. Like on the Youth Bus, the people that run it, if they smell drink on you, you’re not allowed in.’
Young person

Young people will only engage with projects if they are relevant to their needs and interests

62 Projects should offer activities that connect with young people and give them a sense of fun and belonging. Without productive leisure opportunities, there is a risk that they will find these values in a more negative way. For example, hanging around on the street, joining a gang, or engaging in criminal, anti-social or extremist activities can also be fun and give a sense of belonging.

63 Branding is important to young people, and projects need names and brands that appeal. The term ‘youth club’ is off-putting and associated with being old-fashioned or focused on the wrong audience (good or boring young people). Brands such as Dambusters or Midnight League (as used in Burnley), are more effective in gaining young people’s interest.

64 Young people agree that activities should evolve as their needs change and offer some opportunities for progression. Projects that are static in their delivery and offer the same activities all the time become boring and attendance wanes. Once young people engage with an activity they need to know they are progressing and getting something out of it.

‘The teacher did the same over and over. It got repetitive and then it closed down.’
Young person
‘It’s not good enough at our age to palm us off with a kick about. You need to give people something to help them move forward.’

Young person

Age, gender and diversity

Activities should be segmented by age

Segmentation by age is important. Young people recognise three stages:

- transition from primary to secondary school around age 11;
- adolescence from 12 to 15 years; and
- moving on at age 16 and onwards.

Case study 3

Joint action can help young people prepare for secondary school

The Metropolitan Police coordinate a Junior Citizen programme in Haringey each June. The programme targets year six pupils. It aims to equip them with the skills to cope with the transfer to secondary school and the challenges they face as young adults. Junior Citizen covers issues of personal safety, anti-social behaviour, bullying, knife crime, making the right choices and becoming active citizens. Interactive games and puzzles help young people think about the impact and effects of their behaviour.

The setting is Tottenham Hotspur’s ground. The other partners are London Fire Brigade, Haringey Council’s anti-social behaviour and road safety teams, Transport for London, London Ambulance Service, and EDF Energy Networks. These organisations are present all day and see each group of young people. 1,800 pupils go through Junior Citizen each summer.

The venue’s high local, and national, profile is used to reinforce the messages given to young people. They are encouraged to use discussions about the ground as a trigger to tell others about what they learnt on the programme. Teachers in local schools are positive about the impact of Junior Citizen.

Source: Audit Commission

At age 11, the move from primary to secondary school is stressful. Young people feel they move to a less sympathetic environment where they have to fend for themselves. The move represents a change in their status. It puts them at risk of bullying or teasing from older pupils. Some young people will struggle with the challenges of a wider curriculum. These stresses can trigger anti-social behaviour.
Young people between the ages of 12 and 15, begin to distinguish between themselves and ‘children’. They start to spend more time with their peers and less with adults, who they view as having a negative opinion of young people. Some 12 to 15 year olds will express or channel powerful feelings and emotions in anti-social ways. Behaviours start to set in during these years – and anti-social behaviour can become the norm.

By 16, young people see themselves as adults. They begin to make longer-term choices. Young people involved in sport and leisure activities and education have higher levels of optimism.

Case study 4

Burnley Strike for Life targets disadvantaged young people approaching adulthood

Burnley District Council’s sport and play development team coordinates Strike for Life. The programme targets over-16s who are unemployed, on benefits, or working part-time or sporadically. The programme uses sport to engage disadvantaged young people. It also provides sporting level qualifications, numeracy and literacy sessions, and awareness raising workshops to build self-confidence. It promotes volunteering and provides pathways to further education or employment. It is an intensive, structured programme running for two to three hours a day over a four to five week period. Attendance is free.

Young people view the staff as ‘on our level’, which enables an encouraging relationship. The life skills sessions are seen as non-dictatorial. Attendees feel the course gives them something to aim for and improves their self-respect and confidence.

‘Without [project leader] we’d be bums.’

Young person

The programme costs £48,000 a year. Some young people have gained qualifications in sports coaching. Others have gone on to full-time education or employment.

Source: Audit Commission
Young men and young women need different support

69 Young men and young women show similar motivations for engaging in anti-social behaviour: showing off, getting a buzz, rebelling, or belonging to a crowd. There are differences in their behaviour, though. Young women are just as likely to hang around on the street as young men are, but they engage in lower risk behaviour that is less outwardly destructive. This can include drinking, smoking or intimidating people, but is much less likely to involve violence or serious criminal damage.

70 Young men face much stronger peer pressure to get involved in fights or vandalism than young women. As young men mature they develop an added motivation to engage in anti-social behaviour that young women do not: a need to build or reinforce their masculinity as defined by their peer group. This reflects a need to show they are brave, independent, rebellious, or ‘hard’. Without positive role models, or positive opportunities to display these characteristics, young men are at risk of resorting to anti-social behaviours.

‘It’s all about boys’ ego.’
Young person

‘Why do they behave like that? To look hard in front of their mates.’
Young person

71 Providers of sport and leisure activities should ensure they meet the different needs of young men and young women in organising activities and in the opportunities and skills they offer.

The needs of black and minority ethnic young people should be addressed

72 Black young people are over-represented in the criminal justice system. Although they make up 2.7 per cent of the 10 to 17 year-old population, they represent 8.5 per cent of the arrests for that age group. Black and minority ethnic (BME) young people experience the same social exclusion issues faced by many young people in the criminal justice system. In addition, black young people are less likely to be able to identify positive BME role models in society. They are also more likely to be living in single-parent households and so may be without positive male role models in the home too. This can be a particular problem for black young men (Ref. 24).
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Case study 5

Plymouth Innovations project focuses on BME young men

The Innovations project works with BME young men aged between 13 and 18 who are at risk of offending. The project uses film-making to explore the issues that affect young people’s lives. Discussions focus on self-image, identity, experience of racism, and coping strategies. Both course leaders are from BME backgrounds and act as positive role models to attendees. Course leaders stay in close contact with attendees and their families outside the sessions.

A maximum of eight young people attend each course. The courses run once a week for six sessions, and then for two full days during the spring holidays. Outcome data is not yet available but the course organisers are planning to extend it.

Each course costs £5,000. Plymouth Innovations is a partnership between the YOT, Race Equality Council, and local college.

Source: Audit Commission

Projects need to recognise the tensions and divisions between groups of young people based on race and cultural differences. Projects need to balance activities that bring different groups together with those that ensure the specific needs of individual groups are met.

Government policy is moving to a balance of enforcement and prevention

Different government departments are involved in different aspects of policy concerning young people involved in anti-social behaviour. Policy on anti-social behaviour originates in the Home Office, Ministry of Justice, or the Youth Taskforce (part of the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF)). Policies on positive activities involve Communities and Local Government, DCSF, and the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS). Over the last decade government policy across all departments has moved towards a balance of enforcement and prevention (Figure 8).
Government policy is shifting from mainly enforcement towards more support and prevention.

**Enforcement**
- 1998 Crime and Disorder Act
- YOTs
- Respect agenda

**Prevention**
- 2004 Children’s Act
- Every Child Matters
- 2007 Duty to provide positive activities
- 2007 Ten year strategy for positive activities

‘Too many young people start by truanting and causing disruption in school, and only come to the attention of the authorities when they start offending – children for whom an ASBO or juvenile detention is the beginning of their interaction with the state, rather than the last possible resort when all other measures have failed.’

Ed Balls, 2007

Source: Audit Commission
The focus of early policy on anti-social behaviour was enforcement and punishment.\(^1\) This included introducing ASBOs, ABCs, and dispersal orders. The Youth Justice Board (YJB) oversees the youth justice system and provides a national framework for preventing offending and re-offending by young people under the age of 18 (Ref. 25). Each area has a YOT to bring the agencies that contribute to reducing youth offending together. YOTs usually include representatives from police, probation, social services, health, education, drug and alcohol teams, and housing.

More recent government policy recognises that enforcement action alone is not enough to deal with the underlying causes of anti-social behaviour; and that supportive and preventive measures are necessary. This policy shift was behind the statutory duty to provide positive recreational and educational activities for all young people (Ref. 26).

The duty and supporting guidance follows the academic and policy research on the benefits of sport and leisure activities. *Aiming High for Young People: A Ten-year Strategy for Positive Activities* builds on the new duty and outlines the supporting strategy for transforming leisure time opportunities and activities. It also set the stage for the development of integrated youth services between councils and their partners. *Aiming High for Young People* committed £679 million for youth initiatives and £190 million for new and improved youth facilities over the 2008-11 funding period (Ref. 27).

The statutory duty and guidance are reminders that positive activities can address a range of issues, including preventing anti-social behaviour, reducing obesity, and improving health and educational attainment. The duty requires councils to:

- involve young people in decisions about positive activities;
- assess the range of positive activities in their area and work with partners to identify any gaps in provision;
- commission the best providers from the public, private or community sectors;
- remove any barriers to young people taking part in activities; and
- publicise what is available.

---

\(^1\) Crime and Disorder Act 1988.
The 2008 Youth Crime Action Plan outlines an approach to tackling anti-social behaviour that includes:

- tough enforcement where behaviour is unacceptable or illegal;
- non-negotiable support to address the underlying causes of poor behaviour or serious difficulties; and
- better prevention to tackle problems before they become serious or entrenched, and to prevent problems arising.

The Youth Crime Action Plan gave £100 million of extra funding over two and a half years from March 2008 (Ref. 28).

Despite the shift in policy, spending on prevention is low compared with spending on enforcement. For example, only 5 per cent of the YJB budget went on prevention in 2006/07. However the YJB stresses that:

‘each YOT typically secures £1.25 of extra partnership funding (cash and in kind) for every £1 of YJB prevention grant’ (Ref. 29)

Other agencies also fund prevention projects. They include the police and fire services, and different council departments.
Most of the funding for YOTs comes from the YJB, but almost a third (31 per cent) comes from other agencies. Local authority children’s services make the largest contribution (Figure 9). An independent report on the youth justice reforms argued that a significant part of social care budgets has gone into a system that spends little on prevention (Ref. 29). Children’s service departments should review whether this spending is helping them to achieve their objectives.

Figure 9
Children’s services make the largest financial contribution to YOTs after the Youth Justice Board
Funding given to YOTs by local statutory partners 2006/07 (per cent)

- Children’s services: 50
- Health: 6
- Probation: 9
- Education: 10
- Police: 11
- Local authority chief executives: 14

Source: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies

£203 million in 2006/07.
Two public service agreements (PSAs) in the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR07) are relevant to this topic (Table 2). All but two of the local area agreements (LAAs) signed in 2008 included at least one of the seven indicators relevant to preventing anti-social behaviour. Over half (77 out of 150) have included indicators on increasing young people’s participation in positive activities. Almost half (74 out of 150) focus on reducing the number of first-time entrants to the criminal justice system. One-fifth (33 out of 150) include indicators on both increasing young people’s participation in positive activities and reducing the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system.

### Table 2

Tackling anti-social behaviour is a local priority

Most LAAs include relevant indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant indicators</th>
<th>Number of LAAs (out of 150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSA 14: increasing the number of young people on the path to success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reduce the number of 16 and 17 year-olds not in education training or employment</td>
<td>115 (77 per cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reduce the under 18 conception rate</td>
<td>106 (71 per cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• increase participation in positive activities</td>
<td>77 (51 per cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reduce the number of first-time entrants to the criminal justice system</td>
<td>74 (49 per cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reduce the proportion of young people frequently using illicit drugs, alcohol or volatile substances</td>
<td>36 (24 per cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA 23: making communities safer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the percentage of people perceiving anti-social behaviour as a problem</td>
<td>56 (37 per cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• public confidence in local agencies involved in tackling anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>12 (8 per cent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IDeA LAA Tracker
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These LAA targets align with support for initiatives to make communities safer and help young people make a positive contribution to society (Figure 10).

Figure 10
Adults’ priorities for local government
The public supports initiatives to make communities safer and improve young people’s lives

- Creating safer communities
- Getting more young people making a positive contribution
- Creating stronger communities
- Improving young people’s safety
- Improving young people’s achievements
- Improving young people’s health
- Improving children’s economic circumstances

There are local difficulties in interpreting and implementing government policy

84 CDRPs are responsible for developing and implementing strategies to tackle crime and disorder locally (Ref. 30). CDRPs include representatives from local authorities, police, fire and rescue services, and primary care trusts. CDRPs must work with probation boards, governing bodies of educational establishments, social landlords, NHS acute trusts and foundation trusts, drug and alcohol action teams, the local private sector, and voluntary and community agencies. YOTs are among the organisations invited to attend meetings. Each CDRP has to consult with local communities and work with partners to develop a strategic intelligence assessment and partnership plan to tackle local crime and disorder issues.

85 CDRPs are responsible for preventing anti-social behaviour. Children’s trusts are responsible for improving outcomes for children and young people by bringing services together. This creates a shared objective for preventing youth crime and anti-social behaviour. DCSF guidance stresses that children’s trusts and CDRPs:

‘should have clear and recognised communication channels to ensure that local plans are properly aligned, and any potentially conflicting policies addressed. Effective partnership working can help ensure that young people [...] identified as being at risk of committing crime or anti-social behaviour, are offered the services they need to stop their behaviour becoming entrenched’. (Ref. 31)

86 Although collaborative working has improved, children’s trusts’ arrangements are still in their infancy (Ref. 32).
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87 Shifts in government policy do not always translate into local action. Different agencies’ performance targets may not have kept up-to-date with overall policy shifts (Table 3). While YOT targets to reduce the number of first-time entrants to the criminal justice system encourage a focus on prevention, police targets to bring offences to justice can encourage a more enforcement-led approach. The outcome of these local tensions may be that young people enter the criminal justice system, rather than being diverted from it. In an area with an agreed prevention strategy a young person coming to the attention of the police for anti-social behaviour is referred to the YOT for support in changing their behaviour. In an area without an agreed approach, the same young person may end up in court and get a criminal record.

Table 3

Local roles and targets can cause tensions

Performance targets potentially conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Target or indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council (children’s trust)</td>
<td>Provide positive activities</td>
<td>PSA 14: increase participation in positive activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>PSA 14: reduce number of first time entrants to the Criminal Justice System aged 10 to 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDRP</td>
<td>Prevention/enforcement</td>
<td>PSA 23: reduce the percentage of people perceiving anti-social behaviour as a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Offences brought to justice: number of notifiable/recordable offences resulting in conviction, caution or taken into consideration at court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Central government has now recognised this problem. The policing green paper (Ref. 33) proposes a single police target to improve public confidence in addressing the most significant community safety issues in their areas. This would give a clear message of the need to work jointly with partners to achieve this target.

The next chapter analyses local progress in implementing government policy and reviews the evidence about effectiveness.
This chapter considers how councils, children’s trusts, and their partners use sport and leisure to engage young people, develop them as individuals, and prevent them engaging in anti-social behaviour. It draws on the findings of a survey of 56 sport and leisure projects, together with the outcomes of 17 focus groups, held with a total of 71 young people in three case study areas.

Sport and leisure activities can manage anti-social behaviour

Sport and leisure are used to manage anti-social behaviour. Councils and their partners offer a range of different types of activity. Most of the case study schemes (82 per cent) offer developmental opportunities for those young people at high risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour. These schemes ensure that young people have opportunities to become involved. They can design and review project activities, become volunteers, or gain coaching qualifications. But they are less likely to manage projects (Figure 11).

Figure 11
Development opportunities in case study schemes
Young people have opportunities to become more involved

Source: Audit Commission
But not all projects enable young people to reach their full potential

Sport and leisure are most effective at preventing anti-social behaviour when they are available as part of the normal range of activities for young people. Young people must also be able to attend projects regularly to gain the level of interaction needed to change behaviour. A significant proportion of the case study projects:

- offer sessions every week (57 per cent); and
- had existed for three years or more (41 per cent).

The typical scheme offers three to four sessions a week; each session lasts for three and a half hours. But a fifth (20 per cent) of schemes are open just once a week.

Projects available for a short time during the week, or with a short life span, will have limited impact for those young people likely to engage in anti-social behaviour. If projects end abruptly without follow-on support then young people and communities have unrealised expectations and greater alienation from civic society.

Mobile provision can reduce incidents of anti-social behaviour by targeting sport and leisure activities to areas of need. Mobile projects enable a rapid, flexible and targeted response to emerging hot spots of anti-social behaviour.

But mobile provision can be short term. On its own it cannot make a permanent impact on anti-social behaviour. Lasting behavioural change is only achieved if young people are referred on to other schemes. Areas that did not provide follow-on support experienced a return of anti-social behaviour when activities moved away.

Successful projects sometimes need to deal with unintended consequences. One popular project had enough staff to work with 50 young people at a time. The doors closed as soon as capacity was reached. This left young people hanging around outside at each session. This led to more reports of anti-social behaviour and complaints from local residents. A different area resolved a similar problem through discussions at a local partnership meeting. The council’s leisure department provided outside sporting activities for young people waiting outside the project.

Families are important partners in solving problems with anti-social behaviour. They can provide positive role models. In focus group discussions, the young people engaged in positive activities referred to family members or celebrities, especially footballers, as role models. Those not engaged felt they had no role models.
Parents and carers may not always be aware that their children are engaging in anti-social behaviour. Nearly half (47 per cent) of parents whose children admitted to engaging in risky behaviour (drinking, smoking, taking drugs or truanting), were not aware of their child’s behaviour (Ref. 34).

**Case study 6**

**Parents and carers’ role in reducing anti-social behaviour**

Wigan Council and its partners use an incremental response scheme to manage the behaviour of young people involved in anti-social behaviour. The approach centres on a ‘contact card’, managed by the council and police. PCSOs take details from young people involved in anti-social behaviour. The council’s anti-social behaviour team keeps these details on a database. The first time a young person’s details go on the database they get information about local sport and leisure activities. Parents or carers get a warning letter to make sure that they are aware of the problems caused by their children’s behaviour.

‘It gets the message across to parents or carers that they’ve got a responsibility for knowing where their child is.’

Anti-social behaviour team manager

There are more warning letters if the young person’s name is re-entered into the database. After the third letter there is a home visit organised by the YOT, youth service, or other support agency. The final stage is a good behaviour agreement (the same as an ABC) or an ASBO.

The scheme has been improved to increase the parents and carers’ involvement:

‘Parents or carers felt that they weren’t part of the process until [the third or fourth letter], and they didn’t understand, I think, the severity of the behaviour.’

Anti-social behaviour team manager

Anti-social behaviour reduced by 82 per cent between the first and second warning letter. Five hundred warning letters were sent out in 2005/06.

Source: Audit Commission
Meeting the needs of local young people

Different projects, working in collaboration, should meet the needs of all young people in their community. But provision for young women is patchy. Their needs are often an afterthought, rather than original project design. In some case study sites the activities for young women developed when they turned up, accompanying male friends, seeking something to do. A minority of schemes consulted young women and set up female-only groups with a mixture of tailored activities, or adaptations of the activities available for young men.

Case study 7

Focusing on young women’s needs in Wirral

Wirral’s youth inclusion programme (YIP) works with the 50 individuals most likely to engage in crime or anti-social behaviour. The aim is to help these young people change their behaviour. Several young women fall into the ‘top 50’. A separate group, focused on their needs, runs alongside the mixed YIP.

Twelve young women aged 13 to 17 who had been reluctant to engage with other services attend the group. Agencies such as Connexions, Youth Offending Service, education, and family support workers refer people to the group. There are also self-referrals.

The group has been running once a week since 2006. It provides educational activities focused on sexual health, healthy living, and drug and alcohol abuse. There are skills development sessions including film-making and arts and crafts. The young women have asked for sessions in health and beauty, and cooking. Participants have opportunities to help with the design and planning of all the activities. The project is shaped by the young women’s ideas and is a:

‘project that they want to be part of’.

YOT Manager

Each session costs about £60. Funding comes from the youth offending service and the Working Neighbourhoods Fund. The young women say they are less intimidated in a same sex group and more able to be themselves. Attendance leads to improved behaviour. Four young women had been charged with an offence in the year before the group, and only one has been charged with an offence since attending the group. Two young women have avoided ABCs since joining the scheme.

Source: Audit Commission
What is happening locally?

Case study 8

Burnley Dambusters helps build community cohesion

Many of the communities in Burnley are either mainly white or Asian. Young people rarely travel outside their local area. There are few opportunities to mix with young people from other areas.

Burnley’s multi-agency problem solving team (MAPS) (an operational group coordinating some of the actions in the community safety plan) recognised that sport could help to reduce segregation. Dambusters targets young people hanging around on the streets. It is one of several projects aimed at tackling segregation and anti-social behaviour.

Sessions last for three hours. They include football, dance, drama, and gymnastics. There are six free sessions each week. Police intelligence about anti-social behaviour hot spots feeds into the plan for each week’s visits. Between 15 and 20 young people attend each session.

Dambusters aims to improve cohesion, improve levels of participation in activities, improve health by reducing underage drinking and smoking, and provide support and guidance to young people. All of this combines to reduce criminal and anti-social behaviour.

Dambusters costs £27,000 a year. The council’s sport and play development unit, working with MAPS, the youth bus project and local community centres, run Dambusters.

Young people look forward to Dambusters. They have changed their behaviour because they value the project.

‘When you get with people from other communities it helps to change your views of them.’
Young person attending project

‘I didn’t think I’d connect with anyone round here. This [project] helps you fit in.’
Young person attending project

The police report a 19 per cent decline in anti-social behaviour in one of the project’s areas. Local residents are positive and the project is accessible, reliable and relevant to young people.

Source: Audit Commission
With careful management, sport and leisure activities can also bring together groups that would not normally mix.

Consultation with young people and communities

Project development must start from consultation with young people. Too often, though, consultation happens after a project has opened or it fails to involve the young people targeted by the project. Youth councils or parliaments may not involve the young people likely to get into anti-social behaviour. Some areas, though, have made significant efforts to improve engagement.

Few projects developed in response to the views of local young people, despite the emphases in the duty to provide positive activities (Ref. 26). Councils will also have a duty to inform, consult, and involve citizens from April 2009 (Ref. 35). Activities in most areas are based on the views of local commissioners or on the requirements attached to funding streams. They are rarely evidence-based. Such arrangements contribute to young people’s view that there is nothing for them to do.

Case study 9

Calderdale uses youth forums and targeted consultation to gather the views of young people

Calderdale had used its youth parliament to hear the views of young people. The council recognised, though, that the parliament did not represent young people likely to be involved in anti-social behaviour.

Calderdale introduced youth forums to improve representation. Each area of Calderdale has a forum of elected young people. Originally only council-led youth clubs fed into the forum, but this has now extended to include voluntary and community groups too. A forum in each area results in a wide cross-section of young people getting involved. The forums provide BME, lesbian and gay perspectives for example. The council has also arranged for consultations with looked-after and disabled young people and with young offenders.

Source: Audit Commission
Case study 10

Developing activities in response to feedback from young people

The police in Burnley recorded an increase in criminal damage offences in 2006. Young people were involved in 40 per cent of incidents. The police decided to work with young people to find the causes and possible solutions. They commissioned The Participation Works Ltd, a local community organisation, to ask young people about their concerns. Young people said there was nothing to do in the area, and that boredom led them to hanging around in groups and start drinking. Criminal damage was a way of getting an extra buzz. Young people felt their views were ignored.

Young people wanted a safe place to chat with their friends – a place that was theirs. They wanted to be involved in setting up the safe place and influencing its development. Most young people (86 per cent) wanted internet access.

The response was the youth bus. The MAPS team manages the bus in a partnership with The Participation Works Ltd, who also staff it. The lower deck has games consoles and a chill-out area with a wide-screen TV. The upper deck has PCs with internet access and a private consultation room. Training packages are available for young people to develop their IT skills, and youth workers encourage young people to get involved in structured activities. The council’s sport and play development team also go out with the bus three nights a week to provide sporting activities for young people.

The MAPS team sends the bus to hot spot areas. It can move around estates in Burnley so each area gets a weekly visit, or it can stay in a hot spot area for several weeks. It runs from 4.30pm-10.30pm Tuesday to Sunday. Set up costs were £140,000. Annual running costs are £8 for each young person.

Over a five-month period in 2007 the bus provided services to 2,862 young people:
- 438 received support in information and communication technology; and
- 304 were referred on to other youth services.

The bus has made an impact:
- Criminal damage reduced by 321 offences and anti-social behaviour reduced by 687 incidents in comparison with the previous year.
- Asian and white young people who were in conflict now use the facilities together.
- Feedback in the local press and from local communities is positive.

Source: Audit Commission
Councils are more likely to put resources into consultations with local residents. This reflects CDRP's role in consulting and engaging with communities to understand their priorities for reducing crime and disorder (Ref. 36). Community consultation often ignores young people: many adults want to see punitive approaches to tackling anti-social behaviour and it is sometimes difficult to reconcile these views with a more preventive approach.

Young people's views should be gathered as part of consultation exercises that focus on concerns about anti-social behaviour and on proposed solutions.

‘They’re saying, “There’s nowhere else to go because it’s all dark and it’s dangerous. If we go on the field there, there are no lights and we don’t feel safe so that’s why we come here. If you put some lights for us over there, we’d feel safer.” So one of the things that’s come out of consultations is lighting and where young people congregate. Listening to young people, they are giving us some of the clues to solve some of the anti-social behaviour problems.’

YOT manager

Few areas bring work with communities, and work with young people together to understand local anti-social behaviour, its causes and possible solutions. Working Better Together shows how a clean-up operation in Derbyshire successfully brought local residents, businesses, schools, youth clubs and community groups together to improve the environment and reduce fears of anti-social behaviour (Ref. 37).

The need for an area-wide approach

Using sport and leisure to tackle youth anti-social behaviour is a cross-cutting issue. It is relevant to different local organisations. Some of them might be outside any formal partnership arrangements. The core partners usually include police, fire and local authority representatives (community safety or anti-social behaviour teams, youth service, leisure department and YOTs). Additional partners include schools, RSLs (RSLs – housing associations) and voluntary and community organisations.

Despite the existence of successful projects, and some pockets of partnership working, none of the case study sites took area-wide approaches to coordinating activities. The role of some potential partners was not even recognised. Fire and rescue services and RSLs are often ignored, or are not invited to meetings. Opportunities for networking and access to potential funding sources are lost.
There are added challenges in two-tier areas, as responsibility for providing positive activities and for tackling anti-social behaviour is split. There can be tensions between the need to provide sport and leisure activities equitably across a county and the need for district councils to devote extra resources to problem areas. Some councils have worked together to identify local solutions (Table 4).

**Table 4**

**Coordinating activities in two-tier areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council F</td>
<td>A multi-agency team at district level coordinates the approach to providing activities locally. The leisure department plays a key role in providing activities and in getting funding. The youth service, YOT and fire service are linked to the multi-agency team but also deliver some local projects.</td>
<td>Different priorities between county and district level meant the district felt it was not always getting the support and resources needed to tackle youth anti-social behaviour. There were delays in decision making when negotiating between district and county. The district now takes the lead in providing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council M</td>
<td>A sports development post was seconded to the youth service to help youth centres and community projects use sport as a tool for educational and personal development. The post holder helps projects get funding and other resources, and makes links with sports development officers at district level.</td>
<td>The county council hoped that districts would mainstream an existing project already running in one area. However different priorities between county and district level, meant they had to use negotiation and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
RSLs should be involved in developing area-based agreements on tiered approaches to enforcement. Without their support there is likely to be inconsistency between agencies. Some RSLs deliver or fund preventive projects for young people (Case study 11).

**Case study 11**

**Gateshead Housing Company works with young people to prevent anti-social behaviour**

Gateshead Housing Company has a young person’s worker who prepares young people for tenancies and talks to them about the results of getting involved in anti-social behaviour. This worker also manages acceptable behaviour agreements and works with truancy cases through the non-attendance education panels. The Housing Company offers activities to young people through partnerships with other organisations including Gateshead Thunder Rugby League.

Source: Audit Commission
The expertise of the voluntary sector in engaging hard-to-reach groups is often unrecognised. But, in some areas, the voluntary sector is a key partner (Table 5). A 2007 Audit Commission report highlighted that one of the benefits of involving the voluntary sector in planning is that services are more likely to target the specific needs of diverse groups (Ref. 38).

### Table 5

**Support given to voluntary sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Support given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>Young people’s service gives grants to voluntary youth clubs, and uses the Youth Opportunity Fund to support this. The service also gives the voluntary sector access to venues, equipment, and use of a minibus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>Youth service shares its buses for transporting young people to activities with the voluntary sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Youth support service helps the voluntary sector to record and track progress of young people on projects funded through the youth offer. They circulate a quarterly newsletter, with information about funding opportunities, to local providers. The support service also helps voluntary agencies in writing business plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Longer funding periods help to build trust. The voluntary sector is involved in commissioning meetings and its knowledge helps engage hard-to-reach groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Overall, areas where there are strong links between partners generally face fewer challenges in their delivery of activities. Benefits include improved capacity, more effective interventions and improved value for money (Table 6).

### Table 6

**Benefits of strong links with partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>The council sport and play development unit runs outdoor sports activities for young people waiting to attend the youth bus.</td>
<td>Increased capacity and fewer incidents of anti-social behaviour as young people wait to get on the bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Youth workers go with young people attending programmes organised by the fire service.</td>
<td>Programme can continue if firefighters have to respond to a call-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Leeds City Council’s Recreation Service has included some questions about young people’s interest in engaging in activities on the Every Child Matters questionnaire coordinated by children’s services.</td>
<td>Reduced costs by being able to meet all information needs in one questionnaire, and reduces the risk of questionnaire overload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>PCSOs have basic training in youth work to give them enough knowledge to run projects with the youth service.</td>
<td>Youth services can deliver more projects. PCSOs can engage with young people hanging around on the streets. Increased understanding between police and youth workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Expansion in the number of Kickz projects (see Case study 16) means clubs are running multiple projects. One Kickz coordinator can oversee several projects.</td>
<td>Economies of scale mean annual savings of £7,500 on projects usually costing £47,500.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Audit Commission*
What is happening locally?

The role of schools

112 Schools can play a key role in identifying young people with problems and in sharing their knowledge about local communities. Forty-one per cent of secondary schools are dissatisfied with the effectiveness of other local services in providing interventions to deflect young people from anti-social behaviour (Ref. 39). But schools’ involvement in prevention work is patchy. In all case study areas the local police and fire services do some prevention work with schools. In a few areas the YOT is also involved. But in most areas that is the total school involvement. Other partners suggest that schools do not want to be involved unless there is a known local anti-social behaviour problem. There is potential to make more links with extended schools and sports college programmes.

113 Schools that are part of a safer schools partnership (SSP) already focus on prevention. SSPs, piloted in 2002 and mainstreamed from 2006, are a joint initiative between DCSF, YJB, Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). The initiative puts police officers in schools to work with staff and other local agencies to reduce victimisation, crime and anti-social behaviour in and around schools.

114 There are approximately 5,000 SSPs in England and Wales, representing 20 per cent of primary schools and 45 per cent of secondary schools. The scheme has been effective in reducing levels of offending and truancy (Ref. 40). The partnerships:

- introduce whole-school approaches to behaviour and discipline;
- identify and work with young people at risk of becoming victims or offenders;
- ensure the full-time education of young offenders; and
- create a safer environment in schools.

115 Schools can provide a venue and facilities for activities with young people. There is a wide variation in local practice. While a quarter of projects are delivered in-school, some areas report that schools charge for using their facilities or refuse to make them accessible.

‘There are loads of blockers still, like some of the schools’ policies. We have fabulous sports facilities at some of our schools. They aren’t available unless you pay £45 an hour in the evening, and in the same area we’ll have problems with the activity of the young people.’

Director of neighbourhood services, local authority
116 Governing bodies make decisions about community use of school facilities. Schools must cover their costs, but can give reductions for educational activities available for their own pupils and for activities run by another council department (Ref. 41). The 2006 Audit Commission study *More than the Sum*, demonstrated the benefits to schools and to activity providers of working together. It recommended more joint working (Ref. 42). DCSF plans to legislate to extend the ‘duty to cooperate to improve well-being’ to schools. This sets an expectation that schools will work with children’s trusts and other partners to promote the well-being of all young people in an area (Ref. 31).

117 Some young people do not attend school, others find attending school a negative experience. Careful management can reduce their concerns. This can mean using different entrances, different staff, different types of activity, and branding.
Case study 12

Schools can be a centre for local youth projects

A third of the targets that sports colleges must meet should be based on their work with local communities. Depending on local need, relevant targets are set for what the work should focus on. Our Lady and St Chad Catholic Sports College is a diverse community which aims to promote empowerment in the context of its location in an area of high deprivation. In previous years the school was broken into several times and fires have been started on a factory site next to the school. These incidents have been linked to local young people not studying at the school. As a result, one of the targets for community work is to reduce youth crime.

A community sports manager is employed to develop work with local communities and is a member of the Neighbourhood Partnership Forum for Youth Provision. Regular meetings take place with the youth service and Positive Futures project to plan youth provision across the area during weekdays (5.30-10.00pm), weekends and school holidays.

The college has commissioned a football and education programme on site in conjunction with Wolverhampton Wanderers Football Club. The dusk, twilight and midnight leagues aim to reduce anti-social behaviour, prepare excluded young people for re-entering school and build skills that can be used in the workplace. As well as football coaching, attendees must engage in monthly workshops to develop interpersonal skills, gain careers advice and learn about the dangers of drug and alcohol use. Currently 70 local young people are registered with the schemes.

The Positive Futures project also runs activities, such as boxing, dance, football and fitness, on site three times a week. Seventy-five young people are registered with the project and attendees are also given the opportunity to gain sports related qualifications. During 2007, 12 young people attained a preliminary boxing accreditation and 15 achieved an FA level 1 football coaching qualification.
## Case study 12 (continued)

Between 2005 (when the school became a sports college) and 2008:

- criminal damage in the postcode area of the school has reduced by 23 per cent;
- the number of sports clubs based at the school has risen from 8 to 32, covering 11 different sports;
- the number of young people engaging regularly in a sports club has risen from 13 to 432; and
- the college has become a site for national governing body qualifications and courses, providing opportunities for the local community to develop skills to help future young people.

Source: Audit Commission

### Making use of existing universal provision

Other local services and facilities, such as libraries and community centres, are not always used effectively either. There is often a reluctance to make facilities available for those young people likely to get involved in anti-social behaviour.

‘It’s that view – are young people part of our communities? It’s okay if we’re talking about adults or pensioners or under fives. As soon as we start talking about that difficult age group, where they are perhaps a little bit more challenging in behaviour, we don’t want to give them access to our resources. Sometimes there needs to be a little bit more challenge of that attitude.’

Voluntary sector provider

### Young people in focus groups

Young people in the focus groups gave examples of local leisure centres making it clear they were not welcome, even though they were interested in using some of the facilities.
What is happening locally?

Case study 13

Universal facilities that fail to deliver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Had potential to work for</th>
<th>Feedback from users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local leisure centre, with plenty of options for sporting activity.</td>
<td>Young people not interested in team sports or commitment but would like opportunity to play pool, snooker, box or go to the gym.</td>
<td>‘You get chucked out for no reason.’ Boy, 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and adult targeted with perceived exclusion of young people – no concessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘It’s full of little kids.’ Boy, 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Wouldn’t go in some places ‘cause the people who run them turn their noses up at you.’ Male, 18-19 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission

In contrast, Wirral makes local leisure centres the base for a Friday night programme of activities for young people. This reduces cost by taking advantage of the fact that the facility is local, open anyway, and less busy on Friday nights.
Case study 14

Targeting works when ‘universal’ fails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Why it works</th>
<th>Costs and outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local sports centre used as basis for Youth Sport Nights – Friday evenings for two hours when sports centre use is low.</td>
<td>Activities are based on what young people want.</td>
<td>£100 a session, 30 attendees a session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of sports and recreation activities, also programmes in crime reduction, health, and substance misuse.</td>
<td>Competitions held to keep interest and goals.</td>
<td>17 per cent reduction in anti-social behaviour, 28 per cent reduction in criminal damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free access for young people aged 8-17 years.</td>
<td>Sports centre based in local communities, so easy access and reduces cost.</td>
<td>Residents’ perceptions of anti-social behaviour reduced by 16 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five young people volunteer, ten are now in employment, and 25 gained new skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission

121 It is important that commissioners work with all partners across an area to improve the accessibility of activities for young people, balancing universal and targeted provision. Projects must match local need so that activities are available at the times and in places that are most likely to have an impact on reducing anti-social behaviour.
What is happening locally?

There is little understanding of activities on offer

One result of a failure to coordinate across an area is a lack of understanding of available sport and leisure activities.

Funders and commissioners can use mapping to gather evidence of what exists, where there are gaps, where there is duplication, and where young people even have choice (Table 7).

Table 7

Failure to coordinate leads to duplication in effort and spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Examples of duplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council A</td>
<td>Three providers were delivering restorative justice projects with young people in the same area. Coordination could reduce costs or improve targeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council D</td>
<td>A youth service club and a voluntary sector youth club within walking distance of each other had overlaps in their opening times, but neither stayed open as long as young people needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council I</td>
<td>One young person had two ASBOs, one taken out by the community safety team and one by the arm’s length management organisation. This wasted staff and money, and the young person received conflicting messages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
None of the case study areas comprehensively mapped activities for young people involved in anti-social behaviour. Some were developing their approaches (Table 8).

**Table 8**

**It is possible to map activities**

Areas are testing different approaches to mapping positive activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approach to mapping activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>The youth service is coordinating a two-part mapping exercise. In part one all known partners are asked about schemes they run. Part two will include adverts in the local press to find other agencies working with young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>The Sport and Leisure Service is coordinating a mapping exercise through the Youth Sport Executive Board. The board includes the youth support service, police, youth sport trust, sport and leisure service, schools sport partnership, and green spaces department. Each agency has to map the activities it provides. All the results are collated on a spreadsheet and the details shared with neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>Wigan is setting up a community engagement approach called Partners and Communities Together (PACT). Each township will have a local PACT group. The coordinator of the first PACT group noted the partners’ activities. This information went into a booklet for young people. Each PACT group will produce its own guide to local activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Part of the duty to provide positive activities is a requirement for councils to develop a youth offer of available activities (Ref. 43). The lack of effective mapping means most of these are incomplete. Many areas report using websites to publicise activities, however not all young people have access to the internet. Even those with access may not think of looking on a council website to find out about what to do. Some councils make more creative use of technology by sending out text message updates. Others use old technology more effectively – providing leaflets about alternative activities when they make ABCs.

Helping young people to engage with sport and leisure activities

Young people often find out about activities by word of mouth or from youth workers. This explains why partners must be aware of the activities available. Schools and YOTs or youth offending services (YOSs) make the most referrals to projects (Figure 12). While most projects accept referrals from different agencies, the agencies often don’t know about the projects. Partners in some areas, most often the police, RSLs and anti-social behaviour teams, found it difficult to find out what activities were available.

‘Often we don’t know what they [youth service] are doing over the summer. So we cannot say to the kids that, look, there’s something going on down the bottom of your road, why don’t you go down there and give it a go. We do not know. So there’s little publicity internally. There might be stuff going out to schools and so on, but there’s nothing coming to us to say, this is what we’re doing.’

Anti-social behaviour team manager
Figure 12
Referrals to projects come from different sources
Schools, YOTs and YOSs play a key role

- Schools
- YOT/YOS
- Youth workers
- Open access
- Other
- Self
- Social services
- Connexions
- Police
- Outreach workers
- Positive activities for young people
- Probation
- Fire authority

Source: Audit Commission
126 Some areas are reducing the barriers that prevent young people getting to activities. Initiatives include:

- free or reduced price entry;
- mobile provision to take activities into local areas;
- taster sessions to encourage engagement;
- free transport to overcome cost or safety concerns;
- area tournaments to encourage integration of different groups of young people;
- special branding; and
- using the voluntary sector to reach out to disaffected and disengaged youth.

Case study 15

Using music

Plymouth Music Zone offers open access and targeted music based activities for young people. It covers different music styles and cultural traditions. One of its target groups is young people at risk (excluded from school or at risk of this, young people in pupil referral units, and young offenders).

Staff are musicians who can engage with young people. Some are from diverse or challenging backgrounds themselves, and can act as role models. They put young people at the centre of learning by giving them the flexibility to develop their own music interests. The project uses Facebook and MySpace to communicate with participants.

Sessions take place during holidays, after school, and on Saturdays at different venues. About 20 young people attend each session, with a balance between young men and young women.

There is no charge for the young people attending. Each session costs about £75 an hour.

Young people are positive about attending the project. They feel they are making progress with their musical and personal skills.

Source: Audit Commission
Limited evaluation weakens future commissioning

Lack of evidence about project effectiveness is a constraint on future commissioning decisions in most areas. Few projects can prove their efficacy (Figure 13). Just 41 per cent of projects in the case study areas had outcome measures linked to their objectives. One project’s main aim was tackling substance abuse. But it did not measure substance abuse before or after attendance. Just 14 per cent of the projects gathered both qualitative and quantitative outcome data that was matched to their objectives. Some projects had to set objectives to satisfy several different funders – reducing the likelihood of them all being measured or achieved.

Figure 13
Few projects can prove their efficacy
Evaluation is weak

Source: Audit Commission
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Out of all 56 projects we surveyed, only eight fulfilled all the criteria
Nearly half of the cases study projects (48 per cent) either didn’t measure outcomes or relied on anecdote. Project leaders were confused about the difference between:

- outputs (coaching certificates awarded);
- personal outcomes (volunteering to do coaching or using the certificate as a step to further qualifications); and
- social outcomes (less anti-social behaviour and lower perception of anti-social behaviour).

Some projects use local crime data to signal outcomes. These data are a potential indicator of impact but they do not explain what worked. Projects should also be careful about cause and effect. They must ask what they did that led to changes in crime levels – and rule out the impact of general trends or changes in data collection methods.

Projects need to balance information on inputs, processes, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and long-term outcomes (or impact). Intermediate, or personal, outcomes can include:

- levels of engagement and participation;
- improvements in educational attainment and attendance;
- improvements in social relations; and
- success in gaining new skills.

Information in a project’s or a commissioner’s performance management system should include quantitative measures as well as qualitative measures of young people’s views and local residents perceptions. Although many providers recognise the value of using qualitative data, few gather it successfully (Case study 16).

Case study 16

**Kickz evaluation focuses on quantitative and qualitative outcomes**

Kickz is a national programme, coordinated by the Football Foundation. It provides diversionary activities for young people in areas of high deprivation and anti-social behaviour. Kickz aims to reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. It also works to reduce barriers between the police and young people, encourage opportunities for volunteering, education and employment, and increase the number of young people playing, coaching and officiating in sport.

West Bromwich Albion Football Club runs the Kickz project in Sandwell. There are three sessions a week at each of the two venues. Each session lasts for three hours. Over 1,000 young people have registered with the project. There are football sessions but there is also basketball, street dance, and music and arts workshops. There are educational sessions on healthy lifestyles and the dangers of drugs and alcohol.
All Kickz projects use a common monitoring and evaluation tool, Substance Project Reporting System (SPRS). SPRS builds on case records for each attendee. The records chart involvement and progress. The system collects both qualitative and quantitative data. It generates project reports for funders or other interested stakeholders.

The information in SPRS includes:

- people starting, involved in, and stopping the project;
- age, gender, ethnicity, and disability profiles;
- source of referrals;
- session and attendance data; and
- partner agencies involved, their contribution to the project and their views on project effectiveness.

SPRS evaluations cover:

- assessment of levels of engagement with the project;
- outcome data – for example qualifications gained, volunteering completed; and
- case studies – of progress for individual young people, photos, music recordings.

The local police provide background data on incidences of anti-social behaviour since the project started.

Project staff are positive about SPRS. They say it is easy to use. A major benefit of the SPRS is the instant access to statistics and information about the project.

The two programmes in Sandwell cost £80,000 a year. Funding comes from the Football Foundation, West Midlands Police, and Sandwell’s community safety team.

Over 200 young people actively engage with the projects at a time. The local police report a 50 per cent fall in anti-social behaviour in some of the areas where the project runs.

In 2007, young people at the project presented a successful bid to the Youth Opportunity Fund and secured £3,000 for music mixing and rapping equipment.

Source: Audit Commission
Problems with data on project costs make value for money assessments difficult. Nearly a third of case study projects (16 of 56) were unable to provide data on their annual cost, and 31 (55 per cent) were unable to calculate costs for a typical session (Figure 14). There are more problems when several partners fund a project.

**Figure 14**

Lack of cost and outcome data prevents value for money assessment
Projects and funders do not know if they are getting value for money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>56 Total projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is cost per year data provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is cost per session data provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is attendee data provided to allow calculation of unit cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are robust outcomes recorded, to allow value for money profiling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Flowchart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="result.png" alt="Result" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not enough data provided to calculate a value for money profile

Out of all 56 projects we surveyed, only 15 provided the data needed to calculate a value for money profile

Source: Audit Commission
Case study 17

Evaluation of the LIFE project includes a value for money assessment

London Fire Brigade runs an intensive week-long course for young people delivered by front-line staff in fire stations across London. The programme, known as LIFE, is for young people aged between 13 and 17 who are at risk of social exclusion, involvement in anti-social behaviour or fire-related activity. LIFE teaches young people how to work in teams, communicate and set and achieve goals. Challenges, such as using breathing apparatus, help young people discover self-confidence and build self-esteem.

The fire brigade commissioned an independent evaluation using qualitative and quantitative methods. Data from the evaluation, and from other sources, allows the fire brigade to calculate a saving-to-cost ratio (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of incident</th>
<th>Average cost for each incident</th>
<th>Number of incidents prevented for each attendee in a year</th>
<th>Annual cost saving for each attendee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fires in public places</td>
<td>£1,650</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>£1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax calls to fire service</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>£792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>£866</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>£2,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>£802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluators calculate the saving-to-cost ratio of this programme is £1.85 for every £1 spent on the LIFE course.

Source: Audit Commission
133 But programme and cost data rarely reflect the full costs. Staffing, the costs of buying or hiring equipment and buildings, and overhead costs, are often underestimated or ignored in project costing. Project staff should ensure they fully account for all the resources they need when preparing a bid. Poor financial planning puts projects at needless risk.

134 The Audit Commission’s 2007 *Hearts and Minds* report sets out an intelligent commissioning framework that public bodies should use (Ref. 38). LSPs and children’s trusts should also consider local projects’ needs for support (training, brokerage, and advice) in bidding for funds, project management, and monitoring and evaluation.

**Achieving balance between enforcement and prevention**

135 All areas have responded to changes in government policy by moving away from enforcement to a more prevention-led approach to managing anti-social behaviour. Some areas have adopted a tiered approach to enforcement and use case panels before acting. Tensions remain in areas without an area-based policy agreed by all partners. In such areas, it is sometimes unclear when to move from a preventive approach towards enforcement. This leads to inconsistency, or to premature escalation of an issue. In one area the YOT team did not know about ASBO applications. This meant they could not offer the one-to-one support measures that could make an ASBO unnecessary. There are, however, examples from several case study areas of the police stepping in to fill local gaps in the provision of activities for young people or supporting other partners to do so (Case study 18).
Case study 18

Salford uses prevention and enforcement measures

Salford had a problem with alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in several key hot spots on Friday nights. Young people were involved and local residents and businesses were concerned.

The police and the youth service organised Operation Brocade in response. Agencies combine their skills and resources to provide information to young people and to address anti-social behaviour issues.

In the early evening youth workers approach groups of young people and provide them with information about alternative activities. They also advise them of the wider results of their behaviour (a criminal record, long-term health implications of binge drinking). After 9pm, the police provide enforcement action. This can include penalty notices, confiscation of alcohol, and arrests.

Crime in Salford has reduced by 17 per cent since Operation Brocade and other interventions.

Residents report more anti-social behaviour because of the strong police presence in hot spots. The police do not regard the increase in reported anti-social behaviour as failure. For them it is a source of more accurate intelligence (which the youth service also uses to target provision).

Source: Audit Commission

The next chapter reviews how national and local funding arrangements can fail to support the types of projects and programmes that research and young people suggest will work.
Funding arrangements inhibit preventive schemes

National funding arrangements are inefficient

Preventive schemes are most effective when they are run over several years (Ref. 44). Most preventive activities, though, receive fixed-term funding of two or three years and with little prospect of renewal. In general, preventive schemes have to rely on short-term, non-renewable, project funding rather than a needs-based income stream that enables them to become part of the community they serve.

Funds for preventive schemes come from local and national sources. Just over half (56 per cent) of funding for case study schemes is from central government and non-departmental public bodies (Figure 15). Most of this funding traces back to seven government departments. Much travels through other bodies (Sport England for example), before it reaches front-line projects.

Funding could be traced back to Department for Children, Schools and Families; Department for Culture, Media and Sport; Treasury; Cabinet Office; Communities and Local Government; Home Office; and the Department for Innovation, Universities, and Skills.
Figure 15
Central government is the largest provider of funds for preventive projects
Sources of funding (per cent)

Central government/non
departmental public bodies 56

Private 1

European 11

Statutory partners 10

Other national partners 6

Other local partners 2

Local government 14

Source: Audit Commission
Funding arrangements inhibit preventive schemes

139 Central government incurs administration costs for each of the funding streams it manages. DCMS grant programmes have administration costs between 3 and 7 per cent of grant awarded (Ref. 45). Central administration costs are proportionally smaller for larger grants. Streamlining the current system could reduce administration costs and make more money available for front-line services.

140 The average grant from central government is around £27,500, ranging between £900 and £250,000 (Table 9).
### Table 9
**Funding given by partners varies**
The largest payment was a thousand times greater than the smallest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding body</th>
<th>Example of funders</th>
<th>Number of projects funded</th>
<th>Average amount</th>
<th>Median amount</th>
<th>Lowest amount</th>
<th>Highest amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central government/ non-departmental public bodies</td>
<td>DCMS, Sport England, Arts Council</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£47,452</td>
<td>£27,500</td>
<td>£900</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other national partners</td>
<td>Football Foundation, national charities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£21,486</td>
<td>£14,500</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>YOT, youth service, anti-social behaviour team</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>£15,614</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory partner</td>
<td>Police, fire service, schools</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>£14,967</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local partner</td>
<td>Voluntary groups, local football clubs, local radio station</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>£5,311</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European partner</td>
<td>European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector partner</td>
<td>Northern Rail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Audit Commission*

---

*This column adds to more than 56 as the projects received funds from more than one source.*
Funding for preventive work goes to individual projects and is rarely coordinated across an area. Individual projects receive funding from several sources. Some receive most of their money from one funder, but others are reliant on many different funding sources. The 56 projects in the survey received funding of just over £3.3 million from 54 different funding streams. The typical project had three different sources of funds.

A typical project leader spends nearly a third of their time (28 per cent) on identifying and applying for funding and on managing budgets. This is equivalent to £8,000 a year diverted from front-line service provision to unbudgeted administration.

‘I have 19 cost centres. Only one of them is a local authority cost centre. Therefore I’m required to respond to a range of different funders with... budget material or budget returns, and also data returns to all of these agencies or funders. And I have the day job.’

YOT prevention manager
Small projects can find it difficult to get the resources they need to run and may have no choice but to make several applications for small amounts of funding. A similar amount of time and effort goes into applying for low-value and high-value grants. It costs about £3,300 to apply for and manage each new funding stream. The cost of applying for and managing some funding streams can exceed the value of the grant received. It is more cost-effective to make a smaller number of applications for higher value sums – but only if they are available (Table 10).

**Table 10**

**Funding applications carry high costs**

Smaller projects have a higher administrative load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total funding</th>
<th>Number of funding streams</th>
<th>Value of each funding stream</th>
<th>Estimated total administration costs (assuming £3,300 for each funding stream)</th>
<th>Proportion of funding spent on administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>£227,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1) £50,000 2) £58,000 3) £100,000 4) £10,000 5) £7,000 6) £2,000</td>
<td>£19,800</td>
<td>9p for each £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project D</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) £20,000 2) £5,000 3) £5,000</td>
<td>£9,900</td>
<td>33p for each £1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Audit Commission*
Funding arrangements inhibit preventive schemes

Responsibility for bidding for funds and for managing budgets falls on project staff, such as youth workers and sports development officers, who should be working with young people. Councils and their partners need to decide the best way to manage project finances. One solution could be to employ or make better use of staff with suitable skills, knowledge and experience (Table 11).

### Table 11

#### Two approaches to applying for funding

Smaller projects have a higher administrative load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approach to identifying and applying for funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>A member of staff was responsible for coordinating and running programmes for young people. The same staff member was also responsible for identifying funds. The post holder had no previous experience of finding funding and reported finding it difficult to spot potential funding opportunities and to engage effectively with potentially relevant local forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>Area F employed a project coordinator whose prime responsibility was to identify and apply for funding. The post holder had expertise in making funding applications and was successful in bringing in external funding. The post holder also alerted others to potential funding opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Councils and their partners should, as a minimum, coordinate applications for funding. Failure to do so results in competition for the same money and wasted time, money, and effort. The outcome is a local pattern of provision that fails to reflect need.

**Case study 19**

**Coordinating funding helps sustain projects in Waltham Forest**

Different council departments used several funding streams to support projects for young people. There was no overall monitoring and administration. But there was competition for money and duplication of effort.

The London Youth Offer funded by the Mayor of London and DCSF (from 2008/09) is available to all London boroughs. This doubled the youth support service budget for Waltham Forest. It also encouraged the council to consolidate youth-related budgets.

The new arrangements helped the council to cope with funding shortfalls in other areas. The youth support service and the Better Neighbourhoods Initiative (BNI) team agreed to deal with declines in BNI funds by taking a needs-based approach:

> ‘The youth needs are met through our [youth support service] budget. They [BNI] have a shrinking pot and we’ve got an expanding one so they’ve got other groups whose needs could be met.’

Youth support service manager

The council expects the centralised approach to funding will improve understanding of youth provision in the area; value for money; and support future service planning.

Source: Audit Commission
One way of reducing competition, duplication, and overlap is to design projects to address related issues as well as anti-social behaviour (Figure 16). Some case study projects also had objectives for improving community cohesion (two projects), increasing physical exercise (eight projects), or reducing drug or alcohol use (four projects).

Projects with wider objectives received funds from additional sources. Four case study projects received funding and resources in kind from the local drug and alcohol action team. A further three projects worked with their local primary care trust and offered sessions on healthy eating, reducing drinking or smoking, and sex education.

**Figure 16**

**Anti-social behaviour projects can contribute to other government agendas**

Of the projects with objectives to address anti-social behaviour, some also included objectives on related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects selecting these objectives</th>
<th>Anti-social behaviour only</th>
<th>Anti-social behaviour and one other</th>
<th>Anti-social behaviour and two others</th>
<th>Anti-social behaviour and three others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour and one other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour and two others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour and three others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Funding arrangements put effective projects at risk

The heavy reliance on external, fixed-term, funding puts all projects at risk of closure at the end of the funding period. There is little discrimination between effective and ineffective projects. A project with three years of funding only has an active life of two years. In the first six months it recruits staff and builds links with local communities. In the last six months project workers are trying to find new sources of money, referring young people on to other projects and looking for other jobs. Each redundancy payment is nearly £2,000 diverted away from work with young people.

‘What tends to happen now when you do bids for funding is you build in redundancy payment, because you have to make people redundant. So it seems a bit daft that we’re all struggling for money. Instead of [it] going to the young people, you’re putting a pot aside to pay people redundancy money. This seems a bonkers way of doing things when money’s tight, isn’t it? But it is a challenge.’

Officer, leisure department

Many projects do not know if new funding applications are successful until just before the current funding period ends (Table 12). There is little time to develop any exit strategy if projects have to close.

Table 12

Late funding decisions have implications for project staff

Uncertainty creates stress

| Area H | The local YOT commissioned a voluntary sector provider to run a YIP. In February the YOT was told the funding for the YIP would be renewed in April – but there was no written confirmation. The YOT entered into a verbal contract with the voluntary sector provider that the YIP would continue and the voluntary sector worked on trust that the funding would be given. |
| Area I | Two YOT staff members were on fixed-term contracts until the end of March. The YOT secured short-term funding to continue these posts and the work they were doing with young people until the end of June. Without a clear view of future income there was uncertainty about the future of the project and staff involvement. |

Source: Audit Commission
Local coordination can improve sustainability

There is little evidence of projects having long-term funding from councils. Long-term funding would give more security, but many councils report that they cannot afford to do it. Even the areas that provide long-term funding will only do it for some preventive projects – and will expect them to get additional funding.

Local community involvement in project management and delivery can increase sustainability. It can make a project into a part of the community and can transfer skills into the community. Some community groups can access funds that are not available to statutory partners. Community involvement can also link to volunteering: in some areas local students studying for sports qualifications volunteer to help projects.
Improved local links can lead to offers of added support such as staff time, facilities, and equipment (Figure 17). One project estimated that support in kind from the youth service was worth an extra £2,000, and the management support and accommodation provided by the leisure department equalled an extra grant of £31,000.

**Figure 17**

Local partners make large non-financial contributions

Non-financial contributions reflect local partnership flexibility

- **Funding**
- **Staff time**
- **Facilities**
- **Equipment**

- Central government/non departmental public bodies
- Local government (youth service, leisure department, YOT, anti-social behaviour team)
- European
- Statutory partners (police, fire, schools)
- Other national partners
- Other local partners (voluntary and community sector)
- Private

Source: Audit Commission
Funding arrangements inhibit preventive schemes

Two case study projects had private investment or sponsorship. Sponsors brought money, but they also contributed equipment and volunteers (Case study 20).

The final chapter reviews how councils, other statutory agencies, and community organisations and voluntary groups can work with central government to help young people and their communities tackle anti-social behaviour.

Case study 20

Hammersmith and Fulham SNAC project has the support of private investors

The Safer Neighbourhood Annual Challenge (SNAC) started in 2006. It encourages and rewards young people who improve their neighbourhood.

The initiative is open to young people aged from 5 to 19 years old. They must live in, or be members of an organisation in, Hammersmith and Fulham. The project gives young people an opportunity to improve their local community. They identify problems, suggest and devise solutions, and then put those solutions into effect with the help of small amounts of money provided by SNAC. Each group has to bid for its funding, which develops greater ownership and responsibility for the project.

Each year’s SNAC programme ends with an award ceremony. Everyone involved in SNAC is invited and all attendees get goodie bags of gifts provided by sponsors. Celebrities (such as premiership footballers) present awards to the most innovative and successful projects in each age group.

SNAC is in its third year. It is popular and is widely supported by stakeholders. The project actively sought sponsorship. International organisations with offices in the borough have been involved. In 2008, sponsors included KMPG, Disney, EMI, Haymarket Studios, Chelsea FC, and Fulham FC.

This external funding has kept public funding to a minimum. The high-profile sponsors have provided more than just financial support. Several contributed items for the goodie bags, EMI designed the website and, overall, the sponsors’ involvement has increased SNAC’s profile.

Source: Audit Commission
It is the responsibility of all partners within an area to create a better place for local residents to live. Councils and their partners can make a difference to levels of youth anti-social behaviour by working together to invest in and deliver the right provision. The evidence about the projects that are effective is well-known and many areas already have some good examples of local projects.

Despite this, these projects have limited impact without more trust in young people and communities to decide local needs. This will entail a stronger commitment, by both local and central government to engaging with, and responding to, the needs of young people. The media have a key role to play in influencing public views of young people in a more balanced, more positive, way.

Councils are in a unique position to bring together all the relevant partners who can contribute to this agenda and engage with local communities to ensure that solutions are suitable to their needs. Many solutions are low cost. Small-scale initiatives such as liaising with other partners and supporting communities to get involved in local projects can make a difference. By working more closely with other partners, councils may be able to increase their existing capacity to run projects with young people.
158 Councils, children’s trusts and CDRPs must target resources appropriately. Low-cost sport and leisure activities that engage young people through accessible, reliable and relevant provision will be enough for most young people. Young people at medium risk of involvement in anti-social behaviour will need access to developmental activities. High cost one-to-one inputs and enforcement action should be targeted to the few young people for whom low-cost preventive activities and developmental interventions with support have not worked (Figure 18). Spending on lower-cost interventions will reduce the need for higher-cost interventions. As well as creating savings for the public purse, this will also give a better quality of life to young people and communities.

Figure 18
Resources must be targeted appropriately
The three levels of intervention for addressing anti-social behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providers include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary and community sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/RSLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol action team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>Medium risk</th>
<th>High risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging sport and leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• short/medium term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental activity/support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• medium/high cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• medium/long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• high cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
Councils should provide leadership, coordination and promote partnerships

159 Councils, children’s trusts, and CDRPs can provide effective solutions to youth anti-social behaviour by working in partnership with other organisations such as those in the voluntary and community sector. To deliver an integrated, coordinated and comprehensive programme of sport and leisure activities, partners need to:

- develop a joint strategy for reducing youth anti-social behaviour;
- use the LAA to order activities according to need and to ensure there is enough funding;
- provide longer-term (three to five years) funding for projects; and
- review provision to ensure that it is effective in meeting young people’s needs.

160 Councils should make links with the other policy agendas that are relevant to young people’s lives. These include obesity, teenage pregnancy and community cohesion. Local partners must work together to a common aim of improving outcomes for young people. This includes links to the 2012 Olympics with its legacy commitment to ‘inspire a generation of young people to take part in local volunteering, cultural and physical activity’ (Ref. 46). Over the years leading up to 2012, there should be more opportunities for projects to link to the Olympics and their continuing legacy.

Commissioning activities requires a strong evidence base

161 Project commissioners need to ensure there is a strong evidence base to support their decisions and spend on what works. Future commissioning decisions and resource allocation should follow evidence from the projects run now. Funders and commissioners also have a role to play in supporting and training project staff to collect evidence about their effectiveness. That evidence base needs to include:

- shared intelligence on the nature of youth anti-social behaviour problems;
- mapping of the range of activities available across an area;
- data on the throughput of projects;
- clear objectives with defined personal and social outcomes;
- evaluation data using both qualitative and quantitative measures; and
- information on project costs, including staffing costs, management costs, and use of equipment and facilities.

162 Project commissioners need to ensure they commission the most effective services for young people by looking at different providers and delivery options – including the public, private, and third sector.
Commissioners should support long-term programmes in preference to short-term projects. This is essential for building relationships with young people and changing their behaviour. They should also support staff in finding ways to make projects more sustainable.

Engaging the whole local community is crucial

The whole local community (young people and adults) should be partners in councils’ efforts to tackle anti-social behaviour. By consulting and involving both groups in designing solutions to anti-social behaviour, the resulting projects will build on local needs and be more likely to engage young people and be effective. Communities can also manage and deliver activities themselves, ultimately increasing the sustainability of projects.

To achieve this, councils need to ensure that they:

- consult with relevant groups of young people;
- work with communities to help them understand anti-social behaviour and when to report it;
- tell communities about how anti-social behaviour is managed in their area;
- tell young people about activities available in formats that they find accessible;
- provide projects that are accessible, reliable and relevant to young people to ensure that they will engage with them; and
- ensure that provision reflects the diverse needs of young people.
Central government needs to improve the efficiency of funding arrangements

Central government should pool the many funding streams for programmes for young people at risk of anti-social behaviour. Area-based grant is one potential pooling mechanism. Ring-fenced funds provide the security that money is spent on national priorities; they sometimes ensure that new money is spent on local priorities. But the current system creates unnecessary bureaucracy with the costs falling on those least able to carry them. It also makes it more difficult for local partners to work together to pursue linked objectives, such as tackling obesity, through a single project. Increasing the use of area-based grant would ensure that local areas decide how to spend the money to tackle their specific problems. A longer-term view of income sources is required, with support given to long-term local programmes in preference to short-term local projects.

Without an area-based approach, government and other funders should ensure that marketing and communications about available funding makes it easier for projects to identify what is available.

All project and programme evaluation should have the aim of increasing knowledge about successful interventions.

DCSF has several pilot projects to lessen some of the difficulties experienced by councils and their partners. These projects are designing better ways of mapping and publicising local activities. Projects are also in place through the Youth Crime Action Plan to tackle knife crime and gangs. Learning from these pilots should be shared with councils and their partners as soon as it is available.

CAA will take account of the findings

The move to CAA will give more opportunity to examine how different agencies are working together to focus on local priorities such as anti-social behaviour. It will also ensure that all partners who can contribute to solving anti-social behaviour are held jointly accountable for the outcomes that they achieve.

Where there is an identified concern about anti-social behaviour and young people in an area, the Audit Commission will work with other inspectorates within the CAA using the lessons from the study to support improvement.

We will provide guidance, self-assessment tools and case studies to help councils and their partners to improve their provision of sport and leisure activities.
## Self-assessment checklist

### Project design
- ✔ How is the research evidence about what works used in programme and project design?
- ✔ How are the views and needs of local young people reflected in:
  - activities segmented by age?
  - appropriate adjustments for gender, ethnic mix, and disability?
  - ability to make changes according to changing needs?
- ✔ Do the opening hours of local projects match patterns of anti-social behaviour (places and times)?

### Engage with young people
- ✔ How is outreach work used to encourage the most hard to reach young people to attend activities?
- ✔ Are there taster sessions?
- ✔ Is there a progression from informal to more structured work?
- ✔ What are the opportunities for personal and social skills development in local projects?
- ✔ How are young people provided with positive role models or mentors?
- ✔ How are young people involved in setting rules and boundaries?
- ✔ What opportunities do young people have to develop through volunteering or through gaining a coaching qualification?

### Ensure projects are accessible
- ✔ Are free or low-cost places available?
- ✔ Is the project delivered in places that are accessible and safe for the young people?
- ✔ Are any transport costs reimbursed (or avoided)?
- ✔ How do staff ensure young people will be safe when travelling?
- ✔ How does project publicity and branding appeal to young people?
- ✔ How do commissioners ensure projects are open on a regular basis?
- ✔ Are projects offered over a medium- to long-term time period as part of a local programme?

### Help young people to achieve their full potential
- ✔ How do providers give support or refer young people to other activities if a project is short term or does not take place regularly?
- ✔ Are staff alert to any possible unintended consequences of young people attending the project? Do they work with partners to resolve any issues?
- ✔ How do commissioners ensure that local projects meet the needs of girls, young women, and BME groups?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consult and work with adults and young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ How are representative groups of young people consulted before setting up projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Do projects continue to consult during their lifetime?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How are young people supported in devising their own solutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How do councils and their partners consult with communities to understand local concerns about anti-social behaviour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ What work is done with communities to improve their understanding of what can be done to tackle anti-social behaviour and their perceptions of young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Are activities publicised in a format young people find accessible?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinate activities across an area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ What steps are taken to ensure all partners are aware of the range of activities available in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How do commissioners involve partners in decision-making about, and delivery of, projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ What is the area strategy for the use of preventive and enforcement action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Are there clear links between the CDRP and children’s trust over plans to prevent young people engaging in anti-social behaviour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How is the local strategic partnership used to resolve local difficulties in interpreting responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Has consideration been given to using secondments to improve understanding between partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How are councils and their partners building stronger links with schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How do councils and their partners ensure that universal provision is accessible to all young people?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve utilisation of funding and resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ Are partners working together to tackle common problems, for example obesity, community cohesion and anti-social behaviour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ What links are made with other partners who may be able to offer staff time, or use of equipment and facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Are options for private investment or sponsorship considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How do the LSP and the children’s trust support local projects in identifying and bidding for funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ How do the LSP and the children’s trust support local projects in managing, monitoring and evaluating their activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Self-assessment checklist

#### Improve sustainability
- ✓ How is appropriate use of volunteers made?
- ✓ What support is given to communities to run activities themselves?
- ✓ How do senior managers ensure organisational commitment to run activities does not rest with one person?

#### Gather evidence of effectiveness and cost
- ✓ Are there clear objectives for each project?
- ✓ Are personal and social outcomes set and measured for each objective?
- ✓ Are there quantitative and qualitative measures of effectiveness?
- ✓ Is data gathered on costs, including the cost of staff time, equipment and use of facilities?

#### Use evidence to make decisions about future projects
- ✓ How do commissioners support providers in collecting evidence of efficacy?
- ✓ How do partners share intelligence on the nature and location of anti-social behaviour?
- ✓ Is there a record of which organisations deliver what, where and when?
- ✓ What does the mapping of activities say about gaps in provision, duplication, lack of coordination, or the provision of choice?
- ✓ How is the research evidence about what works and the evidence from local programmes used in future programme and project design?
Appendix 1
Research method

1 This study was researched between July 2007 and June 2008. The study team used a mixed methods approach, with a focus on young people and on providers of sport and leisure activities. There were four main parts to the research:

- A literature review of academic evidence on the effectiveness of sport and leisure activities in changing behaviour, combined with analysis of recent government policy (see www.audit-commission.gov.uk/hangingaround).
- Documentary analysis and interviews with key stakeholders in a purposive sample of 14 case study authorities. Case study areas were selected mainly on their level of deprivation, but also included different types of authority and areas of the country. Fieldwork took place over two days at each location and there were 113 interviews. The team spoke to police, fire, and council officers (community safety or anti-social behaviour team, leisure department, youth service, YOT) in all areas. These people then suggested other stakeholders. These included elected members, chairs of CDRPs, directors of children’s services, extended schools coordinators or educational support teams and voluntary and community sector providers. In some areas project visits were included as part of the fieldwork. The Commission thanks the 14 councils that took part in the study.

- An electronic survey of projects running activities for young people was conducted. Projects were identified from the fieldwork interviews. The survey collected data on the type of activities carried out at the project, sources of funding, cost of running the project and monitoring and evaluation data recorded. Data were received on 56 projects.

- Specialist contractors (Progressive Partnership Limited) held 17 focus groups with young people in three fieldwork areas. There were separate focus groups for young men and young women. The focus groups represented young people in terms of age, ethnicity, level of engagement in activities, and likelihood of involvement in anti-social behaviour.

2 Emma Belton, Ash Chand, Jodie Smith, and Sarah Furlong researched and managed the study. Stuart Atkins, Laura Holloway, Melanie Lewis, Glynis Laurence, Karen Price and Tembinkosi Mugwira provided additional support. Michael Hughes was the project director. An external advisory group assisted with developing the research design and findings (see Appendix 2 for details). Young people in Burnley, Gateshead, and Hammersmith and Fulham provided a valuable user perspective. The Commission thanks all those who were involved. However, the views expressed in this report are those of the Audit Commission alone.
This study uses the definition of positive activities referred to in clause 6 of the 2006 Education and Inspections Act. This definition includes both recreational activities, for example sport, leisure and cultural activities; as well as educational activities such as clubs, coaching sessions, learning opportunities, and volunteering.
## Table 13

### Members of external advisory group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name of attendee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Council</td>
<td>Emma Slawinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Concern</td>
<td>Rosie Chadwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Culture Media and Sport</td>
<td>Adam Cooper and Simon Matty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Children Schools and Families</td>
<td>Damon Boxer, Anthony Hughes, Paul Rasch (Activities and Engagement Team) and Ed Parkes (Youth Taskforce), Anthony Thompson, (Youth Justice Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td>Andy Parrott and Alastair Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency</td>
<td>Martyn Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Community Cohesion</td>
<td>Judith Lempriere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association</td>
<td>Daniel Mason and Clive Grimshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Audit Office</td>
<td>Angela Hands and Jonathan MacKay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Safety Network</td>
<td>Lindsey Poole and Sue Raikes (Thames Valley Partnership), and Stephanie Bennett (New Forest District Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Voluntary Youth Services</td>
<td>Mark Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Tony Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Malcolm Tungatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>Neil Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Board</td>
<td>Matthew Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Audit Commission
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ACPO Association of Chief Police Officers
ABC Acceptable behaviour contract
ASBO Anti-social behaviour order
BME Black and minority ethnic
BNI Better Neighbourhoods Initiative
CAA Comprehensive area assessment
CDRP Crime and disorder reduction partnership
CPOs Community police officers
CSR07 Comprehensive Spending Review 2007
DCMS Department for Culture Media and Sport
DCSF Department for Children, Schools and Families
ISO Individual support order
LAA Local area agreement
LSP Local strategic partnership
MAPS Multi-agency problem solving
PACT Partners and Communities Together
PCSO Police community support officer
PSA Public service agreements
SSP Safer schools partnership
RSL Registered social landlord
SNAC Safer Neighbourhoods Annual Challenge
SPRS Substance Project Reporting System
YIP Youth inclusion programme
YJB Youth Justice Board
YOS Youth offending service
YOT Youth offending team