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Executive Summary

Background

CashBack for Communities investment creates opportunities for youth work practitioners to convince policy makers of its widest strategic value. Policies, frameworks and strategies underpin an expectation of professions working together to achieve common goals and tailoring programmes to meet the differentiated needs of young people. Within this youth work’s role is to ensure a unique balance of providing positive experiences for young people but also evaluating their self-image, self-esteem and adherence to moral and ethical standards.

Overall CashBack for Communities has invested more than £45 million in positive activities for young people through 21 fund holders. On behalf of the Scottish Government, during round 4, 20010 to 2012 YouthLink Scotland distributed 469 grant from a budget of three million pounds in its youth work fund. An additional £500,000 was distributed under the anti-violence fund to 24 youth agencies. Hence it was anticipated the evaluation and results presented herein, would uncover examples of ways youth work has benefited from this investment and whether projects funded fit with fund priorities, or deal with the wider context and challenges.

Definitions

Definitions are provided to explain the role of youth work. Given the priorities of the CashBack for Communities fund it sets out statistics regarding young people’s involvement in violence and anti-social behaviour. Therefore it clarifies two distinct types of diversionary youth work interventions: open - reaching high numbers relatively low level intensity activities, or targeted – reaching low numbers with relatively high level intensity activities that are much more tailored to address complex needs and issues. The report takes cognisance of literature when it asserts diversionary youth work is more likely to succeed if plans are consciously made to adopt either an open or targeted approach. A chart is therefore provided to assist with overall analysis of projects examined in the evaluation and their fit with good practice guidelines.

The evaluation methods

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact CashBack for Communities has had on youth sector organisations receiving funds, the young people benefiting and their communities. The evaluation primarily reviewed:

- The distribution and administration of funds
- The extent the funding principles were met.
- The benefits of the funding
- Whether the youth work and anti-violence fund can be improved to make a greater impact in future.

In addition attempts were made to identify good practice in both open and targeted types of diversionary youth work and better understand the impact they make to diverting young people from risk.
Therefore the methods adopted included:

- **A review of documents and data**, including all data on successful and unsuccessful applicants.
- **A survey of successful applicants** – with 220 responses (55% of youth work fund recipients and 50% of anti-violence fund recipients) to review project outputs, and experiences of the whole funding process.
- **Five case studies** in Glasgow City, Edinburgh City, Dumfries & Galloway and Perth & Kinross which included interviews with representatives from local panels, and two separate interviews with a high level award recipient and a low level award recipient in each area. Two out of ten interviews were with anti-violence fund recipients.
- **Interviews and workshops** with YouthLink Scotland CashBack team and two representatives from the Scottish Government, were used to identify ways of improving the overall administration of the funding.

The findings and analysis

**Overview of fund distribution:** In round 4, YouthLink Scotland distributed more than three million pounds to almost 400 youth sector organisations across Scotland. It is estimated that during this time around 60,000 young people benefited from CashBack for the youth sector with a relatively higher proportion of males than females taking part. Although the majority of participants are aged 10-19 there is evidence of some need to expand the age groups covered. Once matched funding is included, the estimated level of total investment stands at seven million pounds. CashBack for Communities has the potential to be matched pound for pound when invested in the youth work sector. Almost all (95%) youth work fund awards are for less than £15,000; whereas three quarters (75%) of awards made by the anti-violence fund are for more than £15,000. Contrary to expectations of a targeted approach, the average and mean number of participants in the anti-violence fund is higher than those in the youth work fund. Therefore there is a need to promote more realistic estimation of numbers based on principles of open and targeted approaches. Further potential arises to assess and make awards based on per-capita investments.

**Uses of funding:** The majority of funding was used towards new activities. The youth work funds were used in ways which predominantly reflect open types of diversionary youth work. Nevertheless some targeted examples were found. Two fifths of survey respondents used the youth work fund for ‘group work’ or ‘skills development’. There are strengths within the mixture of approaches used including learning programmes (one quarter of respondents), issue based work (one fifth of respondents) and working in partnership with others (one sixth of respondents). Yet more can be done in future to address the lack of needs assessment, limited use of outreach/detached work and partnership working, particularly with other CashBack for Communities strands. Most of the anti-violence fund leant towards targeted approaches albeit with some exceptions which would require further investigation. Nevertheless where targeted
approaches are clear projects are more closely coupled with more intense types of youth work interventions that also cause young people to consider their emotional as well as social well-being.

**Contribution to CashBack for Communities’ priorities:** ‘Addressing an identified gap in provision’ was rated higher than the Government’s key priority of ‘focusing resources in areas of high crime’; indicating the fund has become a lifeline in difficult times. When results are compared according to responses, those giving a high priority to ‘focusing resources in a high crime area’ are significantly more likely to also give a high priority to ‘identifying young people that may be at risk of getting involved in violence and/or anti-social behaviour’ and less likely than other fund recipients to rate ‘addressing an identified gap in provision’ as a high priority. In future development of youth sector funds, it appears feasible to weight the priorities in favour of applications that clearly combine multiple priorities.

**Administration of funding:** YouthLink Scotland is distributing what has become an invaluable source of income to a significant number within the youth work sector. The youth work sector is largely very familiar with the funding process and satisfied with their experience of it. However not all recipients of the fund are fully aware that applications are assessed by a local panel and the involvement of young people is patchy and inconsistent. Most respondents support the role of panels, believing they have local knowledge which makes their decision-making more relevant. However respondents seek improvements to the openness and transparency over membership of panels and the decision-making process. Clearer guidance on eligibility and criteria is welcomed and accompanying examples would be helpful to applicants. Frequent requests are made to extend the duration of funding. Panel members would also recommend that other CashBack funds are required to work strategically with the youth work sector in local areas.

**Case studies:** The five area case studies (Highland, Glasgow City, Edinburgh City, Dumfries & Galloway, and Perth & Kinross) are presented in detail. The key findings are combined with previous analysis to determine the wider implications and propose future developments to the CashBack for Communities scheme.

**Lessons Learnt:** The key lesson from the evaluation is that youth work approaches, when executed effectively, prove to be particularly effective at tackling issues such as violence and anti-social behaviour as part of a holistic progressive process of early and later intervention of social and emotional development. To continuously improve youth work practice and the outcomes of CashBack for Communities, detailed lessons are summarised in relation to: success criteria; the benefits and impact of youth work, and administration of the funding.

**Recommendations:** Finally, recommendations are presented as some dos, don’ts and possible maybes. Recommendations to highlight are:

- Do focus on the funding priorities, particularly in line with principles of open and targeted approaches.
- Don’t burden applicants with unnecessary restrictions, but allow them to make their case.
- Possibly explore strategic partnerships with other CashBack fund-holders.
1. Introduction

‘Cash Back for Communities’ is a Scottish Government initiative whereby 21 sporting, arts and youth organisations receive a share of money obtained through proceeds of crime, to increase positive opportunities and activities for young people. These are mainly, though not exclusively national umbrella bodies. Primarily CashBack monies aim to divert 10-19 year olds away from violence and anti-social behaviour. Since CashBack for Communities was launched in 2007 the Government has invested more than £45 million pounds with an estimated 600,000 young people benefiting from the activities delivered.

Whilst a significant bulk of investment goes towards sporting activities (£27 million), this report focuses on two grants administered by YouthLink Scotland. The youth work fund enables the youth work sector to provide diversionary activities for young people. The other is for youth organisations working specifically with young people involved, or at risk of becoming involved in violence. The evaluation focuses on grants awarded during round four of both grant schemes (during 2010 – 2012).

Following a competitive tendering process, Catch the Light youth and community development consultancy were commissioned by YouthLink Scotland to undertake an evaluation. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the impact YouthLink Scotland’s share of CashBack has had on organisations receiving funds, the young people benefiting and their communities. As the national agency in Scotland for the youth work sector, the findings will be used by YouthLink Scotland to inform the future development of CashBack investment in the sector and to report back to the Scottish Government on progress.

The report therefore outlines the background to the CashBack for Communities initiative and the policy context, including current themes and issues facing the youth work sector. It describes the evaluation methods, and presents the findings and analysis. The report concludes with lessons learnt from the study and makes recommendations for future developments.

For the purposes of this report the whole Government scheme involving fund-holding partners is hereinafter referred to as ‘CashBack for communities’; whereas YouthLink Scotland’s grants will be referred to collectively as CashBack for the youth sector. Each separate grant will be referred to as the ‘youth work fund’ or ‘anti-violence fund’.
2. Background
The following section summarises the policy context for youth work in Scotland. The CashBack for Communities scheme is explained along with the role of YouthLink Scotland in administering the distribution of part of this scheme to the youth work sector across Scotland.

2.1 Policy Background
The ‘Christie Commission’ on the future delivery of public services recommends that Scotland should embrace a radical new collaborative culture to tackle deep-rooted social problems. The objectives recommended for public service reform are to ensure that:

- “public services are built around people and communities, their needs, aspirations, capacities and skills, and work to build up their autonomy and resilience;”
- public service organisations work together effectively to achieve outcomes – specifically, by delivering integrated services which help to secure improvements in the quality of life, and the social and economic wellbeing, of the people and communities of Scotland;
- public service organisations prioritise prevention, reduce inequalities and promote equality; and all public services constantly seek to improve performance and reduce costs, and are open, transparent and accountable.” (2011, p.72)

Young people in Scotland are relatively optimistic about their future (YouthLink Scotland 2009). Yet policies relating to young people tend to focus on issues which politicians and communities find most difficult to deal with. Culturally adults often perceive young people as the problem itself when issues like violence and anti-social behaviour are raised. Hence a hierarchy of policy has evolved to combat youth related issues.

At the top, the Scottish Government’s national outcome four (NO4) articulates an aspiration that “our young people are successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens”.

Underneath, numerous ‘strategic pillars’ detail plans for tackling the many complex economic, social, health and educational challenges young people face, as illustrated in the diagram below [see figure 1]:

However more specific to the CashBack for Communities scheme are the following:

- **The Antisocial Behaviour Framework** (Scottish Government 2009) – has prevention and early effective intervention at its heart, based on a framework of prevention, integration, engagement and communication.

- **The Violence Reduction Unit**\(^3\) – is a police led unit with a focus on enforcement of the law, tackling existing problems like knife, gang and gun crime head on. It also develops longer term work to educate young people to prevent violence before it occurs.

To achieve shared outcomes ‘**Getting it Right for Every Child**’ (GIRFEC)\(^4\) outlines a universal way of working so that practitioners improve the well-being of all young people using a common language and tools. These are as follows:

---


- **Well-being Indicators** – areas young people need to progress to do well: nurtured, active, respected, responsible, included, safe, healthy and achieving.
- **My World Triangle** – a mental map to assess and understand a young person’s whole world
- **Resilience Matrix** – analyse more complex information and weigh factors according to vulnerability and resilience, and adversity and protection.

Specific to youth work is the ‘The National Youth Work Strategy’ (2007)\(^5\) that defines a vision, where:

- **All young people in Scotland are able to benefit from youth work opportunities which make a real difference to their lives; and**
- **There is a youth work sector equipped and empowered to achieve ongoing positive outcomes for young people now and in the future.**

Following the publication of the strategy, a guide entitled ‘Valuing Young People’ was prepared by the Scottish Government and CoSLA (2009)\(^6\) in consultation with young people across Scotland to “support partners to deliver positive outcomes for all young people, while recognising that some need more help than others to realise their potential.”

Practitioners ought to be familiar with relevant national outcomes, frameworks and the tools outlined above. Equally services should be tailored according to the needs of young people. Strategies imply that the evaluation is likely to uncover examples of youth workers working alongside other professions to achieve common goals.

### 2.2 Background to the challenges for youth work

Based on its consultation with young people, Action for Children’s (2011)\(^7\) report on knife and gun crime advocates making young people part of the solution by listening to them and making them emotionally healthy and strong to achieve their aspirations of living in safe communities. Youth work has a crucial role to play in effectively fulfilling work that addresses offending behaviour or promotes active citizenship. However the report calls for more sustainable funding for services that reach out to those young people that are often hardest to reach.

Recent riots in England raised widespread fears that youth unrest and disorder may be on the rise. Though there is insufficient evidence that such fears are rational, it is noted that youth services were much depleted in areas where the riots broke out. Research suggests the main causes for these riots are:

---

Inappropriate policing;
Inequality and materialism;
Moral collapse;
Social breakdown; and
Policy (Smith 2011)  

Whilst rioting has not yet occurred in Scotland, there are implications for youth work which Smith (ibid) presents as four main themes:

- **Being clear about what youth work is and offers:** to shape their work appropriately and tell people about it – facilitating relationships; spaces to reflect, learn and grow, freely joining together to organise and take part in activities.
- **Working for extended schooling** – recognising the important role of youth workers an informal education, especially where young people struggle with formal schooling.
- **Developing and making the case for streetwork** – this is not well understood or appreciated.
- **Building civil society** – maximising the potential of forming groups and associations with vital opportunities for face to face interventions.

In addition to points raised above, Edwards & Hatch (2003) declare that **while early intervention is vital, later interventions must be part of a continuing process to divert young people from risks.** Following years of underfunding, modern spaces are badly needed where young people can access a combination of activities, advice and support. Youth workers therefore also require multiple skills and knowledge or have different professions working together.

Pertinent to the CashBack for Communities scheme it claims **current funding for youth services is a ‘scatter gun approach’ that results in services that don’t add up or join up for young people. Contrary to focusing on violence or anti-social behaviour it recommends that funding outcomes should reflect meeting young people’s holistic needs.** Similar concerns were raised by France et al (2007) suggesting youth work may be pressurised towards diluting its principles for the sake of over-focusing on narrow policy objectives.

Youth work’s defining characteristics express its ‘sense of purpose’ of both personal and social development of young people (Young 2006). What matters is not what activities young people do but the way they are supported to “**learn from their experience and develop the motivation and capacity to:**

---

• Examine their values,
• Deliberate on the principles of their own moral judgments,
• Develop the skills and dispositions to make informed decisions that can be sustained through committed action” (Coleman and Henry 1999 as cited in Young 2006).

Moreover it is only through this balance of providing experiences and reflecting on them by evaluating their self-image, self-esteem and adherence to moral and ethical standards that young people can progress and deal with issues they may have.

Thus even when the consequences of not investing in youth work are more publicly apparent; a fundamental challenge is for youth work practitioners to promote its benefits and convince policy makers of its widest strategic value. **CashBack for Communities therefore provides opportunities to promote a better understanding and expression of youth work through for example the way application forms are designed, initiatives are monitored and evaluated, and likewise the way they are promoted.**

### 2.3 Background to CashBack for Communities

From the Scottish Government’s perspective the purpose of CashBack for Communities is to divert 10-19 year olds away from violence and anti-social behaviour by offering positive opportunities and activities. Examples of fund distribution are highlighted below (Scottish Government 2012)\(^\text{12}\):

- £10.4 million to the Scottish Football Association,
- £7.5 million to YouthLink Scotland,
- £4.6 million to Scottish Rugby Union,
- £3.5 million to the Sports Facilities Fund,
- £3.45 million to Creative Identities initiative for Film, Dance and Music,
- £3.2 million to Scottish Sports Futures,
- £1.6 million to the Personal Development Partnership,
- £1.5 million to the Multisport project,
- £1.1 million to Basketball Scotland,
- £1.0 million to Small Grants Scheme - Youth Groups and Youth Organisations,
- £0.5 million for anti-violence diversionary projects (YouthLink Scotland),
- £0.35 million to the Just Play project in Angus,
- £0.3 million to the Prince’s Trust Development Awards,
- £0.2 million to Scottish Power to support the Personal Development Partnership,
- £0.15 million to Working on Wheels,

The key principles underpinning all CashBack activities are:

---

Positive – broadly defined as wholesome, healthy, fun, active, engaging
Open to all – accessible, well advertised, free of charge, of interest to all ages and to both boys and girls, ethnic minorities, young people with disabilities etc
Developmental – changing behaviours and attitudes, developing personal and physical skills
Sustainable – providing medium and long term as well as short term benefits; linked to mainstream funding

Monies are allocated as they become available and each fund-holder has had relative freedom to determine the best way of achieving the principles within their own remits. For instance the Scottish Football Association\textsuperscript{13} invested in programmes such as Schools of Football and Bank of Scotland Midnight Leagues. Creative Scotland established Creative Identities\textsuperscript{14}, a fund to support young people towards greater participation and progression in dance, film and music. A partnership between The Prince’s Trust Scotland, Venture Scotland and the Venture Trust (Personal Development Partnership)\textsuperscript{15} was formed to support young people on the cusp of offending or anti-social behaviour to work towards training, education and employment. Each takes rather different approaches to achieving the overall purpose and principles of CashBack for Communities.

Given proceeds of crime is such an unusual source of investment, future funds are impossible to predict. Hence other than the overarching principles there is a lack of strategy over how the funds should be allocated, or success be measured.

2.4 Background to YouthLink Scotland’s administration of CashBack funds
This report focuses specifically on the funds received by YouthLink Scotland\textsuperscript{16}. YouthLink Scotland is the national agency for the youth work sector in Scotland. Over four years they administered more than seven million pounds of CashBack Funding to around 650 local youth work organisations through two grant funds:

\textbf{The Youth Work Fund:} is for youth organisations to provide diversionary events and activities that are developmental in nature, for young people aged 10-19.

\textbf{The Anti-Violence Fund:} is for projects dedicated to addressing the perception or experience of violence in Scotland among young people aged 10-19 who are at risk of becoming involved.

During the most recent round (round 4) 469 grant awards were made from a budget of three million pounds in the youth work fund. An additional £500,000 was distributed under the anti-violence fund to 24 youth agencies. Therefore this report evaluates this particular round of funding for both grants during 2010 to 2012.

\textsuperscript{13} See for example: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Releases/2011/03/16134101
\textsuperscript{14} See website for more details: http://www.creativescotland.com/investment/creativeidentities
\textsuperscript{15} See for example: http://www.tpdp.org.uk/
\textsuperscript{16} See for examples: http://www.youthlinkscotland.org/Index.asp?MainID=11887
3. Definitions
The proceeding section explores definitions for the main terms used in the report.

3.1 Youth Work
Youth work is a form of informal education with underpinning dimensions of voluntary participation facilitated by youth workers with the skills and integrity to empower young people (adapted from Smith, 2002). In Scotland the purpose is commonly defined as follows:

- To build self-esteem and self-confidence;
- to develop the ability to manage personal and social relationships;
- to create learning and develop new skills;
- to encourage positive group atmospheres;
- to build the capacity of young people to consider risk, make reasoned decisions and take control; and
- to develop a world view which widens horizons and invites social commitment (Milburn et al 2003).

The question for CashBack for Communities is how youth work differs from other interventions and adds value to the priorities.

3.2 Diversionary youth work
Assertions are successfully made, that the majority of youth work is diversionary to some extent. The rationale is that young people engaged in positive leisure time activities are less likely to get involved in negative social behaviours. Indeed longitudinal studies suggest prospects are brighter for those taking part in varied activities, where activities are well led, structured and are purposeful to young people working together towards shared goals (HM Treasury, 2007). CashBack for Communities’ seeks to fund interventions which divert young people from the risk of violence and anti-social behaviour. There are nevertheless two distinct types of youth work adopted to divert young people from such risks.

‘Open’ – Youth organisations adopting an open approach generally provide activities and programmes that are open to all young people within a determined age group or geography. It is not known at the outset whether young people at risk will be identified, unless there is planned action to identify them once the work is underway. Some open youth work seeks to increase the chances of capturing young people at risk through for example working in areas of multiple-deprivation. Alternatively organisations may plan activities, such as information and awareness raising sessions to actively prevent young people from taking inappropriate risks.

---

‘Targeted’: Targeted diversionary youth work refers to the specific aim of addressing challenging issues which only some young people are affected by. It usually begins by identifying young people already showing signs of being ‘at risk’. Young people can be referred because they meet certain criteria (e.g. young people leaving care), alternatively approaches such as streetwork seek out young people in certain situations (e.g. those drinking in public places). Once they voluntarily agree to take part, young people are assessed to identify reasons their risks are higher, and their resilience to identified risk are lower. Activities which follow seek to address both individual and collective issues so that young people develop their social, emotional, behavioural and physical well-being. This often takes the form of using specialist skills such as individual counseling, therapeutic group work, addictions programmes, mentoring and family work.

Thus both types of diversionary work are valid, with distinct types of interventions and equally distinct outcomes. Nevertheless they are not mutually exclusive and one can often follow the other or run in parallel. Methods used in this study were therefore designed to uncover both open and targeted types of diversionary youth work.

3.3 Violence and anti-social behaviour
Anti-social behaviour is notably difficult to define. DTZ Pieda Consulting (2005)\(^{20}\) suggest it is better to think of anti-social behaviour a spectrum of behaviour types ranging from neighbour problems and neighbourhood problems through to problems resulting in a legally definable crime. Their diagram below helpfully illustrates the overlapping areas of crime and anti-social behaviour [see figure 2]:

The report reached the following conclusions regarding violence and anti-social behaviour trends for young people (with numerous caveats which can be found in the full report):

- 42% of recorded violent crimes are due to young people (60% robbery, 43% serious assault and 18% other)
- 22% of adults surveyed in the Scottish Household Survey reported ‘Substance abuse/Illegal drinking/drunkenness/drug dealing as a ‘very’ or ‘fairly common’ problem in their areas. The proportion increases to 35% in areas of social rented housing.
- 32% of adults reported ‘Intimidating gatherings of young people in public places as ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ common.
- 30% of adults consider littering to be a ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ common problem in their area.

Attention is also drawn to other records where the proportion of crimes caused by young people is high. These represent types of crime which can also be interpreted as ‘anti-social behaviour’, such as:

- 75% of fire-raising, vandalism etc is due to young people (86% fire-raising and 75% vandalism)
- 75% of theft of motor vehicles is due to young people
- 65% of theft by opening lockfast places is due to young people
- 59% of crimes involving ‘handling an offensive weapon’ are due to young people (ibid)
Thus young people only account for a higher proportion of certain types of crime, which are often publically perceived as anti-social. Young people claim the reasons they offend are:

- For material gain;
- For excitement;
- For enjoyment; and
- For the relief of boredom (Adamson 2003)\(^{21}\)

Thus **youth work offers crucial benefits in the skillful ways it diverts young people towards more positive social and emotional interactions.** Similarly it can work to reduce negative community perceptions associated with youth related crime and anti-social behaviour. Nevertheless dangers loom if practitioners ignore the importance of adopting the right youth work skills and interventions for the right situations.

### 3.4 Successful interventions

For youth organisations to succeed in meeting the CashBack for Communities purpose and priorities, it is essential to understand why programmes are successful. There are documented ‘warning signs’ of young people’s propensity to violent or anti-social behaviour. Fortunately research claims that most young people in Scotland are resilient to the risks. For those who aren’t, some grow out of adolescent crime with limited intervention; whilst issues for others persist into adulthood (Whyte 2003)\(^{22}\).

Whyte (2003) explains that **programmes aimed at preventing or reducing crime are more likely to succeed as part of a wider programme which includes dealing with issues at school, in the family and substance misuse.** By contrast an evaluation by the Scottish Government (Ahmad 2010)\(^{23}\) of the Scottish Football Association’s Schools of Football which was funded by CashBack for Communities, questioned whether young people affected by violence or anti-social behaviour were involved and if the activities provided could therefore ‘divert’ young people from risk. It warns that **simply situating activities in areas of deprivation is not a guarantee that young people at risk will come forward.** Although not an exhaustive list, the following can be interpreted from literature regarding some of the wrongly held assumptions about diversionary youth work:

- Assuming that all young people are exposed to similar risks (e.g. because they live in an area of deprivation), without assessing their needs.
- Assuming that all young people’s resilience to risk is low, without assessing their resilience.

---


Claiming that activities in areas of multiple-deprivation target young people at risk, without using tools to assess or understand shared problems in the area.

Overlooking harm which may be caused by involving young people who are not directly affected by the issues in issue-based work.

Assuming that providing activities will also address young people’s social and emotional needs, without planning a balance of different types of interventions.

A tendency to over-state the numbers of young people worked with, over a short-term, yet claiming the interventions dealt with complex issues that cannot be solved quickly.

Not including clear measures and indicators at the outset and failing to gather evidence of progress.

To avoid such dangers Bamber (2000)\textsuperscript{24} emphasises \textbf{the need for a ‘ladder of opportunity’ in recognition that young people with more demanding needs require more intensive interventions}. More intensive youth work should be facilitated by highly skilled professionals, including non-youth work disciplines, with sound knowledge of policy theory and practice. Consequently small group work more effectively enables the ongoing assessment of young people’s needs. It allows young people to reflect on aspects of themselves and their connection with wider society. Hence, whether diversionary programmes adopt an open or targeted approach \textbf{it is intrinsic to good youth work practice to continuously assess young people’s needs and review progress} (see links to standards)\textsuperscript{25}. Logically \textbf{funding should also seek to invest in youth activities with clear needs/risk assessment, progressive opportunities appropriate to needs and relevant monitoring and evaluation of progress}. Whyte (2003) summarised success factors for interventions with young offenders as those that are:

\begin{itemize}
\item Implemented in a way that is \textbf{appropriate for the participant} using techniques that are known to work and which require participants to \textbf{spend a reasonable length of time in the programme} considering the changes desired (sufficiency).
\item Designed, delivered and evaluated by \textbf{knowledgeable skilled individuals}, appropriately educated and experienced.
\item Give the \textbf{most intensive programmes to those at the highest risk} of re-offending.
\item Use methods \textbf{based on theoretical models} such as social learning or cognitive behavioural theories of change.
\item Emphasise \textbf{positive reinforcement}.
\item Provide \textbf{contingencies for positive social behaviour}.
\item Are \textbf{individualised} as much as possible.
\end{itemize}


Though these reinforce the previously defined purpose of youth work, they also advocate higher intensity, higher professional skills and greater attention to individual needs among young people facing higher risks. For the purpose of this evaluation the so-called ‘Diversionary Youth Work: Intervention Intensity Grid’ was developed to more easily determine where diversionary interventions fit in relation to the types of intervention according to good practice recommendations [see figure 3].

The diagram is not rigid but flows from one youth work approach to the other as each situation requires. For example open youth work may start with larger groups and filter those identified as being vulnerable to risk towards higher intensity interventions. Likewise those entering a youth work programme because of risks they face may start with higher intensity targeted youth work interventions and directed young people towards lower intensity open youth work interventions as their circumstances improve. The authors accept that there will be exceptions to the rule, however the grid is used to clarify when and where exceptions occur.

Learning from literature, diversionary youth work is more likely to succeed if plans are consciously made to adopt either an open approach, reaching high numbers of young people, with relatively low intensity interventions; or a targeted youth work approach where youth work interventions are required to increase the intensity of interventions with lower numbers of young people. Evaluation methods are therefore designed to use the grid as a framework for assessing and understanding the findings.
4. The evaluation methods

The following section describes the purpose of the evaluation and its particular challenges. It also provides a detailed breakdown of the methods and what was actually achieved.

4.1 The purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact CashBack for Communities has had on youth sector organisations receiving funds, the young people benefiting and their communities. The evaluation primarily reviewed:

- The distribution and administration of funds
- The extent the funding principles were met.
- The benefits of the funding
- Whether the youth work and anti-violence fund can be improved to make a greater impact in future.

In addition attempts were made to identify good practice in both open and targeted types of diversionary youth work and better understand the impact they make to diverting young people from risk.

Data held by YouthLink Scotland was used to assess the overall fund distribution. Calculations such as average per capita investment build a clearer picture of the actual investment made in diversionary work. Surveys were distributed to fund recipients to gather data on areas covered, priorities addressed and numbers taking part. Surveys included open questions to gain a fuller understanding of what actually happened as a result of the funding and the outcomes achieved. Questions were also included regarding fund-recipients’ knowledge of various aspects of the administration of the funding process and levels of satisfaction with their experience of it.

Through five area case studies, interviews were conducted with staff from 10 fund recipients to explore in more depth the benefits and the outcomes achieved at a local level. Questions sought to identify examples of what helps and hinders successful interventions for both open and targeted approaches. In addition interviews were held with panel members in the five local authority case study areas to review the effectiveness of their devolved local decision-making responsibilities. Case study areas were selected as typical examples of the range of local authority areas in Scotland (large/small, urban/rural) and making sure those with high proportions of high crime areas were included. Within each area, extreme examples of high and low levels of award were chosen for interview. However in two areas, one case was substituted with a recipient of the anti-violence fund so that examples of these were included. Focus groups were held with YouthLink Scotland staff responsible for implementing the CashBack for Communities youth sector funds to investigate how the funds were administered and managed across 32 local authority areas. Interviews also tested out reactions to interim findings and the feasibility of emerging recommendations. Two representatives from the Scottish Government, Community Safety Unit were interviewed to better understand how the youth sector funds fit with the wider CashBack for Communities scheme and to anticipate its future direction.
4.2 Evaluation challenges

Each type of diversionary youth work (open and targeted) requires slightly different approaches to evaluation. For example, providers of open youth work programmes are likely to attract large numbers to take part in their activities. Therefore the evaluation might explore whether or not the funding helped increase the number of young people involved. Equally youth organisations adopting open types of diversionary youth work might regard low per capita expenditure as a measure of success.

By contrast, providers of targeted interventions are required to invest more heavily in addressing individual needs, often calling upon intense inputs from specialists, to adequately assess and tackle multiple issues. Consequently the extent of progressive change in the behaviour of young people identified as being at risk is more relevant to measure than the number of young people taking part. Therefore a high level of per capita investment is more likely.

The survey findings have limited reliability as the information provided by organisations is not checked for accuracy. With 213 responses confidence limits can be set at 5% making them reasonably precise, however generalisations are not made to avoid unfounded assumptions about awards made and how they were used. Indications from the data are that awards are highly individualised and variable in size and nature.

Area case studies are intended to enrich understanding of the impact of the funding within communities. They serve an illustrative purpose. They help to identify the types of youth work interventions and the types of impact they make. It presents the benefits of CashBack for Communities, from the perspective of the interviewees. Connections and comparisons can also be made between the roles of local panels, how much they distributed and what this achieved within communities. No comments or judgments are made however on whether these exemplify good practice. Focus groups with YouthLink Scotland and interviews with Government representatives are not presented in any detail in the report as they acted more as a two-way learning process between the evaluators giving independent feedback and testing out feasible responses. The conclusions and recommendations therefore seek to summarise observations from all of the findings and cases studies.
## 4.3 Breakdown of Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>By...</th>
<th>Targets/Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Desk-based review of funding applications and awards data | Review of documents:  
- Documents and monitoring reports  
- Databases  
- Financial reports  
- Relevant Government policy/funding principles and guidelines  
- Relevant YouthLink Scotland documents | • Process, categorise, query and search funding data and convert into relevant charts, tables and analyse the results.  
• Access to the YouthLink databases on grant awards (and rejections). |
| Conduct 5 area based case-studies | Exploring examples of practice in both open and targeted diversionary youth work to:  
- Identify success criteria – what worked and why for each type of youth work approach  
- Evidence the benefits of a youth work approach to diversionary work and its impact  
- Consider the role and views of local panels for each area and the future developments required. | • 5 area case studies using 10 interviews with different fund recipients (examples of open and targeted diversionary youth work)  
• Arranging a balance of locations to get Scotland wide coverage, including identified crime hot-spots, and different amounts of funding awarded (small and large grants; youth work fund and anti-violence). |
| Funding feedback | To assess what organisations expected and what their experience was of the funding process; and comparing them. | All projects funded in round 4. Response rate 220 (55% of youth work fund recipients and 50% of anti-violence fund recipients) |
| Interviews with YouthLink and Government CashBack team and local panels | Identifying ways to improve the overall administration  
- How applications were assessed and awarded  
- How funding was administered and monitored  
- The effectiveness of the BAT system  
- The recording and accessibility of data  
- Lessons and recommendations for the future | CashBack team including:  
- YouthLink Scotland support team  
- CashBack delivery team (Scottish Government)  
- The on-line review group (led by YouthLink Scotland)  
- CashBack Local Panels (Edinburgh, Highland, Glasgow, Dumfries & Galloway and Perth & Kinross) |
5. The Findings and Analysis
This section begins with an overview of how CashBack for the youth sector was distributed by YouthLink Scotland for both the youth work fund and anti-violence fund. Uses of funding are then explored more closely according to good practice guidelines and analysed according to what can be built on and improved in future. The contribution made to CashBack for Communities’ priorities is discussed particularly in relation to areas of high crime. The administration of funds is reviewed and finally the case studies provide detailed illustrations of the impact funding has made in five areas.

5.1 Overview of Fund Distribution
The following table gives an overview of data on actual awards made compared to the data provided by survey respondents for both the youth sector and the anti-violence funds [see figures 4 and 5].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Work Fund - Awards Data</th>
<th>Youth Work Fund - Survey Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>469 awards were made in total.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were 368 applicants (showing that many organisations received more than one award).</td>
<td>201 successful applicants to the youth sector fund responded to the survey (55% of total number of successful applicants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total £2,719,051 of awards were committed.</td>
<td>Respondents account for £1,032,276 of awards committed (38% of the total).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on respondent averages an estimated additional £2,830,288 was match-funded by fund recipients.</td>
<td>Respondents also raised £1,169,023 of matched funding, an average of £7,691 per organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average youth work fund award was £5,798 (Lowest £255: Highest £29,120).</td>
<td>The average youth work fund award made to respondents was £6,857 (Lowest £377, Highest £29,714, Range: £29,337).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The anticipated number of beneficiaries was 95,843 (51,820 male and 44,029 female) however this is skewed by a few organisations.</td>
<td>In total respondents reported 23,300 young people have benefited (13,982 males and 9,318 females). An estimated total of 56,304.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of anticipated beneficiaries per organisation was on average 205 however the median was only 75.</td>
<td>On average 153 young people per organisation benefited however the median was 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on respondent averages, the estimated total investment in young people as a result of the youth work fund is £5.5 million.</td>
<td>The actual amount invested in each young person is £50.17 (which increases to £95.33 when matched funding is taken into account).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477 applications were unsuccessful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 24 successful applicants (there was one award per organisation, though many organisations were also successful via the youth work fund) and 12 successful applicants responded to the survey (50%).

In total £500,000 of awards were committed. Respondents account for £201,931 of awards committed (40% of the total).

Based on respondent averages, an estimated additional £1,136,280 was match-funded by fund recipients. Respondents also raised £284,073 of matched funding, an average of £35,509 per organisation.

The average award made to organisations was £20,833 (Lowest £7,198, Highest £36,421, Range: £29,223). The average award made to respondent organisations was £25,241 (Lowest £13,724: Highest £36,421, Range: £22,697).

The anticipated number of beneficiaries was 31,747 (17,761 male and 14,531 female) however this is skewed by a few organisations as shown by the median figure below.

In total respondents reported 2,851 young people have benefited (1,705: 60% males and 1,146: 40% females). An estimated total of 5,112.

The number of anticipated beneficiaries per organisation was on average 1,323 however the median was 256.

On average 213 young people actually benefited per respondent organisation, however the median was 136.

Based on respondent averages, the estimated total investment in young people as a result of the anti-violence fund is £1.6 million. The actual amount invested in each young person is £70.83 (which increases to £170.47 when matched funding is taken into account).

During 2010 to 2012 YouthLink Scotland has distributed more than three million pounds to almost 400 youth sector organisations across Scotland. Based on response averages for each group of fund recipients, it is estimated that during this time around 60,000 young people benefited from CashBack for the youth sector with a relatively higher proportion of males than females taking part. Once matched funding is included, the estimated level of total investment stands at seven million pounds. Although it is an estimate and the full amount for all recipients is unknown, for survey respondents CashBack for Communities appears to be matched pound for pound when invested in the youth work sector.

Stark differences are naturally revealed in levels of awards between the youth sector fund and the anti-violence fund, with the latter giving larger awards to fewer organisations [see figures 6 and 7]. Almost all (95%) awards made by the youth work fund are for less than £15,000; whereas three quarters (75%) of awards made by the anti-violence fund are for more than £15,000. This highlights that the anti-violence fund makes a higher level investment into projects dedicated to addressing the perception or experience of violence in Scotland among young...
people [see appendix 2]. This should also allow for a higher per capita investment and lends itself to projects adopting a ‘targeted’ type of diversionary youth work with smaller numbers. By contrast the vast numbers of small level grants in the youth work fund promotes low per capita investment and more ‘open’ types of diversionary youth work [see appendix 1]. Contrary to expectations figures 4 and 5 show that some organisations are vastly overestimating the numbers they will attract when they make the application. There is therefore a great difference between the numbers anticipated and those actually reached. Contrary to expectations of targeted approaches, both the average and median in the anti-violence fund is higher than the youth work fund.

Figure 6: Breakdown of awards made to youth fund recipients

Figure 7: Breakdown of awards made to anti-violence fund recipients
As required by the funding criteria, organisations are predominantly working with 10-19 year olds. Nevertheless a significant proportion of organisations are also working with younger and older age-groups [see figures 8 & 9]:

**Figure 8: Proportion of Organisations providing benefit to each age-group via Youth Work Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9: Proportion of organisations providing benefit to each age-group via Anti-violence funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently there is a need to promote more realistic estimation of numbers based on principles of open and targeted approaches. There may also be a need to expand the age groups covered. Potential arises to assess and make awards based on per-capita investments.
5.2 Uses of Funding

The majority of organisations used the funding to fund new rather than existing programmes, activities or posts, though this was more acute in the anti-violence fund [see figure 10].

Figure 10: Proportion of new or existing activities funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Youth Work Fund</th>
<th>Anti-Violence Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing programme/activity/post</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New programme/activity/post</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The youth work funds were used in ways which predominantly reflect open types of diversionary youth work. Nevertheless some targeted examples were found. Activities that attract and maintain involvement of young people in positive activities are a strong focus in this fund. Sufficient evidence reveals an open approach is being adopted to reduce and prevent risks relating to violence and anti-social behaviour. Survey respondents provided examples of work as described below, which is categorised as open or targeted types of youth work [see figure 11]:

Figure 11: Examples of good diversionary youth work practice in the Youth Work Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Open Youth Work</th>
<th>Examples of Targeted Youth Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Youth-led drop-in on Friday evenings</td>
<td>• A specialist arts worker to engage with harder to reach young people who were involved in anti-social behaviour, or categorised as MCMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Land Rover Club where young people renovate the vehicle, make it road worthy and sell it.</td>
<td>• 3 evening groups and 1-1 sessions for young people involved with social work that have been, or are at risk of being permanently excluded from mainstream secondary school. The evening groups programme includes focused group work, cooking, arts, sport and 1-1 work by trained youth workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue based sessions around alcohol, sex education, drugs, bullying and peer pressure.</td>
<td>• Youth workers out doing street work, identifying young people drinking or hanging about the streets, speaking to them and enabling them to know what was on offer for them – linked to a drop-in running at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A youth café which offers important alternatives to alcohol and drugs for 50 young people attending regularly</td>
<td>• Training and support programme for youths on how to deal with an emergency situation in particular relating to incidents involving drugs and alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A 12 week project designed to increase levels of reading but also tolerance, empathy and greater understanding of each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two fifths of organisations responding to the survey used the youth work fund for ‘group work’ or ‘skills development’ (respondents could select up to 5 options) [see figure 12]. Given comparable investments are being made directly to other CashBack for Communities fund-holders for sports and creative activities, it is interesting that such a high proportion of youth organisations used the funding for these. Consequently opportunities exist for fund-holders to work more closely together to maximise outcomes. Details for taking this forward would however require further exploration outwith the realms of this evaluation.

Figure 12: Main uses of the Youth Work Fund
Other points to highlight are listed as ‘strengths to build on’ and ‘areas for improvement’ [see figure 13]:

Figure 13: Strengths to build on and areas for improving the use of funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths to build on</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A quarter of organisations invested in a learning programme</td>
<td>• A lack of evidence of needs assessment, local research or risk assessment as recommended in good practice guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A large proportion of organisations invested in sessional and part-time staffing</td>
<td>• Limited use of outreach or detached youth work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Almost a fifth of organisations invested in issue-based work</td>
<td>• Low investment in full-time staffing which would be important if those at risk are to be assessed and directed into higher intensity interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Around a sixth of organisations invested in peer-education (where young people are trained and supported to work with other young people)</td>
<td>• Need for better links between different CashBack for Communities strands and more strategic partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Around a sixth or organisations invested in working in partnership with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With so few fund recipients and respondents, the analysis of the anti-violence fund is less reliable. Nevertheless results show that it is invested rather differently from the youth work fund with half of respondents claiming the funds were invested in ‘a sessional budget’. More than a third of respondents invested in detached work, a learning programme or issue-based work. Hence the anti-violence fund appears to promote a more targeted approach to diversionary work [see figure 14]:

Figure 14: Main uses of the Anti-violence Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the Anti-violence Fund was mainly used for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A sessional budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue-based work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sessional youth worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A part-time youth worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anti-violence fund recipients could choose from the same range of options as in the youth work fund survey [as previously in figure 12]. However options with one or no responses were not included to protect anonymity. Nevertheless respondents to the Anti-violence Fund survey gave detailed examples of ways the funds were invested. For example:

“*We delivered the LEAP confronting conflict workshops and delivered a number of diversionary activities including boxing classes and football, and linked young people into the local colleges and Youthbuild.*” (Anti-violence Fund Recipient)

“*Young people worked to produce a film and associated discussion pack around issues of gangs and knife crime. The young people looked at their own attitudes as part of the work and they gained new skills in film making, acting and film editing.*” (Anti-violence Fund Recipient)

“*The funding was used to build a Street in a disused warehouse. We used this set to create issue based scenes that would provoke a reaction from the targeted young people that we brought to the unit to witness life on our Street. The scenes tackled many topics including knife crime, domestic violence, bullying and intimidation, vandalism, rape, sexual health, alcohol & drug misuse, cyber bullying and personal safety. The Street experience took 20 minutes and was followed by an hour and half long workshop facilitated by top quality youth workers who then explored how the scenes made the young people feel and recognise the consequences of the individuals actions within the scenes. The point of the workshops is consequential learning and for participants to offer suggestions as to how at crucial decision points the outcomes could have been different.*” (Anti-violence Fund Recipient)

Distinct differences emerge between the anti-violence fund and youth work fund. The youth work fund has strengths associated with varied projects using a mixture of learning activities, issue-based work and working in partnership with others. In future it would however benefit from increasing its use of needs/risk assessment, outreach and detached work and making better connections with other CashBack for Communities strands. Activities within the anti-violence fund are more closely coupled with more intense youth work interventions that also cause young people to consider their emotional as well as social well being. Most examples in the anti-violence fund therefore lean towards a targeted approach. The few examples with extremely high numbers require further investigation into the appropriateness of interventions and the extent anti-violence outcomes were achieved.

5.3 Contribution to CashBack for Communities’ Priorities

A key purpose of the evaluation is to understand the extent CashBack funding priorities are met. The results for both the youth work fund and anti-violence fund are combined to assess the overall level of priority given by fund recipients to the national priorities. The priorities relating to violence and/or antisocial behaviour and drugs and alcohol problems were broken down into separate categories of ‘identifying the risks’ and ‘addressing them’ to avoid making an assumption that both automatically go together [see figure 15]:
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Figure 15: Priorities given by fund recipients to national priorities for CashBack for Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Level of Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing inequalities</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing resources in a high crime area</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing an identified gap in provision</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling a problem specific to young people in the local area</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying young people that may be at risk of getting involved in violence and/or anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying young people that may be at risk of having problems with alcohol and/or drugs</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting young people with a record of involvement in violence and/or anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting young people to address identified problems they have with alcohol and/or drugs</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the priorities have a rating above the mid-way point of 2.5 and are important to the majority of fund-recipients. The highest priority was given to ‘addressing an identified gap in provision’. Many respondents portray sentiments of fighting for survival (YouthLink Scotland 2010)

"The youth activities would not have taken place during this period as core funding for youth work from the local authority does not cover holiday periods." (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

"The project had faced dwindling numbers and pressures on our youth work budget meant that we could no longer sustain the project. We felt that we needed to give it one more shot as some very vulnerable young people were attending and we wanted to continue to offer them the opportunity to participate in youth work activities. The funding enabled us to continue to pay for 2 sessional staff to run the

project, it enabled us to buy additional equipment to offer more varied tuition to young people, it freed up the CLD workers time to invest in the youth volunteers making the project more sustainable in the longer term, and allowed us to focus on making the project a success. Our very healthy and growing membership is a result of this funding.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

“[Without CashBack funding] the groups and 1-1 work would not take place. [The] Council is currently able to fund the workers but there is no available resource to fund evening work.” (Anti-violence Fund Recipient)

Despite CashBack for Communities not being intended as a substitute for mainstream funding, it appears to be taking up position as an inevitable lifeline during exceptional times. Significantly ‘addressing an identified gap in provision’ was rated higher than the Government’s key priority of ‘focusing resources in areas of high crime’. To investigate this further, the data was analysed by comparing the different responses for this specific priority. The comparison groups are identified by their responses to the question as follows: high priority – 55 respondents; medium priority – 47 respondents, low priority 32 respondents and not applicable – 24 respondents (158 in total).

Findings reveal that those giving a high priority to ‘focusing resources in a high crime area’ are significantly more likely to also give a high priority to ‘identifying young people that may be at risk of getting involved in violence and/or anti-social behaviour’ (87% of high priority respondents compared to 62% of medium priority respondents, 34% of low priority respondents and 25% of respondents rating this priority as ‘not applicable’). Likewise they are significantly more likely to also give a high priority to ‘identifying young people that may be at risk of having problems with alcohol and/or drugs’ (64% compared to 51% of medium priority respondents, 16% of low priority respondents and 17% of respondents rating this priority as ‘not applicable’). More than half (55%) are also more likely to rate ‘supporting young people with a record of involvement in violence and/or anti-social behaviour’ as a ‘high priority’ compared to only 13% of medium priority respondents, 16% of low priority respondents and 17% of respondents rating this priority as ‘not applicable’. Two-fifths (40%) also rate ‘supporting young people to address identified problems they have with alcohol and/or drugs’ as a high priority, compared to 15% of medium priority respondents, 6% of low priority respondents and 13% of respondents selecting ‘not applicable’.

Those giving a high priority to ‘focusing resources in a high crime area’ were less likely than other fund recipients to rate ‘addressing an identified gap in provision’ as a high priority (69% compared to 70% of medium priority respondents, 75% of low priority respondents and 83% of not applicable respondents). By contrast a proportion of fund-recipients applying for funds to address an identified gap in provision acknowledge they are not dealing with violence or anti-social behaviour. This however only applies to a small minority of fund recipients.
Thus evidence makes clear that focusing resources on a high crime area pre-determines whether other anti-violence and anti-social behavioural factors will also be made a high priority by youth work providers receiving CashBack funding. There is an important inter-relationship between high crime areas, violence, anti-social behaviour and alcohol and drugs problems which is aligned with good practice recommendations for diversionary interventions.

For YouthLink Scotland as fund-holders it may be feasible to weight the priorities to favour applications that combine multiple priorities. To retain a strong focus on national priorities, it may be prudent to make applications ineligible if they are solely intended to address identified gaps in provision. Alternatively a counter-argument may be to relax national priorities so that CashBack for Communities can legitimately be used to fill gaps in services and positively support more holistic youth work interventions.

5.4 Administration of Funding

Successful applicants responding to the youth work fund and anti-violence fund surveys were asked to comment firstly on how familiar they were with the different stages of the CashBack for Communities youth sector funding process. They were then asked to rate their levels of satisfaction with their experience of the process. The responses to both questions are shown below [see figure 16]:

The youth work sector is largely very familiar with the funding process and satisfied with their experience of it. The application form, the clarity of funding priorities and the ability to get information is perceived most positively by respondents regarding both how familiar they are, and how satisfied they are with their experience. Respondents expressed their appreciation for the overall simplicity of the process and its relevance to the youth work sector. Respondents also welcomed the roadshows and information sessions which YouthLink Scotland ran to raise
awareness of the fund and to support organisations to apply. Additional comments suggest that many within the youth work sector believe that for round four in particular, the process has improved, as expressed by this respondent:

“The process is better now, not so complicated ... that’s the main reason I applied for a modest amount.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

Furthermore there is especially high praise of support YouthLink Scotland has provided to organisations when they have asked for assistance.

Nevertheless there are some areas requiring further development. Not all recipients of the fund are fully aware that applications are assessed by a local panel. This leads to diverging views. Most respondents support the role of panels, believing they have local knowledge which makes their decision-making more relevant. For example:

“The local panel and their knowledge are clearly a positive factor in informed decision making and helped our case.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

“Keeping application assessments to local panels ensures funds are directed where they are needed most which will complement other activities.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

However some concerns were raised regarding panels’ openness and transparency, as these comments revealed:

“More clarity needed on what control local panels have - this needs to be transparent.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

“There is a very strong and growing perception of familiar networks being given preferential treatment irrespective of the quality of bids.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

There are no requests to diminish the role of panels. Nevertheless suggestions were made for tackling concerns, as described by these respondents:

“There needs to be more involvement from the voluntary sector on panels - the representation from local authorities is too heavy. A balance would be more acceptable.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

“I think that the local panel should be changed regularly to ensure applications are assessed on merit and not past reputation.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

Calls came for clearer guidance and examples of what will be funded, such as:
“Less ambiguity between funding criteria and priorities [is required]. Both should match but they don’t appear to at present. [W need] clearer guidance on what can be funded and what will not be supported.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

Clarifying eligibility and criteria might also diffuse questions over certain awards which were made that don’t fit with the guidelines. Without mentioning specific examples, the debate over whether awards should have been made or whether the criteria can be improved has ultimately to be resolved.

More than half of respondents are unaware of the involvement of young people in decision-making and believe the current system requires improvement to avoid becoming tokenistic. Suggestions included:

“Young People need to be more involved in the application, possibly through an interview process.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

“The young people involved in the assessment need to be 100% sure of what they are assessing and provided with the opportunity to speak up about what they do not agree with.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

This is consistent with case study observations. As revealed in the next section, many of the panels interviewed neglected to involve young people or acknowledged that any involvement was tokenistic and not well supported. One panel member explained why:

“We’ve had a variety of young people on our panel and over the past couple of years we have a youth convener who came through our youth participation process i.e. youth forums and SYP. They are on a bursary to work full time to represent the views of young people and voting rights on a number of committees and consult with a lot of young people across [this area]. As part of their role they sit on the CashBack panel and act as an assessor. We would look to involve other young people. However one of the challenges we face regarding involving young people is that meetings are always held during the day.” (Panel Member)

The most frequent plea was to extend the duration of project funding, as in these examples:

“It would be very helpful if funding could be available over a longer period and if there were no barriers to continued funding for projects that could demonstrate success and for which need still exists.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

“It’s very important to have sustainability in sharing the journey with young people from dependency to their independence. Only over a period of time can this happen
and not within one year. It takes time, hard work and a skilled workforce to enable and support change." (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

Interesting ideas were put forward for lengthening the duration of funding, with the following being representative:

“Look at the money given so far and identify projects that are having the greatest effect within their communities/target audiences and ring fence funding for a 3 year period to allow them to develop and grow further. Year on year funding is good when a project is starting off but a 3 year commitment allows better planning and organising… How about inviting all major projects that have made a significant difference in their communities to apply for a three year funding allocation. Projects would need to prepare a presentation providing evidence of their achievements so far and would be given the chance to showcase their project to a panel of judges. It could be part of an award ceremony with the winning project receiving 3 years funding.” (Youth Work Fund Recipient)

Case studies also uncovered ways other CashBack initiatives, not managed by YouthLink Scotland, create difficulties at a local level. Mostly this relates to the lack of connection to local grassroots organisations, for example:

“Some of the funding given to National Organisations doesn’t make a lot of sense, especially here. People like the SFA and those delivering Twilight Basketball have no devolved infrastructure to deliver locally and have little understanding of local priorities.” (Panel Member)

Some [sporting organisations] bid to work across Scotland, but to do that they come to us and ask for our resources and advice on how to do it. (Panel Member)

There is a level of frustration among panel members that CashBack schemes are not coordinated with built in requirements to work in partnership with local youth work providers. There is a belief that this would improve the standard of youth work interventions and increase the effectiveness and sustainability of the overall CashBack for Communities scheme.

Generally feedback indicates that YouthLink Scotland is distributing what has become an invaluable source of income to a significant number within the youth work sector. Youth work approaches are especially relevant to fulfilling the purpose of the funding. The administration of the process across the 32 local authorities adds a democratic dimension which is largely appreciated but, as with all devolved responsibilities, it requires more ‘supervision’ and scrutiny from YouthLink Scotland to ensure the highest standards of openness and transparency are upheld. This is particularly important in maintaining the reputations of the fund; the youth work sector and YouthLink Scotland.
5.5 Case Studies

The following case studies are presented with feedback from the local panel responsible for assessing grant applications and an overview of two funded organisations in each area. For panels, each case looks at the make-up of the panel, the qualities required by panel members, what helps and hinders panels and what they would like to improve. Examples of larger and smaller fund recipients in each area enable a deeper understanding of what organisations did with the funds and the way they did it. It also highlights the impact according to those interviewed. Information is included to indicate the type of youth work approach adopted, the number of young people benefiting and the per-capita investment. Cases also present future developments that those fund-recipients would like to see for the CashBack scheme [see figures 17 to 21].

Figure 17: Case study for the area of Perth & Kinross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1: Perth &amp; Kinross – Total youth work fund distributed £79,927</th>
<th>Total anti-violence fund allocated £0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 1, Perth &amp; Kinross Assessment Panel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which organisations do the panel members represent?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voluntary Action Perthshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Safety Partnership, P&amp;K Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth Services Manager, P&amp;K Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chair of local YMCA or rep from local churches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tayside Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the qualities needed by panel members?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a broad understanding of the strategic links that are in place locally such as the Community Planning process and the Community Safety Partnership in particular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understanding of voluntary organisations history, background and their capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a good general idea of youth issues in the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What helps panels?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What hinders panels?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• buy in from others</td>
<td>• the process highlighted that people weren’t very good at filling in the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wasn’t just the council dictating how the money was allocated</td>
<td>• Under spend - you’re rushed to get the money out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the panel discussions were really useful as it allowed for an analysis of the application and based on people’s knowledge and experience</td>
<td>• Inconsistency in how the priorities and criteria are interpreted and this leads to anomalies in how funding is granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the BAT tool gives a good start point for panel discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would panel members like to improve?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Get feedback from YouthLink on the awards made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Get a general idea of the impact the funding has made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carry under spend over to the following year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permit relevant core costs in the criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1, Example 1: Perth &amp; Kinross Council Youth Services</td>
<td>CashBack Award: £1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong>: Perth &amp; Kinross Youth Services offer a universal provision to young people aged 12 to 25 across Perth and Kinross. The focus of the provision includes promoting social inclusion, providing opportunities for personal and social development. Youth Services work to a team plan to ensure local and national priorities are met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About the project</strong>: To run a youth programme for 11-14 year olds in Pitlochry for one night each month, where no other youth services previously existed. (Oct 2011 to March 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of approach</strong>: Open</td>
<td><strong>Numbers</strong>: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What funds were used for</strong>: Hall rental and a specialist musical instrument arts worker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The way they did it</strong>: Providing a safe, warm place in the winter where young people could meet friends and take part in activities. An arts worker was appointed to run arts workshops following requests from young people taking part. Older members worked as volunteer leaders. Links were made with local Coop who invested £30 per month for healthy snacks in the tuck shop. This was managed by the young leaders. Local police regularly attend out of uniform to build local relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The impact**:  
- Meeting unmet need in a rural area  
- Developing young leaders, backed by DofE and youth achievement awards  |
| **Unique benefits and challenges**:  
- Stronger connections with local business and police.  
- Project led by Youth Work Degree OU student.  
- Challenge of finding and funding suitable premises in rural areas. |
| **Future developments**:  
- A need to sustain and expand this type of work in future.  
- Recognition of investment required for suitable premises in rural areas. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1, Example 2: Logos Centre Ltd</th>
<th>CashBack Award: £13,580 (Youth Work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong>: Over arching aim is to help young people become better citizens / contributors to society, based on Christian beliefs. One fulltime youth worker runs the project and is the main DofE provider in Crieff. Logos was established 10 years ago and is based in the High Street of Crieff’s town centre. In the town there is very little for young people to do and we are the main source of youth provision in the town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **About the project**:  
The centre is open 9.30pm 6 days a week offering a lunch-time drop-in, homework club, DofE programme, day trips etc. |
| **Type of approach**: Open | **Numbers**: 355  
(195 Males and 160 Females) | **Per capita investment**: £38.25 |
| **What the funds were used for**: DofE equipment (tents, compasses and maps), funding travel cost of outings and events, printer and a contribution to full-time youth worker salary. |
The way they did it:
The project put 16 members through their Bronze DofE award and 14 through their silver award. It included a practice 3 day outing leading to a 3-day expedition. Logos also organised a trip to Dundee rep including a workshop, a trip to M&D theme park and purchase of a printer for DofE materials. 50% of income is self-generated through bag packing, public shows and car washes.

The impact:
- Meeting unmet need in a rural area
- A proportion of members achieving DofE awards

Unique benefits and challenges:
- Getting young people involved in a number of fundraising activities and raising £5000
- Logos forum meet monthly to review activities
- Contribute to Strathearn Youth Forum

Future developments:
- Give priority to sustain demonstrated good practice.
- Greater cognisance of rural dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 2: Glasgow City – Total youth work fund distributed £295,504</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total anti-violence fund allocated £126,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case 2: Glasgow City Assessment Panel

Which organisations do the panel members represent?
- Democratic Services, GCC
- Glasgow Community Safety Services (arms-length from GCC)
- Dumbarton Road Corridor (Voluntary Sector)
- Temple Shafton Youth Project (Voluntary Sector)
- Glasgow Life (arms-length from GCC)
- 1 x Young Person

What are the qualities needed by panel members?
- Time (more than current members feel able to give)
- Knowledge and experience of Glasgow’s strategic context
- Good understanding of youth work practice

What helps panels?
- BAT is relatively easy to use and learn

What hinders panels?
- The volume of applications
- Inconsistency between assessment tool and application form terminology
- Lack of understanding of Glasgow context

What would panel members like to improve?
- Projects / programmes that demonstrated active progression and development in what they are providing should be looked on favourably
- Funding criteria and priorities should be clearer to ensure the money is going to diversionary youth work and organisations that work in real partnership
- Permit relevant core costs in the criteria, but proportionately
- Keep assessors independent from the panel
- Have three panels in Glasgow in alignment with community planning boundaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 2, Example 1: Southside Youth Work Support Agency</th>
<th>CashBack Award: £29,120 (Youth Work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General:</strong> An organisation established to look at how youth work training and resources for front line staff could be supported in Govanhill, Pollockshields, Toryglen, and Gorbals. It does not directly deliver youth provision, but commissions it for others.</td>
<td><strong>About the project:</strong> To deliver a programme of events and workshops (Nov 2011 to May 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of approach:</strong> N/A- Supporting staff</td>
<td><strong>What funds were used for:</strong> Purchase of equipment (pool table, cooker, cookware, play stations &amp; games, T.V’s medals and trophies), commissioning specialists (DJ sessions, Urban Arts sessions, Dance sessions, and Relaxation workshop), providing training courses to youth workers/volunteers and a trip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numbers:</strong> 390 (289 Males and 101 Females)</td>
<td><strong>The way they did it:</strong> Training was provided to Glasgow Life's front-line youth workers and volunteers in: Level 3 Expedition Leaders Course; Elementary Food Hygiene; Level 1 &amp; 2 Youth Pathway Certificate (Football Coaching). The programme provided a range of physical and interest-based activities aimed at developing young people’s skills and commitment to participate in long-term activities. The activities were delivered in four centres where young people chose from a variety of activities. The project culminated in a trip to Blackpool Pleasure Beach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Per capita investment:** £74.67 | **The impact:**  
- Raising the quality of youth work provision through specialist inputs.  
- Improving the range and standard of equipment available.  
- Improving the skills of youth workers and volunteers. |
| **Future developments:** |  
- More case studies being available to guide new organisations in the process |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 2, Example 2: Scottish Marriage Care Glasgow</th>
<th>CashBack Award: £28,218 (Anti-violence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General:</strong> A national organisation providing relationship counselling. Work is evolving to adopt an early intervention approach including work with young people.</td>
<td><strong>About the project:</strong> Delivery of REACT Tackling violence project. Providing counselling to groups and school classes to deal with the core causes of problem behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of approach:</strong> Targeted</td>
<td><strong>What the funds were used for:</strong> Development Youth Worker &amp; Project Co-ordinator, staff pensions &amp; costs, travel, catering, evaluations costs, mobile phones, recruitment, marketing, admin, line management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numbers:</strong> 209</td>
<td><strong>Per capita investment:</strong> £135.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The way they did it:**
Our model is based on early intervention dealing with the core causes of problem behaviour over 6 weeks. We work in primary and secondary schools across the East Area of Glasgow. In secondary schools we work closely with Guidance and Pastoral care staff and young people are referred by the schools. In secondary schools we work with groups of 6 to 8 or the whole class in primary. We also used trained peer educators to carry out a consultation exercise to identify needs of young people. We were responding to rising requests from CIRV (an anti-violence programme in Glasgow) for anger management support and research suggesting 10% of Glasgow’s school population would benefit from therapeutic intervention.

**The impact:**
- Developed the capacity of the organisation, expanding from one person to a small delivery team for REACT.
- Improved young people’s confidence in talking about different relationships.
- Increased empathy of consequences of actions.

**Unique benefits and challenges:**
- Sought to identify needs and research.
- Early intervention focus.
- Follow-up requests received

**Future developments:**
- More sustainable funding needed
- Better recognition of early intervention approach

---

**Figure 19: Case study for the area of Dumfries & Galloway**

**Case 3: Dumfries & Galloway – Total youth work fund distributed £100,329**  
**Total anti-violence fund allocated £0**

**Which organisations do the panel members represent?**
- Youth Issues Worker, DGC
- The Hollywood Trust (Voluntary Sector)
- Various sports and community groups (Voluntary Sector)
- Dumfries and Galloway Police
- 1x Young Person from the local Youth Bank Board

**What are the qualities needed by panel members?**
- Local knowledge of the youth sector

**What helps panels?**
- A pool of members to ensure diversity and that integrity is upheld
- All panel members should assess every application to inform decision-making
- The BAT system, makes you look at the bigger picture

**What hinders panels?**
- Confusion coming from CashBack funding
- too many things – thinking it can solve all problems.
- Lack of systems to deal with misuse of funding.

**What would panel members like to improve?**
- More involvement of young people - having someone allocated to support their role.
- Encourage organisations to provide the right kind of information to increase their confidence and skills in applying for funds, also helpful to align application with other well-known funds.
- For panels to see the monitoring, outcomes and impact of what is funded.
**Case 3, Example 1: Rathbone, Dumfries & Galloway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General:</th>
<th>About the project: To support and deliver a Christmas school leavers’ programme for 18 young people over 14 weeks. It is delivered in partnership with Young Persons’ Support Services (D&amp;GC); Skills Development Scotland; Schools; Springboard Training; Adult Learning; Environmental Health; The Red Cross, Education Dept; Finance Dept and Active Schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A local branch of a UK wide charity providing programmes of learning and work experience to young people with a focus on targeting young people with complex needs who are farthest from participating in education, training or employment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach:</th>
<th>Numbers: 18</th>
<th>Per capita investment: £583.16</th>
<th>What funds were used for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The way they did it:</th>
<th>The impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is based on strong partnerships and follows the success of a previous pilot. It offers an alternative to mainstream education, away from school, and prepares young people for the world of work. Referrals are made by the four central schools. The program offers young people the opportunity to attain credible vocational qualifications in First Aid, Health and Hygiene, Customer Services, Health and Safety Construction, Construction Skills Certification and SQA units in Employability, and Health &amp; Wellbeing. Young people also participate in sustained work experience placements.</td>
<td>• Christmas leavers staying involved in learning • Increased motivation for learning • 3 x entering employment • 6 x Get Ready for Work placements • 2 x Skill Seekers placements • 1 x entry to FE course in Business Administration • 2 x relocate to other areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future developments:</th>
<th>Unique benefits and challenges:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Change CashBack for Youth Work criteria to permit more employability initiatives.</td>
<td>• Various awards and accreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case 3, Example 2: YMCA, Dumfries & Galloway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General:</th>
<th>About the project: To fund a residential at Wiston lodge near Biggar for members of a local youth Friday night youth group, aged 10-13 in an area of multiple deprivation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A local branch of a national organisation which aims to enrich the lives of young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach:</th>
<th>Numbers: 15 (4 Male and 9 Female and 2 volunteers)</th>
<th>Per capita investment: £98.66</th>
<th>What the funds were used for: Wiston Lodge Accommodation, Wiston Lodge Programme and Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The way they did it:
We encouraged the involvement of young people in the planning, risk assessment, rules and evaluation of the residential. The application was made by the young people themselves, with one of the senior members given a leadership role. We wanted to provide a residential that was affordable and help them build their social skills and get a new life experience. The young people were asked to contribute a token amount of £20. The residential brought together two separate communities that experience territorialism. To build relationships we consciously put people who didn’t know each other together in groups. As a result some lasting friendships have formed and they now ‘go up the town together’. Team building was developed through outdoor activities and risk-taking. Young people kept diaries of their experience and recorded changes in behaviour.

The impact:
- Challenging young people on consequences of identified inappropriate behaviour (smoking and drinking at 10 years old)
- Reducing barriers to bringing young people together from different territories
- Reduction in fights at the youth club

Unique benefits and challenges:
- High level responsibility and leadership roles given to young people.
- Costs/charges even when low can prevent some young people from taking part.

Future developments:
- Less focus on anti-social behaviour

Figure 20: Case study for the area of Highland

Case 4: Highland – Total youth work fund distributed £127,864
Total anti-violence fund allocated £35,000

Case 4, Highland Assessment Panel

Which organisations do the panel members represent?
- Youth Highland (local Voluntary Sector network for Youth Scotland).
- Action for Children Scotland (Voluntary Sector, local branch of ACS).
- Highland Life, Community Safety and Youth Services (arms-length to HC).
- 1 x young person (local youth convener SYP on full-time bursary).

What are the qualities needed by panel members?
- Clear understanding of the issues facing young people in Highland area.
- Understanding the different issues in different parts of the Highlands and bigger picture.

What helps panels? What hinders panels?
- Going out with YouthLink staff to promote the fund.
- BAT is a useful structure to follow.
- Panel members cascading the BAT training to other local reps.
- Difficult for the voluntary sector to commit the time needed.
- Can’t draw on personal knowledge if you don’t know applicant organisation.
- Confusing landscape of CashBack schemes.

What would panel members like to improve?
- Clearer links between priorities and criteria.
- A mechanism for clawing back and reinvesting under-spend
- Ways to deal with projects having difficulties
- Make BAT more user friendly, less repetition and improved weightings
- Greater clarity on language - whether diversionary work is about making a difference – the journey travelled or restricted to anti-violence and anti-social behaviour.
### Case 4, Example 1: Fushion Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General: Youth Highland provides a range of core services i.e. Training, resources, and advice and support to voluntary organisations across the region plus organisations get access to specific projects we run.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CashBack Award:</strong> £48,574 (Youth Work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About the project:</strong> A programme of winter activities covering the Highland Council Area. The project is a partnership of Youth Highland (lead organisation) Highlife Highland and Action for Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of approach:</strong> Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numbers:</strong> 2,430 (Estimated 1,410 Males and 1,020 Females)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per capita investment:</strong> £19.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What funds were used for:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribution to Youth Highland Activity Coordinator’s Salary (£3,302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activities £42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Management fee £4,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The way they did it:</strong> Fushion activity events were delivered in 22 of the 29 Integrated Learning Communities (ILC) each running 3 to 6 activity events. The demographic and geographic make up in the Highlands means that in each ILC the events differ and range from sports, cake decorating, arts &amp; crafts, film-making and Zumba. Each Youth Development Officer (YDO) consulted with young people and came up with a plan for that community and organised the events. A Fushion event will normally run on a Thursday, Friday or Saturday night. Action for Children had access to police information that highlight nights where the instances of anti social behaviour were highest. Most are one off sessions, some ILCs put together a programme of related events that run over a number of weeks. The theme that runs through all events was raising the awareness of YDO’s of the provision of all the voluntary run provision in the area so this was promoted at the Fushion events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The impact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 107 events provided across Highland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bringing young people together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifying and linking disadvantaged young people with provision in their area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique benefits and challenges:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Being able to work strategically across the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A counter-balance to other cut-backs in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future developments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clearer priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognise local needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater clarity of overall CashBack strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Include questions on outcomes in the application form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clearer guidance on monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case 4, Example 2: Youth Inclusive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General: Youth Inclusive are a faith based organisation situated in the community of Hilton and Merkland in Inverness. Both are areas of multiple-deprivation. The focus of their work is providing Streetwork and a drop-in. Activities are provided by a team of young sessional youth workers and designed to decrease anti-social behaviour, underage drinking and the misuse of drugs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CashBack Award:</strong> £5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About the project:</strong> To provide streetwork, where youth workers make contact with different individuals and groups in identified areas of deprivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of approach:</strong> Open &amp; Targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numbers:</strong> 250 (175 Males and 75 Females)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per capita investment:</strong> £20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What the funds were used for:</strong> Sessional staff costs for streetwork and drop-in facility on a Friday night.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The way they did it: Streetwork in Hilton and Merkland targeted 14-17 year olds. Needs were identified regarding provision, employment, and healthy positive choices. Streetwork teams select different areas to focus on, identify young people hanging around and build relationships with them. Ongoing contact encourages young people to get off the street and take part in activities taking place in the drop-in sessions on a Friday or at the community centre.

The impact:
- 4 x young people entering college/employment

Unique benefits and challenges:
- 7 members of current staff made initial contact through streetwork

Future developments:
- Continue to fund projects that are working.
- Give smaller organisations a bigger voice.

---

Figure 21: Case study for the area of Edinburgh City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 5: Edinburgh – Total youth work fund distributed £187,958</th>
<th>Total anti-violence fund allocated £57,832</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Case 5, Edinburgh Assessment Panel

Which organisations do the panel members represent?
- Community Safety Services, ECC
- Edinburgh City Council
- Citadel Youth Project (Voluntary Sector)
- LAYC (umbrella organisation for local youth organisations)

What are the qualities needed by panel members?
- To be totally unbiased.
- Be objective, even when applications come from within your own organisation.
- A depth of youth work experience.

What helps panels? | What hinders panels?
--- | ---
- A trust in each other’s judgements | - BAT process takes time to do applications justice.
- Working together as a panel over a lengthy period of time. | - Misleading that some organisations are good at filling in applications and can easily generate a high score.
- Attending meetings well prepared, identifying questions. |

What would panel members like to improve?
- May not be necessary to assess applications that YouthLink Scotland know don’t meet the criteria.
- Improve the feedback to panels so that they can learn from experience.
- Remove unnecessary criteria that are over-restrictive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 5, Example 1: Muirhouse Youth Development Group</th>
<th>CashBack Award: £29,714 (Anti-violence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

General: MYDG has been running since 1997 the focus of the work was outdoor and sporting activities. We run ‘My Adventure’ which is a social enterprise and we deliver an outreach and a street work service.

About the project: To use creative activities as a tool to engage with those young people who are hardest to reach and may be perpetrators of crime.
### Case 5, Example 2: Health Opportunities Team

**CashBack Award:** £854 (Youth Work)

**General:** The Team has been around for 10 years and the organisation developed from the Brooke Foundation which is now Caledonia Youth. The project grew from the need to address and provide sexual and emotional education in Craigmillar. Our approach is based on one to one work and group work which we carry out here [at our base] and in four secondary schools. We are a registered charity.

**About the project:** The Feel Good Girls Group (FGGG) targets young women aged 13 – 16 who are seen as the vulnerable or having to take on responsibilities that produce stress and anxiety. They may be isolated at school or show evidence of emotional behaviour issues. The clients are those young people who don’t engage with more generic youth provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of approach:</th>
<th>Numbers: 13 (Females only)</th>
<th>Per capita investment: £65.69</th>
<th>What the funds were used for: Sessional Worker, Physical activities, Issue-based group work and advice and information sessions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The way they did it:</strong> We work intensively with the girls on building trust and encourage them to undertake some of the more physical and health related activities. Some young women are referred to the project others are known to us through the other services we provide and are sign posted to the FGGG. The sessional worker, used established partnerships and services so that the young people could partake in physical activity on a weekly basis; examples of which included; using gym equipment, circuits, walks, running, skipping, stretching, yoga, tai chi and badminton. This activity is linked to group work exploring emotional wellbeing i.e. managing difficult emotions and learning positive coping strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The impact:**  
- Early intervention of social and emotional problems  
- Improved coping skills  
- Greater self-respect  |
| **Unique benefits and challenges:**  
- Provides a safe place for girls to meet and explore/develop their wellbeing |

**Future developments:**  
- Permit funding for proportionate core costs.

Hence the case studies are combined with previous findings to determine the wider implications and propose future developments to the CashBack for Communities scheme.
5.6 The wider impact

Recommendations from research on improving youth work practice are summarised to highlight ways CashBack might help the youth work sector in future and overcome identified hindrances gleaned from this evaluation [see figure 22].

Figure 22: Recommendations for improving youth work practice and ways CashBack for Communities helps and hinders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from research</th>
<th>Ways CB can help?</th>
<th>Ways CB can hinder?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being clearer about youth work and what it offers</td>
<td>Encourage robust and effective youth work – e.g. streetwork/outreach.</td>
<td>The application emphasises activities rather than getting providers to articulate the way they make a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending partnerships and integrated working, towards more holistic needs led work</td>
<td>Encourage joint submissions and consortia. Develop strategic partnerships between CashBack fund-holders.</td>
<td>Current funding process can promote competition and division rather than collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured and longer-term work and relationships with young people and skilled workers make a greater impact</td>
<td>Allow longer-term bids/commitments and ask about the skills &amp; qualifications of staff/volunteers.</td>
<td>Short-term funding undermines good practice, raises expectations and false hope for what can only be sustained if new funding is secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better involvement of young people including designing, delivering, resourcing and reviewing youth activities – moving towards ownership of assets</td>
<td>Create ways for young people to submit ideas and get support to develop and present them e.g. pre-application or work with local Youth Banks</td>
<td>Current involvement is not well known and appears tokenistic. Better to not have it than endorse poor practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention and late intervention is not an either/or – ongoing support is needed as children progress into adulthood</td>
<td>Allow applicants to make their own case. Gather evidence from CB activity to present findings to policy makers</td>
<td>It can be argued that the current priorities only focus on young people with complex problems. May be negligent to focus only on early intervention at the expense of issues which emerge in teenagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, needs/risk assessment and ongoing evaluation is essential to all youth work</td>
<td>Make sure applicants are required to describe how needs/risks are assessed as an integral part of the project – possible links with CLD standards and GIRFEC</td>
<td>No current requirement – no (minimal) evidence of providers doing this and no expectations articulated that standards should be adhered to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Develop emotional as well as social well-being via structured interventions facilitated by skilled, experienced and committed workers

- Define appropriate activities and ways funds can be used to support this. Publish examples of good practice. Provide training in intervention techniques.
- Lack of clarity on good practice and too much focus on activities and skills. Short-term investment is counterproductive.

### Tackle the root causes of problem behaviour – pay attention to family, school, community and wider social, economic and environmental contexts

- Make funding is available to properly assess and understand root causes. Open the criteria so that work can include relevant family and community work.
- No questions are asked about what the needs/risks or likely triggers. Funding can be awarded without explaining the whole experience and reflective process.

### Consistent, coherent and strategic investment – higher intensity and per capita investment for those with complex needs

- Give a clear message that value for money in diversionary youth work does not equate to low per-capita investment. De-mystify old cultures on this.
- No requirement to link with any wider youth work strategy. No strategy from Government.

Thus the background context, findings and analysis culminate into a series of lessons for making necessary future improvements.
6. Lessons learnt
The CashBack for Communities fund creates vast opportunities to add value to a sector which is widely acknowledged as having been underfunded, underdeveloped and under-supported for many years. Youth Work approaches, when executed effectively, prove to be particularly effective at tackling issues such as violence and anti-social behaviour as part of a holistic progressive process of early and later interventions of social and emotional development. To continuously improve youth work practice and the outcomes of CashBack for Communities, the following lessons can be learnt [see figure 23].

Figure 23: Lessons learnt from the evaluation of CashBack for the youth work sector

Success Criteria

• Outcomes improve where needs are assessed, strong relationships are developed with young people and there is robust monitoring & evaluation.
• A balance between activities and social & emotional development is most effective.
• Techniques such as streetwork, outreach, issue-based work and small group work are particularly effective at reaching harder to reach groups and reducing risks.

Benefits & Impact of Youth Work

• Opportunities to focus on early intervention as well as later intervention.
• Opportunities to maximise effective partnership working.
• Much can be achieved regardless of the level of investment, providing the approaches are consciously open or targeted and respond to identified needs.
• Youth work addresses the holistic capacity of young people through providing experiences and personal reflection.
• Many youth providers operate at the grassroots of communities and provide an excellent platform to connect with other CashBack initiatives and maximise outcomes.

Panels & Administration

• Panel members require local knowledge and in-depth understanding of youth work approaches.
• Openness and transparency is required about the panel process and its membership.
• Panels play an important part in checking the strategic ‘bigger picture’ of fund distribution against needs in their local area.
• Panels add a ‘personal touch’ of supporting local organisations and scrutinising whether organisations will fulfil their claims - a local support to YouthLink Scotland.
7. Recommendations

In light of previous discussion, key recommendations on the future direction of CashBack for Communities are summarised below [see figure 24].

Figure 24: Key recommendations for CashBack for the youth work sector

- **Some Dos**
  - Focus on funding priorities.
  - Seek information on needs/risk assessment.
  - Agree outcomes, targets/indicators for projects to achieve.
  - Ask for realistic numbers and per-capita expenditure.
  - Give regular feedback to panels.
  - Increase scrutiny of eligibility and remove ineligible applications from decision-making.
  - Scrutinise panel decisions more thoroughly.
  - Encourage better expression of youth work practice and the types of approaches being adopted.
  - Use recognised good practice standards (e.g. CLD) and frameworks (e.g. GIRFEC) to improve diversionary interventions.

- **Some Don'ts**
  - Panel members need to be vigilant by observing conflicts of interest and making sure they are not directly or indirectly part of such decisions.
  - Don’t add unnecessary criteria, or restrictions, instead let applicants make a case for how they know and can prove their project will work to achieve outcomes.
  - Take care to avoid subsidising or replacing statutory provision directly or indirectly (e.g. through arms-length or third party organisations).
  - Avoid encouraging low per capita expenditure, especially in targeted interventions.

- **Some Possible Maybes**
  - Develop a mechanism for checking and intervening if projects are not working.
  - Claw back and reinvest underspend.
  - Explore strategic partnership ideas/opportunities in each area and with other CashBack fund-holders.
  - Look at increasing duration of funding, especially where projects can evidence delivering on outcomes.
  - Explore whether Scottish Government are prepared to permit funds to be used to fill gaps and shortfalls due to funding cuts.
  - Combine youth work/anti-violence funds to have a simplified, more open application where the onus is on applicants to justify higher or lower amounts for the interventions and outcomes they specify.
Appendix 1 – Youth Work Fund Guidelines

1. What is this CashBack for Communities Fund?

CashBack for Communities aims to support the youth work sector to provide a range of FREE diversionary activities for young people, increasing the opportunities to develop their interests and skills in an enjoyable, fulfilling and supported way, using funds recovered from criminals.

2. Who Can Apply?

Awards from the Fund will be made to youth work organisations who offer programmes of youth work activities for local young people.

3. What Will Be Funded?

The fund is open to application from all organisations offering youth work activities for local young people. The emphasis is on youth work interventions constructed with and for young people in the 10–19 age group.

Priority will be given to:

- events and activities that address inequalities
- proposals which focuses resources in high crime areas
- proposals which address gaps in provision for young people
- areas suffering from particular problems or lack of resources
- organisations which support young people who are currently involved or at risk of becoming involved in violence, alcohol, drugs and or anti-social behaviour

4. How Long Will Projects Be Funded?

Projects can include one off events or run over 20 months. All projects must be completed on or before 31st May 2012

5. Funding Applications must meet the following criteria:

- target young people aged 10 – 19 years from areas of multiple deprivation or where there is a demonstrated need
- fill gaps in provision for young people or add value/build on existing provision, taking account of defined and identified local priorities
- support and encourage the involvement of local people (particularly young people) in the development, management and running of the project

6. What Won’t Be Funded?
• Projects that do not fit the fund criteria
• Events and activities that have already taken place
• Projects with no youth work programme or focus
• Projects with weak youth work outcomes
• Projects that are not considered to be good value for money
• Events and activities for adults
• Single activity projects with no youth work outcomes e.g. sports projects & competitions.
• Employment Training initiatives
• Counseling, befriending and advocacy projects
• Training Courses for staff and volunteers
• Capital costs:
  o Vehicles and other large items of equipment
  o Building renovations: - e.g. double glazing, replacement heating, roofing repairs
  o Equipment Only Projects
  o Items of Personal clothing – e.g. hoodies, tee shirts, fleeces, sports activities strips
• Revenue costs:
  o Overseas projects
  o Memberships to private clubs e.g. gyms, golf and bowling clubs
  o Excessive Management Overheads and Core Costs
• Projects that meet the criteria of the other CashBack for Communities programmes (see Guidance Note 2: Who Can Apply?)

7. Completing the Application Form

The questions asked in the application form will help the assessment panel gain a picture of your organisation, the proposed activities covered by the application and whether the activity and target group matches the criteria set down by Scottish Ministers. Please complete all questions carefully. Do not alter the form. Your referee statement forms an important part of the assessment process so please ensure your referee outlines the need, can confirm your organisation can deliver and that the project is part of a wider strategy for your area. Copies of the application form can be downloaded from the CashBack page on our website using the following link: - CashBack Round 4 Forms

When completing the Finance and Budget Section of the Application Form, please take care to include the full cost of the proposed work, the matched funding and/or in-kind contributions and the amount you require from the CashBack for Communities Fund. Only include match funding that has been approved.
8. Application Processing

Before we begin to assess your application at least two initial checks are undertaken to ensure that all the required information has been included. If, for example, an application is not signed or is received with no accounts or budget, it will not be assessed. However, incomplete or incorrect applications are presented to the local CashBack for Communities Assessment Panel which takes the decision whether an organisation will receive an award or not. Please make sure that you read our guidelines carefully before submitting your application.

As all CashBack applications are electronically scanned, please do not submit duplex copies, stapled material or original documentation. Please help us by only providing us with loose leaf, single sided A4 copies. Complete all sections of the form and ensure that all the attachments requested are provided. Incomplete or incorrect applications will not be considered. We aim to let applicants know if their application has been successful within 2 months of the deadline date.
Appendix 2 – Anti-violence Fund

1. What is this CashBack for Communities Anti-Violence Fund

CashBack for Communities is the Scottish Government’s vehicle for reinvesting the proceeds of crime back into communities to benefit Scotland’s young people. We know that issues such as violence and knife crime are a significant concern for young people (see, for example, Action for Children Scotland’s “Step inside our shoes” survey on young people’s views on gun and knife crime).

We want to use CashBack to build the capacity of young people and the other individuals and organisations who work to support them, to face up to these concerns positively. This is about adding to and consolidating, not replacing, the often excellent existing work already being undertaken throughout Scotland. We welcome proposals for capital and revenue costs relating to the delivery of programmes that meet the following criteria.

2. Who Can Apply?

Awards from the Fund will be made to organisations or partnerships who offer programmes of youth work activities or projects dedicated to addressing the perception or experience of violence among young people aged 10 – 19 years.

3. What Will Be Funded?

The CashBack Anti-Violence Fund will provide ring-fenced grant funding to projects dedicated to addressing the perception or experience of violence in Scotland among youngsters aged 10 to 19 who are at risk of becoming involved in violence. This may include dealing with issues such as knife crime and gang violence. Projects must be located in areas of multiple deprivation or areas with a history of violent incidents or knife crime.

4. Projects must:

- target young people aged 10 – 19 years from areas of multiple deprivation or where there is a demonstrated need;
- focus resources in areas where violence has been identified as an issue and/or a local priority;
- support young people who are currently involved or at risk of becoming involved in violence;
- be open and accessible to young people;
- addresses issues relating to the experience or perception of violence including issues such as knife crime, gang violence etc.;
- offer activities for young people to increase the opportunities they have to develop their interests and skills in an enjoyable, fulfilling and supported way;
- fill gaps in provision for young people or add value/build on existing provision which includes “No Knives Better Lives”;  
- support and encourage the involvement of local people (particularly young people) in the development, management and running of the project.
5. Preference will be given to those projects that:

- can show how work is sustainable (whether in levering in other resources or in leaving a legacy).
- promote equalities.

6. General Information

- £500,000 from the Scottish Government’s ‘CashBack for Communities’ scheme will be invested in a series of anti-violence diversionary projects designed to engage young people in areas with high instances of knife crime, building on the successful No Knives, Better lives education campaign.
- there are no upper or lower limits for awards and as this a rolling programme there are no deadlines for applications.
Appendix 3: CashBack for Communities, Youth Work Fund Assessment

The following diagram illustrates the journey for any applications made to the youth work fund.

1. Application Form Received
2. Data Input by the CashBack Admin team
3. Application 1st Checked by member of the Practice Team
4. Application 2nd Checked by member of the Practice Team
5. Is the application approved by both?
   - Yes: Application to be 3rd Checked
   - No: Application held and discussed at panel meeting
6. Is application Approved by 2 of 3?
   - Yes: Award made by Panel?
   - No: Application passed to assessors
7. Assessors use the BAT score system
8. BAT scores used to Rank applications
9. Panel meeting to assess applications
10. Application Successful?
    - Yes: Letter of confirmation Of award (with conditions If applicable) sent to applicant following the panel meeting
    - No: Unsuccessful letter sent to applicant Following panel meeting

**Responsibility for decision making lies solely with the Assessment Panel NOT YouthLink**

**Use of checklist for info only – Not for decision**

**Where there are minor errors on the application these should be processed as normal – grant award conditional**

**NB. We will not be operating the incomplete letter system this round**
**All correspondence should be held until after panel meeting**
**Some awards can be conditional where info is missing**