

From: Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform and Patrick Leeson, Corporate Director, Education and Young People's Services

To: Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee: 16 December 2014

Subject: **Early Help and Preventative Services – Performance Review of Commissioned Youth Work Services**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Summary: This report sets out the progress made with commissioned youth services and their contribution to a coordinated youth offer to the young people of Kent.

Recommendations: The Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee is asked to:

- I.NOTE the progress that has been made by commissioned youth work services across the county
- II.NOTE the plans to review the targets relating to attendance and membership so that they encourage further ambition amongst the commissioned services to reach and engage more young people.
- III.NOTE the intention to define and confirm the role of youth work in the overall strategy of Early Help and Preventative Services and to ensure that service specifications for the next round of commissioning align with the broader outcomes for the new Division, especially in relation to providing more targeted support to vulnerable young people

1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

- outline the level of activity provided since April 2013 by the twenty two organisations commissioned by the County Council to deliver youth work services in each of the twelve Districts
- provide an analysis of the effectiveness of the performance of each organisation against their respective targets for both 2013-14 and 2014-15

1.2 The County Council, under the Education and Inspection Act 2006, has a statutory duty to secure young people's access to sufficient educational and recreational leisure-time activities. The County Council decided in 2012 to meet this duty through a new model; a mix of direct delivery and commissioned youth work services.

1.3 The management responsibility for the new model initially was with the Integrated Youth Services but, since April 2014 it has transferred to the new Early Help and Preventative Services Division within the Education and Young People's Services Directorate.

1.4 The report details:

- the original context of the Commissioned Youth Work Services
- the types of youth work being undertaken by the Commissioned Youth Work Services
- key findings derived from the processes for:
 - performance review – meetings are undertaken quarterly with each of the 22 organisations

- the quality assurance of youth work practice – assessments are completed via observations undertaken by KCC Youth Work managers, members of the Quality Assurance team and Young Inspectors and Mystery Shoppers

1.5 The annexes include:

- a list of the commissioned youth work providers
- attendances at commissioned youth work activities, by provider
- the guidance for staff in Early Help and Preventative Services who are responsible for assessing the quality of youth work practice and for instigating actions where improvement is required.

2. Financial Implications

2.1 The budget for commissioned youth work services has been £1.6 million for both 2013-14 and 2014-15:

2.2 The new service delivery model, when established in January 2013, delivered base budget savings for the County Council of £900,000 per annum.

3. The Youth Work Model and Commissioned Youth Work Services

3.1 The vision for the youth work model in operation since January 2013 is to support young people as they make the transition from childhood to adulthood. A universal service has been retained but where young people need additional support this is supplemented by targeted family, individual or group work interventions, depending on the presenting need.

3.2 The model has moved from being predominantly in-house provided directly by the County Council to one which combines delivery with the commissioning of 22 external organisations. The model reflects the value placed on the contribution that external service providers make within their local communities. It is geographically based on the twelve Districts of Kent to ensure that young people have the maximum possible local opportunities to access and engage in youth work activities. The commissioned youth work organisations are listed at Annex A.

3.3 The model was shaped by both “Bold Steps for Kent” and the five priorities of “Every Day Matters”, the KCC Children and Young People’s Strategic Plan (2013-16). It was developed in close collaboration with young people, district partners and the Lead Cabinet Member for Youth Services. The key factors were:

- the development of a market within the County for the delivery of youth work (21 of the current 22 providers are Kent based) so that high quality services, in line with the key indicators set out in paragraph 4.2 below, are available to young people in all communities across the county
- the ongoing commitment to the participation and involvement of young people in the design and evaluation of youth work services
- universal access for young people from all communities as a core element of the overall preventative strategy and the promotion and safeguarding of their welfare
- the commissioning of “Young Kent” at a total cost of £200k, of which £60k is used for providing grants to countywide umbrella youth work organisations (e.g. Kent Scouts and Girl Guides). The role of Young Kent is to reflect the commitment of the County Council to the availability of a diverse youth work offer.

3.4 Early Help and Preventative Services (EHPS) provide for commissioned youth work services in each District by ensuring the following:

- training, quality assurance and assistance with curriculum development and delivery (e.g. funding has been provided to enable staff from the services to attend the NVQ Level 2 “Youth Work Practice” training which addresses the core competencies required by youth workers)
- consultation on future developments including the priorities they should be commissioned to deliver
- routine quarterly reviews which enable EHPS to take action with those organisations whose performance is not in line with contractual requirements
- the involvement of the Kent Youth County Council, Young Inspectors and Mystery Shoppers – ensuring the voice of the young person is heard with regard to service development.

4. Performance Measurement of the Youth Work Model and Commissioned Youth Work Services

4.1 Both direct delivery and commissioned services work to the same performance management framework which draws on quantitative data and qualitative assessment processes (guidance relating to the latter is included at Annex C). Each commissioned service has its own targets which were agreed when the contracts were awarded. Quarterly meetings are held with providers to inform the review of their performance. These meetings focus on the:

- number of sessions provided
- attendances by young people at youth work sessions – in centre and street based and school based youth work
- number of individual young people attending and the number of participants; young people who attend a project at least four times a year
- the outcomes being achieved including, for example, those participating in the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award or other accredited programmes

4.2 The findings from the observations of the quality of youth work practice are presented against five distinct dimensions. These are:

- **the context** in which the youth work is being delivered, e.g. the population attending, the state of the building or mobile resource, and the resources available
- **planning** - the extent to which the activities have been planned and young people have been involved in the process
- **the quality of the relationships** between youth workers and young people and how the relationships are used to achieve positive outcomes for the latter
- **session delivery** – the skills demonstrated by the staff, the effectiveness of their use of available resources and the degree to which young people participate and benefit
- **outcomes** – evidencing the progress being made by the young people towards the objectives for the session or for the overall programme. This may include both recorded and accredited outcomes.

4.3 Since January 2013 a formal observation has been undertaken of at least one project being delivered by each of the commissioned services. The possible outcomes (and their related scores) following the observation and assessment are:

Outstanding (Grade 4)

Work that is consistently delivered well above the minimum requirement is innovative, cost effective and contributes to developing a range of young people's capabilities. The service raises expectations for them and enables the achievement of wider outcomes in their families and communities.

Good (Grade 3)

Work that delivers above the minimum requirement, has elements of innovative practice, is increasingly cost effective and contributes to the development of young people's capabilities. The service makes some contribution to young people's outcomes in the family and wider community.

Adequate (Grade 2)

Work that meets the minimum requirements for young people, delivering a basic service but is one which does not demonstrate the ability to improve young people's aspirations and offers little contribution to developing capabilities or outcomes in a wider context

Inadequate (Grade 1)

Work that fails to deliver the minimum requirements is not cost-effective and does not make a contribution to the development of young people's capabilities nor does it demonstrate an impact upon young people's outcomes.

4.4 Prompt and robust contract management has been undertaken where performance is causing concern in order to address issues and to provide a clear timescale for improvement. With respect to one organisation, this resulted in formal action from commissioners as the level of engagement they were achieving and the quality of their interventions were both viewed as inadequate. The outstanding contracts were re-commissioned and were awarded to another provider.

4.5 An audit review was undertaken as part of the KCC Audit Plan for 2013-14 to examine the process for commissioning youth services and for contract management. The overall objective of the Audit was to provide assurance that the services were commissioned appropriately with adequate monitoring to ensure that outcomes were achieved. The audit concluded positively, commenting that:

"there was a good process in place for the management of the youth services contracts. Quantitative data on performance is received and analysed on a regular basis with quarterly meetings to discuss performance held with the providers. Observations are also carried out by senior youth workers and mystery-shoppers to provide qualitative information. There is evidence that unsatisfactory performance is identified and measures have been put in place to address this"

4.6 In August 2014 all of the commissioned services attended three consultation sessions which were led by EHPS. The focus of the meetings was to consider the outcomes that each organisation is working towards and how they support progress towards key indicators, and their targets, included within the performance framework for the Kent Integrated Adolescent Support Service (KIASS). The meetings highlighted a clear alignment between the work being undertaken and the priority service areas for EHPS.

5. Performance of Commissioned Youth Work Services, 2013-14 & Quarters 1 and 2, in 2014-15

5.1 The new model was mobilised during the final Quarter of 2012-13, and was fully implemented by April 2013.

5.2 There are targets for each of the commissioned youth work services. The key findings, derived from the performance review meetings, are as follows:

- **Sessions delivered:** during 2013-14 the commissioned services exceeded the number of sessions they were contracted to provide and in the first two Quarters of the current year they are at 85.4% against the target. The lower level of performance to date in 2014-15 can be accounted for by four services having to be re-commissioned and the mobilisation period required for an organisation to move from being awarded a contract to commencing youth work delivery.
- **Attendances, number of individuals and participants:** the points arising with respect to these targets are:
 - the reasons for attendances in 2013-14 being at 92.2% against target were that two significant providers ceased delivering during the year and the need to re-commission/mobilise new provision
 - the level of attendance will strongly influence the number of individual young people involved and the number who attend on four or more occasions.

5.4 It is intended, in the light of these findings, to review whether the targets agreed relating to the number of individuals, and the number of participants, are framed correctly given that the required sessions are being delivered and attendances overall are good. It has been observed through the performance management process that services tend to achieve a core and consistent membership and tend not to have a frequent turnover of members. This can be viewed in a positive light as it reflects the quality of the relationships, a critical aspect of youth work, which are being established between commissioned youth work services and young people. However it may mean that some groups of young people are not engaging as would be expected.

5.5 Details of the performances recorded against each of the above targets are broken down by Provider, and included in annex B.

5.6 A total of 210 observation visits to assess the quality of practice have been made to commissioned youth work projects since April 2013.

5.7 The table below illustrates and compares the findings using the average scores (guidance is at paragraph 4.2), recorded by each dimension for all commissioned and directly delivered services grouped together for both 2013-14 and for the first two Quarters of 2014-15.

| Project Type | Context | Planning | Quality of Relationships | Session Delivery | Outcomes |
|----------------------|---------|----------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|
| 2013-14 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| 2014-15 (to date) | 3.2 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.7 |

5.8 The table provides a picture of progress being made by all service providers with regard to the quality of their youth work practice. The grades reflect performance that

is mostly adequate or better. The average scores for each of the dimensions have been higher during the first two Quarters of 2014-15 than they were for the twelve months of 2013.14, with none in either financial year having an overall score of “inadequate”. The quality of relationships is the highest scoring dimension which helps to explain why services retain a core membership and tend not to have the turnover of members required to meet the targets for the number of individuals attending and participants.

6. Conclusions

6.1 The co-produced model for the transformed youth service is now fully operational. The key priorities for Early Help and Preventative Services are to:

- continue to strengthen the market for youth work providers in preparation for the next commissioning cycle (2015-16)
- support continuous improvement in youth work practice through an ongoing commitment to Youth Work Observations, to opening up training opportunities for the staff of commissioned youth work services including the provision of accredited outcome opportunities and to the involvement of young people in the assessment of the quality of youth work practice
- maintaining the quarterly performance reviews so that routine dialogue about progress towards agreed targets is held and where necessary changes in approach can be determined
- Ensure young people identified as needed targeted support can access and engage in youth work activities to their clear benefit
- Ensure outcomes-based commissioning and confirm the required outcomes from commissioned providers in the context of a new Early Help and Preventative Services Division in Kent.

7. Recommendations

7.1 The Education and Young People’s Cabinet Committee is asked to:

- (i) NOTE the progress that has been made by the commissioned youth work providers
- (ii) NOTE the plans to review the targets relating to attendance and membership so that they encourage ambition while remaining attainable
- (iii) NOTE the intention to define and confirm the role of youth work in the overall strategy of Early Help and Preventative Services and to ensure that service specifications for the next round of commissioning align with the broader outcomes for the new Division, especially in relation to providing more targeted support to vulnerable young people

8. Background Documents

8.1 The documents supporting the preparation of this report were:

- Bold Steps for Kent 2012.14
- “Every Day Matters”, the KCC Children and Young People’s Strategic Plan (April 2013).

9. Contact details

Andy Jones

Information, Quality & Performance Unit
Early Help and Preventative Services

andy.jones@kent.gov.uk

Charlie Beaumont

Information, Quality & Performance Unit
Early Help and Preventative Services

charlie.beaumont@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:

Florence Kroll, Director for Early Help and Preventative Services

03000 416362

florence.kroll@kent.gov.uk




Annex A

Commissioned Youth Work Organisations









































































| ORGANISATION | OPERATING IN: |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Avante | Maidstone, Shepway, Thanet |
| Sk8side CIC | Ashford |
| Connexions Partnership | Ashford, Dover, Sevenoaks, Swale, Tonbridge & Malling, Tunbridge Wells |
| Canterbury Academy | Canterbury |
| Walk Tall | Dartford |
| YMCA Thames Gateway | Dartford |
| Project Salus | Maidstone, Shepway |
| Dartford Borough Council | Dartford |
| The Gr@nd | Gravesham |
| Switch Youth Café | Maidstone |
| Charles Harrison Associates | Maidstone |
| West Kent Extra | Sevenoaks |
| Sevenoaks Town Council | Sevenoaks |
| Folkestone Youth Project | Shepway |
| West Faversham Community Assoc | Swale |
| Restoration Youth | Swale |
| Pie Factory Music Group | Thanet |
| The Zone, Broadstairs | Thanet |
| Voluntary Action Within Kent | Thanet, Tunbridge Wells |
| Westgate Youth Project | Thanet |
| The Beat Project | Tonbridge & Malling |
| West Kent YMCA | Tonbridge & Malling, Tunbridge Wells |

Key Performance Indicators by Provider

Annex B

Green >=  90% Amber >=  60% Red <  60%

Combined figures for periods: 2013/14 and 2014/15 Qtrs 1 and 2 (18 month duration)

| Service Provider | Sessions | | | No of Attendances at sessions | | | No of Young People | | | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------|--|--------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | Target | Actual | % | Target | Actual | % | Target | Actual | % | |
| Avante | 114 | 55 |  48% | 1018.8 | 450 |  44% | 278.5 | 100 |  36% | New provider since May 2014 (replaces CXK in three lots in Thanet, Maidstone and Shepway) |
| Charles Harrison Associates | 202 | 186 |  92% | 2962.5 | 5710 |  193% | 592.5 | 1281 |  216% | |
| CXK | 5751 | 5323 |  93% | 61940 | 51857 |  84% | 16216 | 4203 |  26% | Provider being challenged over number of individual young people being reached |
| Folkestone Youth Project | 546 | 538 |  99% | 8250 | 10393 |  126% | 450 | 761 |  169% | |
| Gravesham Network | 1125 | 1048 |  93% | 7500 | 12133 |  162% | 2947.5 | 1872 |  64% | |
| Pie Factory Music | 375 | 420 |  112% | 6375 | 7250 |  114% | 600 | 596 |  99% | |
| Platform 51 | 162 | 162 |  100% | 1150 | 453 |  39% | 130 | 66 |  51% | Project closed in January following withdrawal of provider; CXK contracted from April 2014 |
| Project Salus | 2023 | 1137 |  56% | 16200 | 14862 |  92% | 1184.4 | 1068 |  90% | |
| Restoration Youth Ltd | 240 | 286 |  119% | 3750 | 1429 |  38% | 450 | 249 |  55% | Currently subject to intensive management action |
| Sevenoaks Town Council | 468 | 1292 |  276% | 11700 | 7837 |  67% | 450 | 390 |  87% | |
| Sk8side | 750 | 1265 |  169% | 10500 | 15405 |  147% | 750 | 1152 |  154% | |
| South and West Kent College | 58 | 95 |  164% | 830 | 833 |  100% | 500 | 316 |  63% | Project in Dover closed in April 2014; work will continue with local provider |
| Switch Youth Cafe | 114 | 111 |  97% | 1275 | 1557 |  122% | 75 | 136 |  181% | |
| The Beat Project | 132 | 134 |  102% | 946.5 | 902 |  95% | 210 | 169 |  80% | |
| The Canterbury Academy | 1560 | 1790 |  115% | 40800 | 34205 |  84% | 2625 | 2828 |  108% | |
| The Zone | 75 | 110 |  147% | 1350 | 1748 |  129% | 105 | 130 |  124% | |
| VAWK | 135 | 120 |  89% | 2700 | 1185 |  44% | 270 | 167 |  62% | Management intervention has taken place to address under-performance |
| Walk Tall | 150 | 222 |  148% | 1755 | 2117 |  121% | 75 | 77 |  103% | |
| West Faversham Community Assoc | 315 | 363 |  115% | 5880 | 5241 |  89% | 300 | 328 |  109% | |
| West Kent Extra | 522 | 549 |  105% | 5971.5 | 6028 |  101% | 615 | 673 |  109% | |
| West Kent YMCA | 300 | 338 |  113% | 4125 | 3692 |  90% | 360 | 268 |  74% | |
| Westgate Youth Project | 408 | 437 |  107% | 3840 | 4041 |  105% | 120 | 488 |  407% | |
| YMCA Thames Gateway | 450 | 885 |  197% | 13521 | 8917 |  66% | 757.5 | 527 |  70% | |
| TOTAL | 15975 | 16866 |  106% | 214340 | 198245 |  92% | 30061 | 17845 |  59% | |

Youth Work Observations – Guidance for Assessors

| Grading | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Grade 4 – Outstanding | Work that is consistently delivered well above minimum requirement is innovative, cost effective and contributes to developing a range of young people’s capabilities. A service that raises expectations for the young people and the achievement of wider outcomes in their families and communities. |
| Grade 3 – Good | Work that delivers above the minimum requirements, has elements of innovative practice, is increasingly cost effective and contributes to the development of young people’s capabilities. The service makes some contribution to young people’s outcomes in the family and wider community. |
| Grade 2 – Adequate | Work that meets the minimum requirements for young people, delivering a basic service but which does not demonstrate the ability to improve young people’s aspirations and offers little contribution to developing capabilities or outcomes in a wider context. |
| Grade 1 – Inadequate | Work that fails to deliver minimum requirements is not cost-effective and does not make a contribution to the development of young people’s capabilities nor does it demonstrate an impact upon young people’s outcomes. |

| Grade 4 | Grade3 | Grade 2 | Grade 1 |
|--|---|---|---|
| Grade Descriptors: Context | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environment is clear, welcoming and young people regularly have direct input into the use and design of space and resource. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environment is clear and welcoming, has been designed for use by young people with a range of information well displayed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environment displays information and resources for young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environment is uninviting with little resource or information displayed. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access and inclusivity are integral to the use of space and information, signage and displays support the creation of a positive, safe space for young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access and inclusivity are considered and signage, displays and information reflect the range of needs of young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access and inclusivity are being considered at a basic level in signage, displays and information provided. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access is poor, signage; displays and information fail to create an inclusive atmosphere. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings, vehicles are very well cared for and a positive safety of H&S is clear for adults and young people alike. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings and vehicles are clean, well-cared for and H&S is effectively managed at all times. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings & vehicles are clean and effective and H&S requirements are met. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings or vehicles are in a poor state of repair – H&S issues have not been addressed. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources being used are ideally suited to the groups and have been designed/created with the active participation of young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources are suited to the groups needs with the input of young people having been considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources are appropriate to the group and are adequate for the session. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources are not suited to the group or are generally poor |

| Grade Descriptors: Planning | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session planning is proactively inclusive and anti-oppressive and the needs of specific young people and communities are recognised through participation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims of the session consider equality issues fully and the specific needs of young people are anticipated and planned for. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims of the session consider equality issues and are recognise the general needs of young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims of the session fail to recognise or meet equality issues and needs of the young people. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear and effective youth work curriculum has been developed with clear links to local need and is regularly reviewed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear and effective youth work curriculum is in place which addresses young people's issues and is reviewed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A youth work curriculum which addresses young people's issues is in place. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of an effective youth work curriculum. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session plans are co-produced with young people leading elements of planning. Plans are challenging and clearly develop young people's capabilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning is carried out with young people which allows for a range of challenging activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic planning takes place with some challenging activities considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning is rudimentary and lacks sufficient challenge. Young people have not been involved in the planning of sessions. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation, monitoring and feedback from staff & young people is integral to the working of the project and evidence of change as a result is clear. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and evaluation are regularly carried out with young to a good standard and used to inform future planning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and recording is carried out to a basic level with basic evidence of evaluation and feedback. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and recording is basic or non-existent. |
| Grade Descriptors: Quality of relationships | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people take a lead on welcoming new people to the session and clearly demonstrate a depth of relationship which facilitates learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people demonstrate a depth of relationship with peers and staff which allows development to take place. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people attend regularly and demonstrate a working relationship with peers and staff. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people lack self-awareness and relate poorly to peers, youth workers and observers. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers individually and as a team are able to effectively carry out a range of roles to support young people in interpersonal development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers recognise the range of roles situations may demand and are able to respond appropriately as a team to support young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers maintain clear boundaries and utilise relationship skills to support young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers do not demonstrate an understanding of befriending and educational roles. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear culture, supported by clear, co-produced boundaries encourages the joint ownership of both behaviour and challenge. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour & language are proactively challenged and supported by clear boundaries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour and language are positively challenged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of behaviour, language and positive challenge is not evident. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are able to demonstrate a high level of personal confidence and self-esteem when working with peers, staff and are able to function | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people have good communication and engagement skills and demonstrated good levels of self-esteem. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people communicate to a reasonable level and engage but with limited skill and confidence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people communicate poorly and are disruptive due to a lack of challenging activity and superficial relationships with peers |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| as autonomous members of the group. | | | and staff. |
| Grade Descriptors: Session delivery | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and young people co-deliver the session effectively with flexibility and adaptability to ensure the engagement of all members of the group. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff able to recognise the need to adapt and change plans to meet the need young people and carry this out effectively. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session delivered as planned to a basic standard. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session plan not delivered effectively or rigidly applied inappropriately. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people participate and begin to take ownership of their own, and others learning and development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are motivated by what is on offer and participate well. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people engage in the activities delivered but are recipients more than participants. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people lack engagement, enjoyment and a sense of purpose. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers demonstrate the ability to progress smoothly from adult led activities to young people led during sessions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers actively participate in activities alongside young people learning together. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers supervise and deliver activities safely and effectively. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth workers are little more than supervisors of recreational activities. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A culture of safeguarding and anti-oppressive practice is clear amongst staff and young people which tackles oppressive behaviour & bullying robustly. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppressive behaviour & bullying are proactively challenged through clear boundaries and effective curriculum. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppressive behaviour & bullying are challenged actively. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppressive behaviour & bullying are not challenged appropriately. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some young people are playing a clear leadership role in the session. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are clearly involved in the delivery of the session and well engaged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people show some sign of progress and take a limited ownership of the session. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people take no sense of ownership of the session or organising activities & young people's levels of participation are generally low. |
| Grade Descriptors: Outcomes | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning and development and routes to accreditation are an integral part of all planning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good range of opportunities for development is available for young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to develop and accredit young people are planned for but may be limited. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No opportunities to develop and accredit capabilities are planned for - or taken when the opportunity arises. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All activities offer an element of learning and the potential to lead to more challenging activities including pathways to other settings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear programme of learning, tailored to need, is in place which allows the young person to develop. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth work links to a curriculum which allows young people to learn and develop their capabilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little if any learning takes place and little development of young people's capabilities is evident. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are able to narrate a story of engagement and development through which they can identify key stages of engagement in youth work which has enabled | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people clearly display a range of skills learnt through an ongoing programme of challenge and support. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are able to progress through stages of learning and recognise this taking place. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little evidence exists of a process of youth work development with young people. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| them to develop skills. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people accept responsibility for their actions and are able to partake in restorative approaches to situations, are able to be self-critical and show ambition and aspiration to improve. They understand the impact actions in a wider social context. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people demonstrate a responsible attitude, are aware of the impact of some actions in a wider social context and demonstrate and understanding of restorative approaches. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people have a responsible attitude towards themselves and their wider social context and demonstrate a good understanding of their community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people are unaware of wider social context and consequence of actions. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are regularly celebrated as a normal process in such a way that promotes the positive image of young people within the wider community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are clearly celebrated in the centre and wider community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are celebrated to a basic level within the session and project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of young people are not celebrated. |