Young People's Development Programme evaluation

Final report

Meg Wiggins, Chris Bonell,Helen Burchett, Mary Sawtell, Helen Austerberry, Elizabeth Allen,Vicki Strange

Social Science Research Unit
Institute of Education
University of London with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

July 2008

Acknowledgements

This report is dedicated to the memory of Kerry Williams (April 1975 – July 2005), who worked for the National Youth Agency on YPDP. She was an inspirational colleague, whose dedication and kindness have been much missed.

Table of contents

Methodology
Response rates
Outcome tables

Executive Summary

Young People's Development Programme Evaluation: Final Report

The programme

The Young People's Development Programme (YPDP) was a three-year pilot initiative funded by the English Department of Health in partnership with the Teenage Pregnancy Unit at the (then) Department for Education and Skills. The purpose of YPDP was to test an innovative approach to reducing involvement in substance misuse and preventing teenage conceptions, reducing school absence and exclusion. All of these were key UK government priorities. The programme involved 27 youth projects which aimed to deliver an intensive (6-10 hour per week) one-year holistic programme of education and support to young people aged 13 to 15 who were deemed by professionals, such as teachers, as at-risk of school exclusion, drug misuse and teenage pregnancy.

YPDP was intended to embrace a positive approach, building on young people's potential and involving parents and other key stakeholders in local communities. The range of components offered to these at-risk young people was expected to include:

- education (literacy, numeracy, IT, vocational skills)
- training/employment opportunities
- life skills (e.g. communication, decision-making, goal-setting, relationships, negotiation, anger-management)
- mentoring (weekly one-to-one sessions with staff)
- volunteering (both career-oriented and community-based)
- health education (particularly sexual health, substance misuse)
- arts and sports
- advice on accessing services (health, contraceptive, drug and alcohol services, welfare, benefits advice, counselling and advice, housing)[i]

YPDP was located within existing youth projects who applied to participate in the pilot programme. Those projects that participated received additional funding, as well as support and training provided by the National Youth Agency (NYA - the Training and Co-ordination Agent involved in the programme). Projects were expected to modify their provision to: meet targets for recruiting appropriate young people; provide the specified components in a holistic way; and involve young people for the duration and intensity specified.

YPDP aimed to have an impact on vulnerable young people, using a 'youth development' model. As such, it targeted self-esteem, aiming to provide at-risk young people with opportunities and a different outlook on life. This focus on self-esteem was intended to be coupled with information on specific health, education and social issues, as well as tackling individual challenges in one-to-one sessions. The full YPDP package aimed to address immediate challenges as well as the foundations for participants' future development.

This holistic approach was influenced by several 'youth development programmes' undertaken in the USA. There is no agreed definition of what constitutes a 'youth development programme' but such schemes in general encourage raising self-esteem, positive aspirations and sense of purpose amongst vulnerable young people. The ethos of these programmes is to target the most vulnerable young

people but in doing so emphasise and develop their potential rather than merely address their problems[ii]. They also aim to help young people develop a broad range of skills, attitudes and opportunities relating to health, education, employment and/or other areas. The expectation is that involvement in such programmes will result in greater motivation to avoid pregnancy, substance misuse and other negative health and social outcomes. Youth development programmes take place in a variety of settings and tend to engage with young people continuously over relatively long periods.

The evaluation

The evaluation of the YPDP pilot was carried out by a team of researchers at the Social
Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London, in collaboration with consultants at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. This executive summary presents the key findings regarding the delivery of the programme and the short and medium term impact of the programme on participants. It includes data gathered through: baseline and two follow up questionnaires and interviews in case study sites with over 2700 young people; questionnaires and focus groups with staff; as well as monthly monitoring statistics.

Our evaluation comprised an impact study with a non-randomized, matched design, in conjunction with a detailed process evaluation. We matched the 27 YPDP projects with 27 comparison areas by local deprivation levels and teenage pregnancy rates as well as whether the projects were from the voluntary or statutory sector. Initially we drew our comparison sample of young people from youth service providers in the comparison areas. These providers had all bid to DH for funding to provide YPDP and had been shortlisted, but were ultimately unsuccessful. However, we recruited additional young people from pupil referral units (PRUs) in some of these 27 areas in order to recruit sufficient young people to our comparison arm who were similar to YPDP participants in terms of their degree of vulnerability. This was necessary because YPDP providers were aiming to recruit a more vulnerable group of young people than is normally the case in standard youth work, and many YPDP providers were also recruiting from PRUs. Our aim was to recruit young people in comparison sites who might have been referred to YPDP had it been offered in their area. Our comparison, therefore was not of young people receiving no provision, but of young people receiving services from various services engaged in delivering work of variable quality.

Key findings

Delivering YPDP

- In its first year, the YPDP projects experienced early challenges in developing and implementing the programme. Like many other new initiatives (e.g. Sure Start), the programme took time to recruit staff and participants and embed policies and service delivery. By the end of the first year of the pilot, nearly all 27 projects were operating a programme that offered the key components of YPDP.

- The YPDP programme successfully met its targets in terms of recruiting the expected numbers of at-risk 13 to 15 year old young people. Over the three

years of YPDP 2371 young people participated to some extent in the programme. The projects were able to retain and engage many vulnerable young people in relatively intensive provision for a prolonged period (on average 173 hours over 40 weeks), although the average amount of time young people spent on YPDP was less than the DH had originally targeted. This did still represent a significant increase in the level of engagement that many of these projects had provided prior to YPDP.

- Overall YPDP was a programme successful at delivering a holistic range of activities to young people. For the majority of young people this included some exposure to the range of expected components (education, life skills, health, sports, arts, mentoring, volunteering and access to services). There were significantly more YPDP than comparison young people who had participated in a wide breadth of activities on the project they attended.

- The pilot projects operationalised YPDP in diverse ways. Ultimately this meant that there was not one clear model of YPDP being delivered, despite intensive work by the NYA to limit inappropriate diversity. YPDP was influenced by youth development programmes undertaken in the USA, but was, from the outset, intended to be shorter in duration and more targeted towards specific groups of at-risk young people. In practice, other differences emerged. Notably, the young people received less weekly mentoring and fewer referrals to health providers than expected and a greater proportion experienced YPDP as an alternative education provision rather than an addition to mainstream education.

- The YPDP programme was well liked by the young people, the staff that implemented the pilot, parents and other key stakeholders. Young people were especially positive about the activities on offer and their relationships with staff. Staff liked working in a more holistic way with young people and thought that through YPDP they were offering a better service to their participants. Other local stakeholders – schools and other agencies – had high awareness of YPDP and valued it as an additional community resource.

  '(My YPDP project) is a totally different world [from school]. You can trust everyone. Everyone has been through what you have or similar. The respect level is so high, it's unreal.' (YPDP young person)

  'I remember kids faces smiling. Good activities – canoeing, skiing, motorbikings, go-carting, white water rafting, climbing. The staff were great to talk to and it was very good.' (YPDP young person, reflecting back on time on project)

  '*[YPDP] is very, very highly valued, highly prized resource and it has to be targeted at the right children who are gonna get most out of it.*'' (Deputy head teacher)

- In-depth economic analysis suggested that YPDP cost approximately £2500 per participant. Funding from DH for YPDP did not appear to cover the full costs of running the programme so that projects cross-subsidised YPDP by about £500 per participant, this relating chiefly to overhead and core staff costs.

Making a difference to young people

To determine the extent of the impact of YPDP, we carried out rigorous statistical analyses, using descriptive statistics and logistic regression to explore the impact of YPDP on a series of pre-specified outcome measures. To ensure that the comparison was a fair one, we used statistical adjustments to adjust for baseline differences and weight for different rates of follow up between the young people in the YPDP and comparison groups.

- There were mixed findings in terms of perceived benefits of the YPDP programme. More young people in YPDP than comparison sites perceived the programme as having been beneficial to them (both at the first follow up point when they were still involved in the project, and afterwards at second follow up). A greater number of young people in YPDP than comparison sites achieved accreditation as part of their project.

- Our qualitative work in case study sites provided examples of participants who reported that involvement in the project had helped them, for example, to change how they spent their time and with whom they spent it. Improvements in self-confidence and the ability to get on with people better were key themes emerging from interviews with YPDP participants and staff.

- Some outcomes improved with time ('positive distance travelled') for both YPDP and comparison young people: with improvements on numbers truanting and those involved with the police.

- However, our comparative outcome analysis did not suggest that participation in YPDP was associated with higher rates of positive outcomes than in the comparison group. Those engaged in YPDP were no more likely than those from comparison sites to report on their questionnaires positive outcomes related to self-esteem and mental wellbeing, substance misuse, or contact with police. For young women attending YPDP the statistical comparisons suggested that they had significantly less positive outcomes than the comparison group relating to truanting, temporary exclusion, expectation of teenage parenthood, sexual activity and teenage pregnancy. Possible factors relating to our methodology and the programme that may have influenced these comparative statistical findings are discussed further below.

Discussion and recommendations

YPDP has shown it is possible to engage at-risk young people in an intensive programme, over relatively long periods. It provides evidence that the most vulnerable young people will participate actively in a broad package of provision which they find engaging; and that it is possible to integrate a health agenda into youth work with this group. YPDP has also shown that these young people are able to gain accreditation and to perceive changes in their own behaviour and aspiration as a result of participation.

The YPDP programme undoubtedly involved some excellent youth work and many individual examples of personal progress for young people. However, ultimately, our statistical comparative analysis did not show YPDP to add value across a range of pre-specified outcomes compared with the other services being delivered in comparison sites. Furthermore and unfortunately, young women participating in YPDP were significantly more likely to report truanting, temporary exclusions and expectation of being a teenage parent at first follow-up, and sexual activity and teenage pregnancy at second follow-up.

Various reasons for these findings could exist:

1. Methodological issues:

    -   the comparison group may have been different in other ways in addition to those that we adjusted for in statistical analyses;

    -   the variations in follow-up rates between the YPDP and comparison groups may have influenced the results (although we weighted for this in our analyses);

2. Delivery issues

    -   the comparison group may have offered a high standard of youth service, making additional benefit of YPDP difficult to show;

    -   the YPDP sites may have undergone a period of adjustment in offering the programme that the comparison sites did not experience - this may have influenced results, especially in the first year;

    -   YPDP was not delivered fully in the way it was intended - the reduced intensity, less structured programme and disparity in delivery models may have reduced the possibility of showing a programme effect;

3. Programme issues

    -   the planned YPDP intervention was for one year (40 weeks was achieved) - this may have been too short an intervention to show significant impacts;

    -   unintended negative effects have been shown in other interventions that target at-risk young people, either because of a) the network effects of bringing together groups of young people already involved in risk behaviours; or b) the labelling of young people as problematic or lacking in potential - either of these may have influenced the findings in YPDP;

    -   the possibility that the youth development approach is not as appropriate in the UK setting as it was in the US.

In summary, the findings of the YPDP evaluation are complex: the process data points to a programme that was popular and generally well delivered in a holistic way to a group of very challenging and vulnerable young people. Participants and staff regarded participation as potentially beneficial. We found some support for this in: the extent of engagement with previously difficult-to-reach young people; the accreditation they received; and the distance travelled stories of many. However the evidence of *additional* impact from YPDP on short and medium term outcomes was not clear cut and there was also some evidence that some outcomes were more positive among the comparison group. The evaluation team believes that a combination of reasons best explain this situation: the difficulties of providing an intervention in a consistent manner; the networking effect of bringing together the riskiest young people in YPDP; the assumption that a relatively short-term programme can alone substantially influence long-term, entrenched problems in the often chaotic lives of vulnerable young people; and the methodological challenges of measuring and making a fair comparison.

Recommendations

-   We recommend that any future implementations of the targeted youth development model in the UK should be subjected to a randomised controlled

trial evaluation. This should be preceded by an initial phase to refine the programme and ensure implementation is fully underway and programme 'fidelity' is maximised. Any such implementation should also employ a 'logic model' to clarify the nature of the intervention and the pathway expected to lead to key outcomes. This would guide implementation as well as evaluation and monitoring. Any such implementation would benefit from a training and coordination agent to provide support as well as to monitor and support programme fidelity. Additionally, any such programme should be funded at least to the level that our economic evaluation identified as the true overall cost of YPDP.

- The set of outcomes on which the DH hoped for impact as a result of YPDP were ambitious. Although the evaluation team agrees that these are appropriate long-term goals for a social intervention of this nature, we recommend that future programmes are also given formal outcome targets that are of a more intermediate nature.

- We recommend that those who implement programmes using a youth development model, or one that targets vulnerable young people, should pay careful attention to the provision of these services for young women and consider the feasibility of working with separate groups of young women and young men. Additionally it should ensure that intervention does not inadvertently bring participants into contact with a more risky group of friends and associates. This might be achieved by: separating provision for those of different ages; working with broader groups of young people defined in terms of their general social disadvantage (as CAS-Carrera has done) rather by their particular risk of certain outcomes (as YPDP has done); and working with pre-existing friendship groups.

- To minimize any possibilities of labelling young people as 'problematic', we would recommend that youth development programmes should not in effect become a form of alternative education for vulnerable or disaffected young people but should continue to complement schools.

- Further consideration should be given to the length and timing of future interventions, as staff felt that a longer programme offered at an earlier age would have had greater impact.

1.   Introduction

1.1   The Young People's Development Programme

The Young People's Development Programme (YPDP) was a three year pilot scheme offered to vulnerable young people via voluntary and statutory youth services in 27 locations in England between 2004 and 2007. The programme was originally devised by the UK Department of Health's (DH's) Teenage Pregnancy Unit (now based in the Department for Children, Schools and Families) in collaboration with the Substance Misuse Team in the Department of Health. The Children's and Young People's Health Team in the DH had oversight for the pilot scheme since 2003 and provided the funding in conjunction with the Teenage Pregnancy Unit. Delivery of YPDP was co-ordinated by the National Youth Agency (NYA), a registered charity that is the national expert and development organisation in youth work in England.

YPDP aims and objectives
YPDP was targeted at 13-15 year-old young people living in areas with high rates of deprivation and teenage conceptions, who were deemed by teachers, social workers and/or other staff to be at risk of school exclusion, teenage pregnancy and/or substance misuse. The programme aimed to offer these vulnerable young people a holistic set of structured activities run by youth services in intensive weekly provision over a period of one year. These varied activities aimed to focus on young people's health and education as well as their broader social development.

YPDP was intended to embrace a positive approach, building on young people's potential and involving parents and other key stakeholders in local communities. Specific programme content was to be determined by the individual projects who were delivering services. However the range of components offered to these at-risk young people was expected to include:
- education (literacy, numeracy, IT, vocational skills)
- training/employment opportunities
- life skills (e.g. communication, decision-making, goal-setting, relationships, negotiation, anger-management)
- mentoring (weekly one-to-one sessions with staff)
- volunteering (both career-oriented and community-based)
- health education (particularly sexual health, substance misuse)
- arts and sports
- advice on accessing services (health, contraceptive, drug and alcohol services, welfare, benefits advice, counselling and advice, housing)[1]

Through a competitive tendering exercise youth projects in England applied to participate in YPDP. Those who applied agreed to fulfil certain delivery criteria. These delivery expectations for the YPDP projects included:

- Recruiting three annual cohorts of at-risk young people, to begin receiving services in April of each year of the pilot. Annual target recruitment numbers were pre-determined depending on the capacity of individual projects, and ranged between 14 and 32 young people per year. The

---

[1] Section 6.1 outlines the proportions of expected time that young people would spend on each of these components during their programme involvement. Department of Health. (2004) *Young People's Development Programme Briefing*, London.

overall recruitment target for the three years of the programme was 2098 young people.

- Offering a holistic package of activities involving the eight components, based on individual young people's specific needs.

- Offering the service intensively – with the expectation of six to ten hours of engagement per week with each participant, over a one year period.

- Participating actively with the evaluation, including providing monthly monitoring information on individual participants.

In exchange for delivering these aspects, YPDP projects were offered:
- Three years of funding from the DH.

- Individual support from the NYA to develop and implement the programme (with specific support for administrative and financial elements, information provision and networking opportunities).

- A training programme for staff.

YPDP aimed to have an impact on vulnerable young people, using a 'youth development' model. As such, it targeted self-esteem and the whole person, aiming to provide at-risk young people with opportunities and a different outlook on life. This focus on self-esteem was intended to be coupled with information on specific health, education and social issues, as well as tackling individual challenges in one-to-one sessions. Additionally YPDP aimed to provide the link to appropriate services, such as family planning clinics and substance misuse workers. The full YPDP package thus aimed to address immediate challenges as well as the foundations for participants' future development. The programme aimed to have impact on the following outcomes relating to targets of the Drug, Sexual Health and Teenage Pregnancy Strategies[1]:

- reduced rate of conceptions amongst young women;
- reduced rate of sexually transmitted infections amongst young people;
- reduced rate of illegal drug use amongst those under 25.

It also aimed to impact on a broader range of health, educational and social outcomes:

- reduced level of alcohol consumption;
- reduced school exclusions;
- reduced authorized and unauthorized absenteeism;
- improved educational attainment;
- increased post-16 participation in education, employment and training;
- reduced offending rates and convictions;
- improved mental health and self-esteem;
- greater involvement in volunteering;
- increased preparedness and aspirations for adult life.

The YPDP programme thus aimed to deliver an holistic set of activities to young people. This breadth of activities was intended to ensure that all young people would find some of the activities on offer appealing. It should be noted that a formal 'logic model' was not developed for YPDP. Such models are increasingly used to define

the intended causal pathway that might relate an intervention to its short, intermediate and long-term outcomes.

This holistic approach was influenced by several 'youth development programmes' undertaken in the USA, and in particular the Children's Aid Society (CAS) Carrera Program[2] (see box 1). This was an intervention that several reviews had identified as of particular promise[3]. There is no agreed definition of what constitutes a 'youth development programme' but such schemes in general encourage raising self-esteem, positive aspirations and sense of purpose amongst vulnerable young people. The ethos of these programmes is to target the most vulnerable young people but in doing so emphasise and develop their potential rather than merely address their problems[4]. They also aim to help young people develop a broad range of skills, attitudes and opportunities relating to health, education, employment and/or other areas. The expectation is that involvement in such programmes will result in greater motivation to avoid pregnancy, substance misuse and other negative health and social outcomes. Youth development programmes take place in a variety of settings and tend to engage with young people continuously over relatively long periods.

1.2 UK Policy relevance

The YPDP model has relevance to a number of key policy initiatives, for instance: the Youth Matters Green Paper (2005)[5]; the Children's Act 2004; the National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity Services[6]; and the RESPECT agenda[7]. YPDP also was included as a commitment by the government in the 'Choosing Health' White Paper[8].

Given the promising evidence highlighted in reviews of youth development as a way to reduce teenage pregnancy, having the YPDP programme as a trial of youth development in a UK context was deemed useful for informing the UK Government's Teenage Pregnancy Strategy. This Strategy aims to halve the under-18 conception rate in the UK[9].

---

[2] Philliber S, et al (2002) Preventing pregnancy and improving health care access among teenagers: an evaluation of the Children's Aid Society-Carrera Program. Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 34(5): 244-251
http://www.childrensaidsociety.org/youthdevelopment/carrera

[3] Kirby D (2001) *Emerging Answers: Research Findings on Programs to Reduce Teen Pregnancy.* Washington DC: National Campaign to Reduce Teen Pregnancy

Harden A, Brunton G, Fletcher A, *et al* (2006) *Young people, pregnancy and social exclusion: a systematic synthesis of research evidence to identify effective, appropriate and promising approaches for prevention and support.* London: EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Dennison C. (2004) Teenage *pregnancy: an overview of the research evidence.* London: Health Development Agency.

[4] Schulman S and Davies T. (2007) *Evidence of the impact of the 'Youth Development Model' on outcomes for young people – A literature review.* Leicester: National Youth Agency.

[5] Department for Education and Skills (2005) *Youth Matters,* London: The Stationery Office.

[6] Department for Education and Skills and Department of Health. (2004) *National Service Framework for children, young people and maternity services.* London: The Stationery Office.

[7] Home Office (2006) *Respect Action Plan: Give Respect, Get Respect.* London: The Stationery Office.

[8] HM Government. (2004) *Choosing Health: Making healthy choices easier.* London: The Stationery Office.

[9] Department for Education and Skills (2006*) Teenage Pregnancy: Accelerating the strategy to 2010.* London: The Stationery Office.

YPDP is also an example of a programme offering integrated, targeted youth support. The Targeted Youth Support (TYS) reforms are a core feature of the Youth Matters Green Paper, and confer on local authorities the responsibility to ensure that they provide *'coherent, young person-centred delivery of information, advice and guidance, support, development opportunities and positive activities'*[10] for vulnerable teenagers. Additionally, the structured activities of YPDP supports the positive activities model set out in the UK Government's recent 10 year strategy for young people, *Aiming High*[11].

Box 1

Children's AID Society-Carrera Program

Intervention – After-school intensive youth-work provision where staff aimed to: offer parent-like support; focus on young people's potential; offer holistic services; and involve parents. Components included highly structured academic tutoring (the most frequent activity) as well as work preparation, sex education, arts, sports and referrals to mental and physical health interventions.

Targeting – Disadvantaged 13-15 year-olds . About 20% from workless households and almost all were Black or Hispanic.

Dose and duration – Aimed to engage young people 5 days per week, 3 hours per day for 3 years. About 80% of young people were involved in some way after 3 years with about half still participating in all components (among these the mean monthly contact was 22 hours, i.e. less than targeted).

Evaluation – Individual RCT initially across 6 sites in NYC[2] (Philiber et al 2002) later extended outside New York (Philiber et al 2001)[12]. Reported reductions for young women in sexual activity and pregnancies, and increases in use of contraception at last sex. These findings did not extend to young men.

Differences between planned YPDP model and CAS- Carrera programme

Targeting - YPDP to target disadvantaged young people who were specifically identified as at risk of teenage pregnancy, substance misuse or school exclusion.

Dose and duration- YPDP planned less involvement – 1 year programme rather than 3 year. Target weekly participation on YPDP intended to be 6-10 hours per week versus CAS-Carerra target of 15 hours per week.

---

[10] Department for Education and Skills, (2007) *Targeted youth support – A guide.* London: The Stationery Office.
[11] HM Treasury and Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007) *Aiming High for young people: a ten year strategy for positive activities.* London: The Stationery Office.
[12] Philiber S, Kaye JW, Herrling S (2001) *The National Evaluation of the Children's Aid Society Carrera Model Program to Prevent Teen Pregnancy.* New York, Philiber Research Associations.

1.3   Learning from the YPDP Evaluation

The YPDP evaluation has been carried out by an independent team of researchers based at the Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London in collaboration with consultants at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. The evaluation team did not have a vested interest in the success of the programme. The evaluators worked alongside the national policy makers, NYA as the Training and Co-ordination Agent, and local staff from the launch of the programme until the end of the three year pilot.

A key aim of the YPDP evaluation was to provide a rigorous, independent assessment of whether such a programme might be feasible and acceptable to deliver in the UK and, if so, whether it would bring about similar benefits to those seen in youth development programmes in the USA. It is hoped that the results of this evaluation will be used to inform national provision of support for at-risk young people. The design and methods used in the evaluation are described in section 2.

This report will focus on evaluation findings from the three year pilot of YPDP regarding:

- delivery of a holistic youth programme;

- recruiting and engaging vulnerable young people;

- the impact that YPDP had on key short and medium term outcomes for participants;

- the costs of providing the service.

The lessons learned from the YPDP pilot are highly relevant to those planning and providing educational, recreational and support services for vulnerable young people.

2.   How did we evaluate YPDP?

This section provides a brief overview of the design and methods used by the evaluation team. A full description of these is available in Appendix 1.

2.1   Evaluation aim and design

The aim of the YPDP evaluation was to answer key questions regarding:
- the processes of planning and providing services to young people;
- determining whether the programme had an impact on the lives of vulnerable young people; and
- exploring the cost-effectiveness of this programme.

To answer these questions, the evaluation was designed with several components.

Process evaluation
First, the evaluation undertook a detailed process evaluation which allowed us to understand: how YPDP was delivered across the 27 pilot projects; who participated and their degree of involvement; and the challenges experienced when introducing this pilot programme. This component of the evaluation included data collection from all pilot projects as well as detailed work in a purposive sub-sample of 7 case study sites. Process evaluation data was also collected in comparison sites including 4 case-study sites.

Impact study
Secondly, as the original brief was to carry out as rigorous an evaluation as possible, we included an impact study which compared the outcomes for YPDP participants with those of vulnerable young people recruited from various agencies within 27 sites that were not part of the programme. This comparison was a matched non-randomised design, which allowed us to explore the 'added value' of YPDP.

We selected our outcomes in order to reflect the aims of the YPDP programme, informed by our awareness of the likely prevalence of outcomes relating to these in the target population and our knowledge of existing established measures and proxy measures. In terms of the aims of YPDP relating to the Drug, Sexual Health and Teenage Pregnancy Strategies, we anticipated that we might be able to detect effects of the intervention on teenage pregnancy and drug use (see below for the details of our power calculation), but not on sexually transmitted infections given the low incidence of infections among younger teenagers. We therefore aimed to measure experience of heterosexual activity, as well as numbers of sexual partners and frequency of condom use in the last six months as proxies for sexually transmitted infections and teenage pregnancy. We focused on cannabis use in the previous 6 months as our drug measure since cannabis is by far the most commonly used drug in this population and we examined frequency of use in order to provide a sensitive measure of incremental change. In addition we included truancy in the previous 6 months as a proxy for drug use[13]. We used well established measures of these outcomes, employed on our previous 'RIPPLE' trial of sex education[14]. Selection of our other outcomes is discussed in Appendix 1.

---

[13] Lloyd, C (1998) Risk factors for problem drug use: identifying vulnerable groups. *Drugs: education, prevention and policy.* 5(3): 217-232.
[14] Stephenson JM, Strange V et al (2004) Pupil-led sex education in England (RIPPLE study): cluster-randomised intervention trial. *Lancet.* 364(9431):338-46.

Our original statistical power calculation was based on 35 YPDP and 35 comparison sites with an estimated 2,300 participating young people in each arm. This sample size, with a 5% level of significance, 80% power and an estimated intra-cluster correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.05 was to enable us to detect a 18% change in pre-16 heterosexual activity based on an assumed rate of 50% among the target population of vulnerable young people (informed by our previous RIPPLE trial). With the subsequent reduction in number of intervention sites to 27 (and therefore similarly the number of comparison sites), we would still be powered to detect a 20% change in sexual activity.

We originally proposed to undertake a cluster-randomized evaluation but this was not possible because DH selected YPDP provider agencies by a competitive tendering exercise rather than via random allocation. We matched the 27 intervention sites with the 27 comparison sites by local deprivation levels and teenage pregnancy rates as well as whether the projects were from the voluntary or statutory sector. Initially we drew our comparison sample of young people from youth service providers in the comparison areas. These agencies had all bid to DH for funding to provide YPDP and had been shortlisted, but were ultimately unsuccessful. However, we quickly decided to recruit additional young people from pupil referral units (PRUs) in some of these 27 areas in order to recruit sufficient young people to our comparison arm who were similar to YPDP participants in terms of degree of vulnerability. This was necessary because YPDP providers were aiming to recruit a more vulnerable group of young people than is normally the case in standard youth work, and many YPDP providers were also recruiting from PRUs. Our aim was to recruit young people in comparison sites who might have been referred to YPDP had it been offered in their area. Our comparison, therefore, was not of young people receiving no provision, but of young people receiving various services from agencies engaged in delivering work of variable quality.

We were aware from the outset that because it was non-random such a comparison would not supply a perfect match for YPDP projects and participants. YPDP providers were likely to differ from youth work providers in comparison sites in that the former but not the latter had successfully bid to provide YPDP and therefore probably had greater capacity at the point when the programme started. Young people in YPDP and comparison arms were likely to differ somewhat from each other, in spite of our efforts to match these. These 'potential confounding factors' might bring about differences in outcomes between our YPDP and comparison group over and above any differences arising from the effects of the interventions each received (see Appendix 1 for list of confounding factors). Appendix 1 outlines how we identified a comprehensive range of potential confounders in order that we could judge how well our groups were matched and – where we found differences at baseline - we could statistically adjust for these in our logistic regression analyses of outcomes.

We also explored impact on specific individual young people via qualitative data from interviews and open-ended questions on the surveys. While such qualitative data cannot provide authoritative information on the overall impact of the programme because it relies on semi-structured data from a relatively small sample of individuals, it can nonetheless provide more in-depth data and offer some corroboration of quantitative impact findings.

Economic evaluation
Thirdly, the evaluation included an economic evaluation, which identified key features relating to the costs of providing the YPDP programme, and explored these in more depth within case study sites.

2.2   Data collection methods

Evidence was gathered in a variety of ways, to ensure that the broadest possible picture was developed. Methods used for data collection included:
- monthly project monitoring records for all 27 YPDP projects (including individual records of participant involvement);
- questionnaires with 1637 YPDP young people and 1087 comparison young people at three time points - baseline (approx two months after joining YPDP), nine months after joining YPDP and 18 months after joining focusing on key short and medium term outcomes related to health behaviours, education, police involvement, mental health, personal aspiration, as well at personal demographic details and questions about the projects they attended;
- YPDP staff questionnaires (annual) and focus groups (once);
- comparison site staff questionnaires (twice);
- economic questionnaire; and
- observation of training sessions, meetings and conferences.

All data were collected with individuals' informed, written[15] consent. Our study was approved by the Institute of Education research ethics committee.

Questionnaires were completed by young people either at the site or some other convenient location (e.g. the project mini-bus). Where necessary (because of literacy problems or because the questionnaire was completed via a telephone interview) researchers read out the questions and indicated options for response. Data from questionnaires completed at baseline and each follow-up were linked together using anonymised identification codes which could be linked to participants' names via a key accessible only by the evaluation team.

Further in-depth interviews were carried out in seven of the YPDP sites which acted as 'case studies' – with young people, staff and local partner services. There was also in-depth interviewing carried out by the evaluation in four comparison case study sites. All in-depth interviews and focus groups were conducted in private with researchers, and were audio-recorded and transcribed in full.

2.3   Data analysis methods

Qualitative data were subject to thematic content analysis to explore key topics in relation to our research questions. Two or three researchers independently analysed each transcript noting codes on the transcripts and summarising key themes. These then met to agree on a shared coding strategy and read through each transcript a second time undertaking further coding.

Quantitative data was subject to basic descriptive statistics as well as logistic regression analysis to explore the impact of YPDP on a series of pre-specified outcome measures. We identified measures that reflected the aims and objectives that were set for YPDP at the outset of the programme. Where we felt that an objective could not be measured or would not be common enough to study statistically, we identified a 'proxy' measure (e.g. contraceptive use at last sex as a proxy for acquiring a sexually transmitted infection). We took this approach to pre-specifying outcome measures so that we did not simply trawl a large number of outcome measures searching for significant findings (which carries with it the risk of

---

[15] Where interviews were carried out over the telephone, this consent was verbally given.

identifying chance, false-positive findings) or reporting only the results relating to outcomes where these fitted any preconceptions we might have had (which carries with it the risk of bias).

We undertook logistic regression in order to adjust for potential confounders. As expected, young people in comparison sites did differ slightly from those in YPDP (See Appendix 3). The comparison young people were slightly less ethnically diverse and socio-economically disadvantaged but slightly more engaged in risk behaviours at baseline. The comparison group attended PRUs somewhat more often than those participating in YPDP. Crucially for our analysis, the two groups substantially overlapped; they were not totally different.

We used logistic regression to adjust for these baseline differences to minimize as far as possible the extent to which these, rather than young people's subsequent experiences, might explain any differences between intervention and comparison groups. Our statistical analysis also adjusted for the 'clustered' nature of our data[16].

A further analysis also weighted for the variation in loss to follow-up between the YPDP and comparison arms. Considering the vulnerability of the young people involved, our evaluation was relatively successful in retaining these young people, including the most vulnerable, at each follow-up (see Appendix 1 for response rates). Furthermore, it was not the case that the most vulnerable young people were retained more successfully in the YPDP rather than the comparison group; this varied across different measures of vulnerability at baseline (see Appendix 1). In order to minimize the possibility that any differences in follow-up between our two arms could explain our results we checked for this by performing a weighted analysis. This analysis identified factors at baseline that predicted which young people would be less likely to be retained at follow-up. We then gave more weight to the outcomes reported by young people who reported these predictive factors at baseline but did remain in our sample at follow-up.

In addition, we undertook an additional analysis of follow-up 2 outcomes including propensity score as a categorical covariate in models, as a check on the effects estimated in our logistic regression models. This is appropriate where the number of cases of an outcome is small relative to the number of variables being adjusted for (see Appendix 1).

Following the main logistic regression analysis on the pre-specified outcomes, we carried out some exploratory analyses to see whether any aspect of programme function may have had additional influence on these outcomes: for instance the intensity of the programme delivered; the statutory vs. voluntary nature of the project, whether participants attended PRUs etc. Also, additional analyses were carried out to see if there were 'interactions' whether outcomes differed according to participants' gender or year of participation.

The statistical results, including odds ratios and confidence intervals for unadjusted, adjusted, weighted and propensity-score-based analyses are presented in Appendix 3.

---

[16] e.g. the cluster unit was the project they attended, which allowed for the fact that young people attending a project are likely to be similar to each other in ways that we have not otherwise measured.

3. What was involved in getting YPDP up and running?

YPDP was a pilot programme devised by the DH at national level, which asked 27 existing youth services to adapt their working in order to explore the feasibility, acceptability and appropriateness of the YPDP model at a local level.

This section will address:
- the background to these pilot projects;
- key issues involved in setting up of YPDP in existing local youth projects; and
- will provide some information about the services running in comparison projects.

3.1 Background to the YPDP projects – who were they?

Twenty-seven youth projects across England were selected for YPDP (see figure 1) via a competitive tendering exercise run by DH. The YPDP sites represented a variety of areas (e.g. urban, rural, seaside) with varying deprivation and teenage conception rates. They also covered a range of different baseline styles of youth work, including both statutory and voluntary projects, long established projects that ran a number of programmes and some newer projects which concentrated almost solely on delivering YPDP (see appendix 1, table 7 for more information)

Figure 1

Projects varied in their provision prior to YPDP as to whether attendance was:
- *compulsory,* in lieu of some or all school attendance (8); or
- *voluntary*, in addition to school attendance (19).

The former either worked closely with schools, taking groups of young people for set periods or whole school days, or offered alternative education provision to young

people not currently attending mainstream school. These services tended to offer most of their activities during school hours. Sites with voluntary attendance tended to work in a more informal 'youth club' style. Although they may have had links with schools and other education providers, they were not formally offering services to or for them. Consequently activities tended to be run outside of school hours and worked with young people regardless of their current education provision.

Prior to YPDP there were three main models of project delivery that were used by projects. Some projects focused on a particular activity type and, although running occasional extra activities, spent most of their time in one area. For example, some projects focused on delivering outdoor sports activities, motor mechanics work, or drama and arts activities (see box 2). Six of the YPDP projects fitted this model prior to the programme commencing.

Box 2

Example of 'Focused Activity' Model of Project Delivery

Havering Motorvations (Havering, Essex)
This was a programme providing a range of accredited educational elements with a focus on car maintenance. It had a five-year track record in engaging difficult and excluded young people, aiming to enhance their future career and training prospects.

A second model of project delivery was a more generic model, similar to traditional 'youth work/club' delivery. A range of activities were offered, including drop-ins and/or one-to-one work (see box 3). This was the most common model, with sixteen of the YPDP projects fitted this model prior to the programme commencing.

Box 3

Example of more generic model of provision

Scotswood Area Strategy (Newcastle)
This agency offered a range of opportunities for hard-to-reach young people, including courses, detached street work, informal learning programmes, work with non-school attenders, and girls' nights. Young people bid for funds for individual projects from a local 'key fund'.

A final model focused on providing alternative education for those not currently in, or struggling with, mainstream education (see box 4). Five of the YPDP projects fitted this model prior to the programme commencing.

Box 4

Example of alternative education provider

Stepping Forward (Swindon)
This project offered an accredited education programme for young people who were either excluded or on the verge of being excluded from mainstream education, many of whom had not attended school for over a year.

While almost all projects delivered activities to groups of young people prior to YPDP, the extent to which one-to-one work was undertaken varied.

Box 5

The Comparison Projects – Who were they?

Providers in the comparison arm offered forms of provision that reflect the range generally available in the UK. There were 30 different projects, which were located in 27 areas in England (see figure 2). As with the YPDP projects, they included projects that had both compulsory (16) and voluntary attendance (14). Additionally they incorporated all three models of project delivery that YPDP projects were engaged in prior to their entry into the programme: 11 offered generic provision; five were 'focused activity' projects; and 14 were alternative education providers. (For more information, see appendix 2, table 7)

As the majority of the comparison projects were selected from those bidding for YPDP funding, they incorporated some projects that were already doing innovative, holistic work with disadvantaged young people. It is possible that as a result of the bidding process for YPDP that some comparison projects chose nonetheless to follow something approximating to a more 'YPDP type model' than they had done previously, although we found no evidence of this. None of the comparison projects received extra funding or the support of the NYA to do this, and none in practice provided a programme that offered the full mix of components of the intended model of YPDP. Some of the PRUs – in which we recruited about a fifth of the comparison group - provided services at a comparable level of hours-per-week as that targeted for the YPDP programme, but other comparison sites did not reach this level of intensity.

Examples from the comparison projects of the three main models of project provision are detailed below:

Example of more generic model of provision - a voluntary sector comparison project operated a youth club with young people from the one secondary school in town. The main activities were offered at two drop in venues (a church hall and a youth centre), and included table tennis, music and refreshments. Additionally, some limited out-reach work was done by staff in the community with disaffected young people.

Focused activity model – A comparison project specialised in offering workshops and short courses in music and multimedia activities for young people of all ages. The project had considerable experience of working with young people with disabilities or who were difficult to engage.

Alternative education provider – A comparison project offered alternative education in a neighbourhood based, youth work setting. Young people who were attending the local PRU or on the verge of exclusion from a mainstream school were offered one or more days at the project per week as part of a package of education provision. More young people in the comparison than the YPDP group attended PRUs and so we adjusted for this in our analysis of outcomes.

Figure 2

Comparison - 27 Areas

Sunderland
Stockton
Durham
Castleford
Rochdale
Barrow in Furness
Bradford
Fleetwood
Nottingham
Preston
Leicester
Manchester
St Helens
Norwich
Stoke
Ramsgate
Birmingham (2)
Southwark
Catford
Plymouth
Reading
Brent
Newton
Sutton
Abbot (2)
Eastbourne

3.2 Early implementation issues

There were a number of challenges in setting up YPDP projects, whether this was to adapt an existing service or create a completely new one within an existing project. In the first year, nearly all the projects were slow to take on board all the necessary changes that being part of the YPDP pilot required. This led to a number of delays in developing and implementing the full programme in a number of sites.

The variations in forms of attendance (i.e. compulsory or voluntary) and model of project delivery meant that while some projects found only minor alterations to their existing service were required in order to deliver the YPDP model, for others it was more of a challenge.

> *'I think [our YPDP programme] is functioning really well, I think solely because we had the sort of the components in place already, we were working in that way already so session plans were in place.'* (YPDP manager)

Projects which previously were working to a model that was distinctly different from YPDP were sometimes initially reluctant to make substantial changes or to incorporate specific aspects of the YPDP programme elements. Others were willing to do so, but still found this difficult to implement.

The particular challenges that contributed to delays included:
- delays in issuing programme contracts from the DH;

- delays in recruitment of young people in year one;
- delays in staff recruitment;
- the expected contact time with young people;
- agreeing an accreditation programme to use;
- and for a minority, a lack of shared vision about what being part of YPDP meant.

Overall the YPDP experience suggests that even with a clear plan for implementation based on a thorough understanding of local needs, the development and implementation of a new programme like YPDP takes at least one year to become reasonably operational. The delays in programme establishment were even seen where implementing YPDP only involved adding new elements to existing services and with the back-up support of the NYA as an external Training and Co-ordination Agent. This experience of slow implementation mirrors that of other recent policy initiatives, such as Sure Start[17]. Despite the delays and challenges faced, a great deal of high quality work was carried out by the majority of YPDP projects.

Further details relating to the early delivery of the YPDP programme can be found in sections 3 – 5 and 8 of this report, and also in the two evaluation interim reports.[18]

Key points – Background and early implementation

- Prior to YPDP there was a wide variation amongst the 27 selected pilot projects in terms of their existing structures and ways of working.

- The comparison group of projects was similarly varied in the services they were offering vulnerable young people (in the absence of the funding and support being given to the YPDP pilot sites). There were more alternative education providers and PRUs amongst the comparisons. Because of the differing levels of support that may be offered in a more structured PRU setting, to make our comparison more fair, we adjusted for PRU attendance in all of our statistical analyses.

- In the first year of the YPDP pilot, many of the projects faced a number of delays in developing and implementing the full programme. This experience reiterates that of other government pilot programmes that took at least a year to become fully operational.

---

[17] Tunstill J, Alnock et al. (2002) *Sure Start National Evaluation: Early Experiences of Implementing Sure Start.* Nottingham: DfES publications.

[18] Wiggins M, Bonell C, Sawtell M, *et al* (2005) *Evaluation of the Young People's Development Programme: First interim report: December 2004*. London: Social Science Research Unit Report, Institute of Education, http://www.ioe.ac.uk/ssru/reports/ypdpfirstinterim.pdf

Wiggins M, Sawtell M, Austerberry H, *et al.* (2006) *Evaluation of the Young People's Development Programme: Second interim report: July 2006.* London: Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

4. How did the programme reach vulnerable young people?

The original vision for YPDP set projects the challenging task of recruiting the *most* at-risk young teenagers in their area to take part in an intensive (6-10 hours per week) year-long programme. Each of the 27 projects was asked to recruit a certain-sized cohort of 13 to 15 year olds to engage with for one year in each of the three years of the programme. This target, which ranged between projects from 48 to 96 young people in total (over three years), was based on the project's own assessment of their capacity. Some projects were aiming to work with specific types of young people: two projects each were recruiting only young men or young women; and two projects were specifically recruiting black and minority ethnic young people.

This section will explore:
- whether the YPDP projects were able to engage the targeted number of vulnerable young people;
- the methods that were used to recruit them; and
- the lessons learned to maximize success in recruitment.

A later section will explore whether projects were able to retain participants at the frequency and for duration expected of the programme. (See section 5).

4.1 Did YPDP projects meet their recruitment targets?

The evaluation evidence suggests that the YPDP programme exceeded its goals regarding the numbers of young people recruited who received at least some of the programme. Over the three years of the YPDP pilot, 2371 young people were recruited and had at least some participation[19] in the programme[20].

As well as reaching the target numbers, our evidence indicates that the YPDP projects were also successful in attracting the vulnerable young people for whom the programme was intended. In addition to living in deprived areas, the YPDP participants were found to be a very socially and economically disadvantaged group of predominantly13-15 year olds, often leading very chaotic lives. They were, on the whole, disaffected with school (over half had either been permanently excluded or were at risk of this) and exhibiting behavioural and emotional problems. Staff provided the evaluation team with 'joiner's forms' as young people officially entered the YPDP programme, providing basic data included the reason(s) for recruitment to the project. A third of the young people were identified on these forms as being engaged in health risk behaviours such as substance misuse and/or unsafe sexual behaviour. A quarter were reported as having been involved in some form of offending. Further details of participants are available in appendix 3.

Over the three years of YPDP, the overall profile of the young people being recruited onto the programme remained consistent. Although all 27 projects consistently reached vulnerable young people, some projects increasingly included a proportion of young people deemed slightly less at-risk in years 2 and 3 as a way of improving levels of engagement. There was also some variation between projects regarding the typical profile of the vulnerable young people they recruited. The clearest reasons for these differences can be found in the historical focus of the project (e.g. previous work with young offenders) and by the referral routes used to find young people (e.g. tending to receive referrals mostly from schools or social workers etc).

---

[19] Participation is defined here as having spent *at least* two hours on the programme.
[20] The original target was 2098 young people.

Box 6

> **Reasons given by project staff on 'joiner's forms' for suitability of young person to participate in YPDP.** Some examples:
>
> *'Self harming; using drugs; smokes cannabis. Exclusions from school. Charged with assault. Drinks excessively.'*
>
> *'Low self-esteem & self-worth. Very disadvantaged home. Very vulnerable - sexual abuse? Risk of prostitution.'*
>
> *'Incredible anger management issues. He has a lovely nature but can lose his temper and become very violent. Issues around his skin, poor academic ability, volatile nature of his home. He often truants lessons and has left home on occasions.'*
>
> *'Young person referred due to substance misuse & practising unsafe sex. Parents separated & he has been evicted by father. Social services involved as neither parent will accommodate him. Issue of rejection & anger & lack of self-esteem.'*
>
> *'Poor school attendance; emotional issues re: loss of [a family member]; was raped by a friend.'*

4.2   What methods did YPDP projects use to recruit young people?

The successful meeting of the DH recruitment targets should not mask the fact that recruitment was a major challenge for many projects especially in the first year of the pilot. Nearly 60% of staff members said in the first annual staff survey that recruitment to YPDP had been either difficult or very difficult, despite two-thirds of staff members thinking that the number of young people they were contracted to recruit was reasonable for their project.

The projects used a variety of routes to identify and recruit appropriate young people to the programme. Some projects focused on one main route, others used a mixture. Whichever routes projects took, recruitment required significant amounts of staff time. The main routes are described below.

- *Identifying young people via schools and PRUs*

The most common route used to identify young people was via schools and PRUs. Referrals were made from schools in one of two ways: either 1) for individuals that the school staff thought fitted the criteria of the programme; or 2) for a group of pupils (a class, stream, or sub-group) that the school staff felt would benefit from work with YPDP.

There were several forms of provision that schools negotiated with YPDP projects for young people's participation:
- formalised attendance during the school day (usually delivered on the school site) in lieu of specific lessons; or

- formalised attendance for some or all of the week instead of school/PRU as part of alternative education package (delivered on and/or off the school site); or
- informal attendance at the project outside of school hours - in this situation the school acted as the original contact between the young person and YPDP, but all future involvement was voluntary.

In the first two of these scenarios, the YPDP project usually negotiated access with the schools in advance of identifying and approaching specific young people.

- ***Recruitment via other services***
Some YPDP projects used structured referral processes with local agencies including youth offending teams and probation officers, social services, education welfare teams or other staff from local education authorities, Connexions, or youth workers from voluntary agencies. Referral forms were distributed to these agencies and these were completed and returned to the YPDP project. Project staff would then contact the young person, often via the referring agency initially, and discuss the programme.

Some YPDP projects had formal arrangements to work in conjunction with other agencies, sharing their pool of targeted young people. This happened in several projects with local 'Youth Inclusion Programmes' whereby the young people identified as 'most at risk of youth offending' in an area, would be offered the YPDP programme as part of their support package.

In some cases, there were much less formalised referrals from agencies with whom good relationships had been built, generally prior to YPDP. Rather than having a formalised process, staff from other agencies would contact YPDP project workers when they had a young person they thought would benefit from involvement.

- ***Recruitment via outreach work, previous project experience and self-referral***
Some projects used outreach youth work to identify young people for the YPDP programme, involving workers meeting young people where they congregated locally (e.g. on estates, in shopping centres). This was mentioned as an important route for finding young people who were not attending school and were disengaged from services.

In the first year of the YPDP pilot, nearly half the projects identified young people from within their previous project activities who would be suitable for the YPDP programme. This route became less fruitful for many projects as time went on, either because less non-YPDP activity was happening in projects or because they had exhausted the pool of young people already in touch with the project to recruit for YPDP.

A quarter of the projects accepted self-referrals (or referrals via friends and family members) but by the second year, none reported using this as their main way of finding appropriate young people for the project. One young person described how he was referred by a friend.

> *'My friend told me about it…He said 'there's this club that I'm going to… about history and some other stuff and it's good'. …I was just like saying, 'yeah, whatever, whatever'. And then one day he just grabbed me after school and said… 'we're going, whether you like it or not', and then when I came I liked it, so I kept on coming.'* (young person)

Despite the fact that fewer young people came as self-referrals, some projects remained strong advocates for this approach, as they felt it helped with retaining the young people on the programme.

> *'Less referrals this year from schools and social services but more self referrals - deliberate strategy as wanted young people who want to be there.'*
> (YPDP project staff)

Some marketing of the programme (in the form of leaflets or posters) was initially directed at young people and their parents in a few sites, but many projects chose to limit their promotional activities to those targeting other professionals.

Agreement to participate
Regardless of the route used for identifying young people, most of the projects then made individual contact with these potential participants and explained the programme, to see whether the young person would like to take part. All young people on YPDP were given a choice whether or not to attend. However, some who agreed to participate then made statutory agreements to attend as part of their alternative educational provision (see section 6.4).

4.3   Challenges to recruitment

In aiming to recruit the most appropriate young people for the programme, the most frequent challenges faced by projects included:

- **Recruiting an annual 'cohort' instead of a rolling recruitment** - The expectation of the YPDP programme was that agencies would recruit a group of young people who would start the programme together and carry on for a year. Recruitment was therefore expected to take place over a one to two month period. This recruitment of a cohort all at the same time generally differed from the way young people had traditionally come to participate in projects prior to YPDP. This meant that projects faced difficulty in both identifying the required number of suitable young people at the right time for the programme, as well as at times also having to ask some young people to delay taking part, despite having an identified need and being ready for immediate participation.

- **The timing of recruitment** - Due to the start date of the pilot, projects needed to recruit their cohort in April each year. This proved to be a very challenging task, especially for projects whose intake was primarily provided by schools; or for those who organised their own activities mainly around a school calendar. For these projects, a more natural start would have been in September or October. Some projects were able to re-organise how they worked to fit in with the April start; others negotiated with NYA to continue with their traditional autumn start arrangements, but then had to recruit more young people to cohorts in years one and two, and none in year three, to ensure that the participants had the opportunity of a full year of programme support before the pilot ended.

- **Finding the right point of contact within a school** - Some YPDP projects had difficulties identifying the most appropriate point of contact within a school that had both the authority to agree to recruitment strategies and the operational knowledge to make the process work. Recruitment via schools also encountered difficulties because of staff turnover – both at schools and at YPDP projects – where there had been unwritten agreements based on relationships between two individuals, which were sometimes no longer honoured after staff changes.

- **Relying too heavily on one source of referral** – Some YPDP projects made assumptions, especially in the first year of the pilot, that a single source would be able to provide sufficient numbers of appropriate referrals, only to be disappointed when this did not occur. Sometimes these problems developed because of the points already raised in the bullet points above, but for others they were influenced by local issues, such as the number of asylum seeking young people who were housed in the local area.

- **Existing projects having to find a different population than they were used to working with** – Because of the nature of the expected target group for YPDP, some projects needed to shift away from the group of young people they normally recruited. These differences generally concerned participants' ages or degree of vulnerability. As a result, in addition to finding new routes for identifying the appropriate young people, some projects found that they were having to turn away those who would have traditionally participated to make way for new recruits. This sometimes created tension amongst the young people and the staff.

- **The intensive nature of the proposed programme** – The degree of consistent commitment that young people were expected to make to the YPDP project (e.g. weekly attendance for a year) plus the nature of the content made some young people reluctant to commit to participation.

- **Identifying the most vulnerable young people –** Some projects struggled to recruit because they were intent on finding the most 'at-risk' young people, who didn't attend school or access local services.

4.4   Strategies of overcoming challenges to recruitment

Challenges in recruitment were less noticeable in projects that carried out work in the statutory sector and those with a strong community-based history. For those in the statutory sector, this was usually because their recruitment links had been embedded before the start of YPDP. This circumvented the need to spend time identifying points of contact in potential referring agencies, developing relationships with them and creating understanding about YPDP.

For those projects which had been in a specific community for a number of years and were well established, there was recognition by other agencies, parents and young people of the work that they did, even if they were unfamiliar with the new YPDP aspect of their work. Crucially, in these community programmes there was a degree of trust from referrers that the service would be delivered to an appropriate standard. Additionally, project staff already were familiar with some of the local young people who might benefit most from participation.

For those projects that did struggle with recruitment, most tried to broaden the sources of their referrals and often this meant they turned to local schools and PRUs to help with their recruitment difficulties, either from the start, or in years 2 and 3 when recruitment had emerged as a particular problem. Although working with school brought some additional challenges, it did usually bring a greater number of appropriate young people to the attention of the projects. Creative solutions were employed to meet the needs of the schools in these situations. These solutions included: providing YPDP project work on school premises each week; or providing modified scheduling or structure of YPDP activities to suit both school and programme requirements.

Methods used to overcome the reluctance of young people to agree to participate in such an intensive programme varied. Some projects offered flexibility to young people regarding their degree of commitment from the outset (although this undercut one of the aims of the programme to deliver an intervention of a fixed, high intensity). Others stressed the variety within the programme components and created personal plans tailored to individual young people's needs and interests. Other projects made attendance compulsory as part of an alternative educational package. Finally, others accepted that some young people would not be interested or able to maintain commitment and, anticipating drop-out, over-recruited their target number to ensure that a suitable cohort would actually participate.

The NYA, in its role as training and co-ordination agent for YPDP, checked frequently with projects about how recruitment was progressing, and maintained pressure on sites to achieve the recruitment levels to which they had agreed. Although some sites did not always appreciate this attention, most acknowledged that it had kept them focused and ensured they tried a number of strategies for reaching their targets. Several projects said that the NYA had provided crucial support in helping them find alternatives in difficult scenarios (e.g. when expected recruitment via schools did not happen as planned). In these situations, NYA also acted as a conduit for learning between sites. (Section 8 provides more detail on NYA's role.)

Key points - YPDP recruitment of vulnerable teenagers

- It was possible in YPDP to recruit vulnerable young people at least for some participation in the programme. However, considerable time was required to develop strategies for identifying appropriate young people or have them referred.

- Recruitment worked best for YPDP projects when more than one agency or service was involved in identifying potential participants. Relying solely on one source (e.g. a single school) often led to recruitment difficulties.

- Local knowledge, fostered through years of working in an area proved invaluable for finding the most appropriate young people to recruit.

- Working with schools was crucial for recruitment, but not unproblematic. Negotiations over access and referral routes took considerable time to set up. Finding the staff with appropriate authority within schools was critical.

- YPDP projects needed to identify and contact more young people than they planned to work with in order to attain the target numbers. They found this necessary, since with this client group there was an inevitable lack of engagement with a portion of the young people approached.

- The YPDP pilot also indicated that it was better to have rolling recruitment rather than an expectation of an annual cohort, to ensure the right young people are getting help when they need it.

---

5.   How did YPDP engage and retain vulnerable young people?

As discussed in previous sections, YPDP originally aimed to engage vulnerable young people for six to ten hours per week over one year, informed by the CAS-Carrera programme in the US[21]

In this section we will concentrate on:
- the actual hours spent by YPDP participants on the project;
- patterns of involvement;
- the actual number of weeks this group of young people tended to stay involved in the project;
- challenges to and solutions for engaging and retaining young people on the YPDP programme.

5.1   Hours of involvement

YPDP projects were given the target of engaging each young person for 6-10 hours over 48 weeks. This converts to a total of between 288 hours and 480 hours overall. However a large majority of participants did not participate for the targeted number of hours. Monitoring from projects identified that half of YPDP participants spent 143 hours or more on the programme. On average, participants in YPDP spent a total of 179 hours on the programme.

There was no significant difference in hours of involvement in YPDP by gender or ethnicity although younger participants were more likely to attain the targeted number of hours on the programme.

On the first follow-up questionnaires, 42% of YPDP young people reported that they had spent between 2 and 5 hours a week on the programme and a further 28% said they had spent 6 – 10 hours. About 70% of YPDP respondents reported that they had spent the 'right' amount of time at the project, but a quarter of the young people would have liked to spend more time.

> *'It would be good if it was more available and we could spend more time there'.* (YPDP young person)

5.2   Patterns of Involvement

The original expectation was that the young people would attend each week for 6 to 10 hours, predominantly outside of school hours. However in practice, from the start of the programme, projects pursued a variety of patterns of involvement:

- The 'intended model' i.e. **6 -10 hours, spread through the week, outside of school hours on a voluntary basis**. Generally projects working to this model offered young people several evening sessions a week, each lasting a few hours – either as organised group-work or drop-in sessions. This pattern of involvement was generally consistent through both term time and school holidays and was suited best to projects that were readily accessible by their

---

[21] Philiber, P., Williams Kaye, J., Herrling, S. and West. E. (2002) Preventing pregnancy and improving health care access among teenagers: an evaluation of the Children's Aid Society-Carrera Program. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 34(5), 244-251

target population (e.g. based in locations near to the school or homes of the participants).

- **Short periods, offered often through the week, as above, but within school hours and offered as an alternative to school**. This pattern was generally maintained through the year regardless of school terms and again required the project to be easy for young people to access independently.

- **One day a week during term time, where young people would attend for 6 – 8 hours, sometimes as an alternative to school.** Projects working to this model included those that were recruiting young people from a wide catchment area and thus had to minimise the ratio of transport time to project time. It also included projects that were working in/with schools as a means of maximising involvement. Projects working in this way had to alter their pattern of provision during school holidays, offering voluntary holiday programmes.

- **Lower weekly average hours, but additional hours were made up through occasional residential trips**, which generally ran for between 2 – 7 days.

- **High activity followed by very little activity**. Projects with this pattern generally did very intensive work over the first few months of the programme and then reduced the intensity. This pattern was generally used because it suited the target group for the project – for example unaccompanied asylum seekers who had recently arrived in the UK or young people not in education, employment or training, who were being prepared for returning to education. These groups were initially given high levels of support in a range of ways, including organising education placements, in the first few months of the programme and then reduced levels once they were settled elsewhere.

In general the projects started out with a pattern of involvement based on the type of service they were experienced at delivering prior to YPDP. This was then enhanced or reconfigured in specific ways as a means of maximising the potential for meeting the high involvement and retention targets for YPDP. It should be noted that only the first of these options is faithful to the 'youth-development' model, for example as used in the CAS-Carrera programme. The use of YPDP provision as an alternative to education in schools in particular represents a major deviation from previous youth-development work.

5.3 Challenges of intensive weekly engagement of young people on the programme

Many staff welcomed the general principle of intensive working with vulnerable young people.

> *'[It is] really good to be back with what I call 'the Fuck-off kids' – we say 'hello' and they say 'Fuck-off' – and you know they like you because they have actually bothered to answer! (laughs)'* (YPDP project manager)

However our findings show just how challenging this target proved to be. Specific difficulties that staff in all types of projects referred to, in relation to achieving the weekly target hours include:

- **Working with vulnerable young people** –The hours target was perceived as constricting the ability of projects to work flexibly with young people whose lives are chaotic and hard and who might not welcome a structured, intensive 'school-like' approach. Levels of attendance and engagement will be influenced by the context of people's lives; it was felt that a young person

experiencing difficulties needed to be able to be involved at the level that was most appropriate for them at any given time.

- **Age groups** – Some projects found it difficult to offer the same range of services to the whole 13 to 15 age group, because the needs of the younger end of the age spectrum were different from the older. For the smaller, less well resourced projects, this was generally considered impractical. By not offering different age-specific activities, these projects felt they had less engagement with some young people, for whom their activities had less appeal.

- **Temporary exclusions** -The hours target had a compromising effect on the use of temporary exclusion from the project as a sanction for unacceptable behaviour. Some projects had historically relied on this as a means of modifying the behaviour of individuals who were being disruptive and of protecting groups from the negative effects of disruptive or, at times, dangerous members.

- **Focus on hours** -The perception held by some project staff that the key focus from the centre, was on quantity rather than quality i.e. *'hours not outcomes'.*

The projects that were most successful at achieving the target 6 - 10 hours of weekly involvement shared one or more of the following:

- a staff group that generally remained stable through the 3 years of the pilot;

- a history of working in close partnership with young people using their service and staff in key local partner agencies; and

- projects that were well established, with strong links with key stakeholders and a good understanding of their community.

5.4   'Long-term' retention of young people on the project

It was intended that YPDP would involve a year of participation for the young people who took part. For practicality this 'year' was agreed by projects, the NYA and the DH to mean 48 weeks of participation, to allow for staff and young people's holidays.

Overall, 40% of YPDP young people stayed involved on the programme for at least the target 48 weeks (n=936). On average, young people participated for 40 weeks[22], ranging from two weeks to 130 weeks. The length of time on YPDP varied significantly between the 27 projects – the highest project average (across all its participants) was 49 weeks, the lowest was 31 weeks; in total three projects achieved a 48 week average. Retention of young people for the targeted number of weeks improved over the three years of the pilot.

5.5   Challenges to achieving a 'year of participation'

As with the more intensive weekly hours, many staff welcomed the opportunity to work for an extended period of time with this challenging group of young people.

---

[22] Duration was calculated from date of joining to date of leaving, regardless of level of activity in intervening weeks. Data was from monitoring data and from joiners and leavers forms supplied by projects.

However, this expectation of working with young people for one year was reported as the aspect of the YPDP programme that was most different from the work that their projects had previously carried out. The challenges to retention were very similar to those of weekly hours of involvement. However there were some additional challenges that were specific to this target:

- some young people 'outgrew' YPDP before the end of the year – feeling that they had made more rapid progress than had been anticipated - and wanting to move on to something else;

- some young people did not feel ready to leave after a year and moving them on too soon was considered by staff to halt, or even reverse, the progress they have made;

- sustained engagement with some young people, whose lives were particularly chaotic and unstable, could only be achieved by allowing them some flexibility around their period of involvement with the project; and

- projects should be able to exclude young people who persistently break project rules in order to protect the other young people in the group and to disincentivize bad behaviour.

5.6 Strategies to promote long term, intensive engagement with vulnerable young people

Some staff commented that the YPDP model made them work harder than they had done previously to encourage engagement, which may have brought benefits for some young people. Throughout the course of the study, staff cited examples of young people who stayed on the programme, when previously they would have dropped out, and were perceived to have benefited as a result.

The realisation of how hard it was to achieve the targeted level of involvement and duration led some projects to rethink their initial approach to where, how and to whom they were delivering the programme. Projects did this in a number of ways including:

- shifting to recruiting a more mixed group, comprised of the most 'at-risk' young people but also some who were deemed less 'at-risk';

- lowering their expectations in terms of the intensity and structured nature of the content of the programme – providing more flexible engagement according to young people's expressed needs;

- allocating staff time for telephone contact and support rather than face-to-face contact, as a means of maintaining involvement in periods where young people chose not to, or were unable, to attend;

- running more residential trips than they previously had - these were popular with young people and were used at key points in the programme as an incentive to support longer term retention, and as a short term solution to boost participation hours;

- working closely with other stakeholders, including parents/carers and professional partners in order to encourage young people who had 'dropped out' of the programme to return;

- increasing the proportion of the programme that they offered during the school day, as an alternative to statutory education.

Moving to offering alternative school time provision had a number of apparent advantages for projects in terms of achieving their involvement targets. For example, school staff used their prior knowledge of their pupils to identify young people whom they thought would benefit and stay involved; the young people given the choice of either a normal school day or a day with the YPDP project generally preferred the latter and therefore were more inclined to attend; work carried out as part of YPDP could support work on the school curriculum.

However, these changes were often instrumental in cases of YPDP provision deviating markedly from that associated with a 'youth-development' model. Some projects which had previously worked as out-of-school voluntary youth work providers were unhappy about re-orienting their service towards an alternative education model as a means of achieving the engagement target.

Box 7

How did YPDP attendance levels differ from that of comparison young people?

The evaluation did not ask the comparison sites to providing monthly monitoring data on individual young people, as was the case for all the YPDP sites, so a direct comparison of individual involvement is not possible. A general comparison, based on other data collected, follows.

The providers in comparison areas reported that in most cases they had no set target for duration of attendance. For three quarters of the comparison projects attendance was flexible, with no specific end point. Comparison project staff estimated that, on average, two thirds of young people were involved for over one year. The evaluation was not able to validate this estimate, which was made for all of their participants, not just their most at-risk, so it makes a direct comparison with YPDP levels of involvement even more difficult to make. Of the comparison projects, 85% reported that most young people stayed involved for a period of time agreed with the young person, or for a duration that seemed appropriate.

Staff in comparison projects reported two extremes when asked what the usual hours of working with young people were for their projects: either for less than two hours a week, or for more than 10 hours a week. This wide range reflects the differing nature of the comparison projects' provision: there was no expectation of weekly-hour attainment for most youth work agencies, whereas all PRUs had a statutory expectation of attendance.

When asked on their questionnaires, three quarters of comparison young people thought they spent the right amount of time on their project. Significantly fewer young people in comparison projects than YPDP ones wanted to spend more time on their project.

Key points - engagement and retention of young people

- A major achievement of the YPDP programme was that it succeeded in consistently involving a group of very vulnerable young people. On average the programme engaged participants for an average of 176 hours over 40 weeks. YPDP programmes that were most successful at maintaining involvement utilised a variety of methods: including allocating staff time for regular phone contact; tailoring services to specified interests of young people; having a wide range of activities on offer; and approaching service delivery with constant flexibility.

- Overall, project staff welcomed the fact that YPDP was a programme that allowed intensive work with participants over a long period of time. However, as the YPDP pilot developed, project staff were less convinced that they could, or indeed should, achieve the original hours and weeks of engagement targets. It was felt that better work and outcomes would result from concentrating on individual needs and circumstances. Most staff wanted a more flexible, young person-centred approach to both weekly levels, and duration, of participation.

- Although working in effect as an alternative education provider was shown to increase hours and duration of engagement, this represented a major deviation from the original planned 'youth development' model.

6.   What did young people receive from YPDP?

This section examines what was delivered in the YPDP programme by the pilot projects. It will concentrate on:
- the extent to which the main expected components of the planned YPDP programme were actually delivered;
- the extent to which young people received a 'holistic' programme;
- the amount of referral to other services that was carried out on behalf of the young people; and
- the extent to which YPDP involved a common model of provision.

6.1   Main components of the YPDP programme

Before YPDP, the DH noted that, although many activities could be found in existing English youth work, few combined a whole range of activity types into a single programme[23]. YPDP projects were expected to deliver a range of key components with approximate targets for the proportion of each young person's project time (see

YPDP Participants
- The YPDP projects worked annually with, on average, 17 to 45 YPDP participants.
- Overall 61% of those who joined were boys
- 75% classified their ethnicity as white British

table1) each component should account for, as a means of ensuring that young people had the opportunity to have a wide variety of experiences, learn a range of skills and gain appropriate information.

Table 1

YPDP component	*Original targets for time allocation on YPDP*
Education, training and employment activities	*20 – 40%*
Life skills work	*5 – 20%*
Health education, *including on sexual health and substance misuse*	*10 – 20%*
Mentoring	*5 – 20%*
Sports/physical activities	*10 – 20%*
Arts	*5 – 10%*
Voluntary work	*5 – 10%*
Accessing other services	*1 – 2%*

Below we describe the extent to which young people participated in these types of activities and explain how each of these components were operationally defined by the projects. Additionally we comment on the staff views on the feasibility of these activities.

---

[23] Department of Health. (2004) *Young People's Development Programme Briefing*, London.

Component 1: Education, training and employment activities

More than three quarters of YPDP participants spent time on education or training and employment activities. For some these were fairly formal education lessons on numeracy and literacy. For others these were relatively informal sessions teaching IT skills, motor maintenance, journalism skills, photography, etc. Other activities were undertaken that were intended to boost the participants' confidence in applying for or holding down jobs, such as interviewing skills sessions or work placement experience. Some YPDP projects also helped young people become familiar with their local college and helped them to apply and undertake courses.

Component 2: Life skills

Nearly all YPDP young people spent time on lifeskills activities. On average, half their time at the project was spent on activities that could be classified in some way as impacting on life skills. Examples of such activities included: modules of the 'Getting Connected' accreditation programme; team building exercises; independent living skills workshops; one-to-one anger management sessions; anti-bullying workshops, etc. Many activities that were primarily focused on another component of YPDP (like sports or arts) were provided in a context where life skills lessons were drawn out by staff as part of the session.

Component 3: Health activities (with focus on education about substance misuse and sexual health)

Three quarters of YPDP participants spent some time on health activities during the programme. On average, a quarter of YPDP young people's time on activities was spent on general health activities. One tenth of their time was spent on sexual health activities and one in every fourteen of their activity hours was spent on substance misuse education. However, experience of health activities varied: half of young people received less than six hours of sexual health activities during their entire participation and half received less than three hours of substance misuse education in total. At the other end of the scale, one in ten young people received at least 50 hours of sexual health activities and one in twenty had at least twenty hours of substance misuse education.

The amount of health work carried out varied by project, with some projects finding it much more difficult to incorporate, particularly regarding substance misuse and sexual health work. The NYA provided support to those projects with difficulties, via training and networking opportunities to help them develop these sorts of activities. (see section 8.)

> "*It wasn't* [difficult] *'cause we already did the sexual health work and originally we set up a teenage pregnancy project. Literally the money was there around sexual health so we came out of the sexual health work anyway and we were known as doing sexual health work so… that was not new to us*" (YPDP project staff)

> "*It is pretty hard because not only are you doing that* [attempting to achieve 6-10 hours per week with 30 young people] *… but to get the drug awareness and alcohol… when all they wanna do after school is not do that, they're like… I've just been doing school for 6 hours*" (YPDP project staff)

In addition to work about sexual health and substance misuse, a lot of health work focused on healthy eating; for example cooking sessions, healthy eating quizzes and a 'world fruit exercise'. Other health activities included exercise (football, dance), smoking cessation and first aid.

Box 8

<div style="border:1px solid black; background-color:#d6f5d6; padding:10px;">

Example of substance misuse education

'Drugs is an interesting one 'cause they're all so obsessed with [them*] particularly cannabis, and yet actually when you get the drugs box out and start talking to them about different drugs, their knowledge is very, very limited. So I think it's about informing them and then they have that informed choice of whether they… you're not necessarily gonna stop them doing it or trying it, but at least they have more idea about what it is and what it might do and what the consequences could be. I think that's what it is really 'cause you're never gonna know because you're not there with them 24/7, but I like to think they're learning from their experience with us.'* (YPDP project worker)

</div>

Component 4: Mentoring

One-to-one mentoring (individual discussions between the young person and a staff member or volunteer on the project) was expected to take place weekly in the original YPDP model. Only about three quarters of the YPDP participants were reported as ever having been mentored. Although according to monitoring data, overall young people spent nearly one third of their time on mentoring activities, this varied greatly between young people and between projects. It appeared that often, if a young person received any mentoring, they spent many hours being mentored, whilst a substantial proportion received virtually none. One quarter of young people were reported on monitoring forms to have received two hours or less mentoring in total during their whole time on YPDP, whereas one tenth received 150 hours or more.

All but one of the YPDP projects reported that mentoring was taking place as part of their programme, but staff admitted that this was one of the most difficult of the components to deliver (second only to volunteering). Reasons for this were varied, but often had to do with staffing problems, finding appropriate time and space to hold one-to-one discussions, and difficulties engaging young people on a regular weekly basis. The quotes from YPDP staff illustrate some of the challenges involved:

> '*The mentoring* [has been hard to deliver] *because we started doing one-to-one sessions in the school and then we'd go in and they'd be dragged off to assembly and things, so that didn't always work out. I think we've done* [mentoring] *more informally …, so we've had those conversations with young people but it's not been as regular as maybe it should have been.'* (YPDP project worker)

> '*We use the older, 16 – 25 young mothers that we work with as mentors [for the YPDP participants]. And that was necessary because for the co-ordinator of YPDP, the budget as it was, only enabled us to employ one full time worker… So we needed to get on board the mentors to support her in her role. And they've been absolutely vital, because one of the difficulties we've found is that the majority of the young women who've been recruited to the YPDP programme have got enormously complex home lives, and that you are not actually just working with that young person, you're working with her (social workers) and so on, massive issues within their families which can mean that you are spending an awful lot of time in just encouraging them.'* (YPDP strategic project lead)

Box 9

> **Example: Young Person's Perspective of Mentoring**
>
> (interview between researcher and YPDP participant)
>
> Q*:* *'Have you had any informal chats with workers one-to-one about those kind of issues?*
> A: *I speak to [one worker] a lot… really good mate [he] is… [He] helped me out with like drug use.*
> Q: *…What kind of things has he done with you about that?*
> A: *When I was using drugs, I talked to him to try and stop and now I have stopped.*
> Q: *And do you think that's because of what he did for you?*
> A: *Because of what he's helped me with… yeah. I've been clean for a month now.*
> Q: *Have you… wow. What kind of things has he said and done with you?*
> A: *Told me like the consequences of doing it and that… lots of stuff really. Told me what could happen and where you'd end up.*
> Q: *And it's worked for you?*
> A: *Yeah.'*

Component 5: Sports and physical activity

More than three quarters of YPDP participants spent time on sports and physical activities. Most YPDP project staff were comfortable delivering this element, as they were accustomed to these types of youth work activities. Several projects were already heavily involved in delivering outward bound type physical activities, and others had strong links with centres that offered these opportunities. Initial anxiety was raised by only a few projects, who had traditionally concentrated on other aspects of youth work (like education, training and employment) and were uncertain how they would shift to incorporate sports into their normal curriculum. By the latter years of the pilot, these concerns had disappeared.

Sports and outdoor activities offered on YPDP included individual sports and team activities such as rock climbing, surfing, canoeing, gym sessions, ice skating, mountain biking, swimming, football and rugby.

YPDP gave some young people fantastic opportunities to use their acquired physical activity skills to undertake longer residential trips, such as week-long experiences sailing on tall ships across the English Channel, or a weekend in the Lake District doing orienteering, caving and white water rafting.

Component 6: Arts

More than three quarters of YPDP participants spent time on arts activities. As with the sports component, project staff reported being very comfortable with delivering the arts component, as this was an area with which nearly all the projects used frequently in their work prior to YPDP. Additionally, staff were certain of the popularity of such activities with the majority of young people, so did not feel that this was a challenging component to 'sell' to the participants.

Examples of arts activities delivered on YPDP ranged from drama, singing lessons, dancing, painting, pottery, creative writing to film making, DJing, graffiti art and circus skills. Although most activities were directed at individual's learning of arts skills,

some activities included trips to professional performances as well as providing opportunities to showcase the talents of the YPDP participants.

Component 7: Volunteering

Half of YPDP participants were reported as having spent any time volunteering as part of their involvement on the project: for only a very few (1 in 20) was this reported as a regular activity. According to the monitoring data, volunteering was the least common of all activities.

In all three years of the pilot, staff considered volunteering to be the most challenging and difficult component of the YPDP programme to deliver. Some reasons for this included difficulties in defining volunteering; finding age-appropriate activities; and obtaining insurance for such activities. Staff elaborated on these challenges:

> '*I'm just trying to work out what is volunteering. My interpretation of volunteering is helping you out in your garden if you need it, maybe half an hour a week. What does it mean to young people? And what does it mean to yourselves? And are those meanings the same?*' (YPDP project worker)

> '[With volunteering] *it's just very difficult to find anything out there at the moment. I mean we do it, but not the way we'd like to…Everything is geared to 16-25 year olds with volunteering, there's very little for 13-15 year olds. So that's our biggest challenge.*' (YPDP project worker)

After reporting these difficulties in the first interim report, the NYA responded to the challenges of delivering volunteering work by offering several training sessions on the topic to staff. Despite this additional support and sharing of innovative and successful ideas, staff at two-thirds of the projects continued to consider it to be a challenging component in the remaining years of the pilot.

Through networking and training, some YPDP staff began to understand a more modern version of volunteering, and included activities such as refurbishing bicycles, tidying, consultation work and even completing the SSRU evaluation questionnaires.

> "*Volunteering is helping - they're enjoying it and get self-satisfaction, and like the end result.*" (YPDP project worker)

Component 8: Access to Services

The initial briefing to YPDP projects on this component explained that this work '*should include an overview of how the following work, how to use them and what exists locally, as well as search and information skills:*
- *health, contraceptive, drug and alcohol services*
- *welfare, benefits advice*
- *counselling and advice*
- *housing.*'[24]

On average, a tenth of YPDP young people's time on the programme was spent on activities that staff categorised (at least in part) as 'access to service'. This was higher than the original target of 1-2% of their time. One of the reasons for this greater-than-expected time could be due to the way in which this activity was conceptualised by projects.

---

[24] Department of Health. (2004) *Young People's Development Programme Briefing*, London.

Although the original expectation was that this activity would focus on accessing social welfare and health services, projects tended to view it much more broadly than this. Some activities did appear to fit in with the programme's vision, for example visiting a college or a genitourinary medicine clinic. However other activities reported in this category included trips to the cinema and to football matches, and an Easter egg hunt. Some projects also categorised their initial meetings and visits with young people, as well as phone calls and meetings, as 'access to services'.

Perhaps partly because of this broad definition, very few of the projects reported 'access to services' as being a challenge to deliver.

6.2 Did YPDP young people receive a holistic programme of activities?

Although some projects initially came to YPDP doing 'single focus' work, nearly all were able to broaden their work to cover all the expected components. As a result, most of the YPDP young people received an holistic programme, with three quarters of young people spending time on at least five of the eight YPDP components. It was extremely rare for a participant to spend time only on one or two types of activities during their involvement on the programme.

Box 10

John's experience of the YPDP programme

'John' participated in YPDP for just over a year.   He joined when he was 13, having been recruited by a project worker through outreach work on the estate on which he lived. While on the project, which offered activities outside of school time, he took part in full range of the YPDP components The monitoring forms submitted by YPDP staff showed that over the course of the year John participated for nearly 500 hours, exceeding the target level of involvement set for the programme.

As an example of the type of programme YPDP offered John, we highlight the type of activities that he participated in over the course of one month. During this time, John regularly attended two sessions held weekly: one that concentrated on sexual and physical health issues, the other on personal development (incorporating anger management, self esteem, etc). In addition to these, he attended three music sessions during the month, plus had help with homework on one occasion. He spent time talking one-to-one with a staff member (being 'mentored') once during this time. Finally, he participated in a two-day residential trip undertaking outdoor adventure activities.

John said about YPDP *' It helped me to be sociable with people, do good, help with community services and get good qualifications'*
After his year, John left YPDP having gained two certificates in sailing. He continued full time at school and was working towards getting his GCSEs.

The extent to which YPDP projects offered a 'holistic' programme varied, but all managed to deliver an average of at least four different components to their participants. As such, it appears that overall YPDP was a programme that young people experienced as a holistic range of activities, offering the opportunity to learn a wide variety of skills.

Box 11

How did YPDP programme content differ from the comparison projects?

Almost all the youth work agencies in comparison areas also offered a range of components in their services, yet fewer of them offered the same breadth as YPDP. When asking young people about the activities they'd been involved with at their project, more YPDP young people reported ever having done health activities, art, one-to-one work, sports and work experience, compared to young people in the comparison group.

However while there was a clear difference in whether young people had ever tried these activities, there was less difference between comparison and YPDP young people about whether they had done these activities at least once a week. Similar proportions in the YPDP and comparison projects reported doing arts, one-to-one activities, volunteering, sports and work experience *at least once a week.* Slightly more YPDP young people reported participating regularly in health activities compared to young people in our comparison group.

In terms of having a 'holistic experience' on their project, significantly more YPDP young people reported having done a wide range of activity components, compared to comparison young people. Discussions among our fieldwork team informed by their experiences in YPDP and comparison projects also strongly suggested that overall work was less intense and less holistic in comparison sites compared with YPDP sites.

Examples of comparison site programme content:

1) One comparison project provided two sessions per week: a 2-hour, open access drop-in held in the early evening; and a group held for 2-hours on a weekday, where the young women who participated were released from school to attend for one term. Most participated in one of these sessions, very few participated in both. The day-time group was of about 15 young women and was primarily a discussion group held in a community centre, focusing on health (including sexual health) and emotional well-being (self-esteem building, etc.), and centre-based activities such a drama. The evening drop-in was less structured, and very few young women appeared to attend regularly for a long time.

2) An extended secondary school in the North of England, with a very deprived catchment area, was offering a range of innovative services and activities to vulnerable students after school, at weekends and in school holidays. Those who attended these additional activities comprised the group of comparison young people from this site. A small project team was based within the school and project staff worked closely with teachers on activities. Activities included drama, sports, public speaking at local community events, bicycle maintenance. Other initiatives included the securing of a flat from the local housing department which provided a supportive environment for young people after school who did not have this at home.

3) One voluntary comparison project worked with young people closely affected by drug, alcohol and emotional issues who were having difficulties staying in full time education - many young people had parents who were misusing substances who were also offered support from the project. A range of work was carried out including exploration of behaviours and attitudes, music, art and crafts, diet and nutrition, peer education around substance misuse issues, sports, IT and off-site activities (e.g. taster sessions at colleges).

6.3 Did YPDP link young people to additional support?

Because YPDP projects were working with at-risk young people, there was some expectation that the YPDP programme would act as a conduit for these young people to access additional appropriate services. This expectation was in part grounded in the experience of the CAS-Carrera project in the USA (see section 1).

Through monitoring data from projects, the evaluation found that formal referrals from YPDP to other services and projects were only reported for one in ten young people. However staff liaised informally with other services on behalf of nearly two thirds of the YPDP young people. The most frequent liaison was with schools (and other education providers), as well as local education authorities, Connexions, youth offending teams, police, and social services. (See section 7 re: how other services viewed YPDP). However it is not clear whether or not these liaisons involved young people being referred to new services that they would otherwise not have received.

Additionally, YPDP staff contacted the parents/carers of about seven out of ten young people at some point during their time at YPDP. However for almost all of these, the actual time spent in touch with parents/carers was low (on average, less than two hours in total). There were notable exceptions to this though, and a small number of projects concentrated heavily on work with parents as well as young people (See section 7 re: parents' views of YPDP).

One example of how YPDP programmes linked to wider support services to help a participant in detailed in box 12 below.

Box 12

Case Study of YPDP work: Mary's story

One 14 year old girl, 'Mary' was referred to YPDP by her school. She had been bullied and, as a consequence, had not attended school properly for three months. She had a difficult relationship with her mum. At the time of her referral, she was living with a friend as she and her mum had been made homeless due to rent arrears. During her time at YPDP she continued to have chaotic living arrangements, moving between friends' houses and staying with her mum's ex-boyfriend. YPDP staff contacted social services on her behalf, and continued to liaise with them as it became apparent that her mother was failing to support her financially or otherwise (despite informing social services differently).

YPDP staff recognised that it was vital to boost this girl's self esteem. As she enjoyed sports and outdoor activities, with staff encouragement she participated in swimming, bench ball, badminton and walking. She also started getting involved in drama activities, which helped her develop team-working skills. She enjoyed helping to prepare lunches at the project and she also achieved accreditation for Getting Connected.

YPDP staff worked closely with her school, helping to devise a new timetable to help get her back into school and arranging for work to be sent home if she could not attend. At this time, the young person was not being supported financially by her mother or by social services. As a consequence, she struggled to find the bus fare to get to school every day. YPDP staff believed that the only decent meals she ate were at YPDP sessions. They also supported her by bringing her bags of food and essentials.

Mary is now back in school full time and has a home with her mother's ex-boyfriend; they now receive benefits as well. Her goal in life is to be a solicitor.

6.4 Models of YPDP Provision

Despite the general adherence by YPDP projects to the original list of components to be offered to young people, and the overall holistic nature of the programme offered, there was no single, agreed model of provision for YPDP. There were some key differences in the ways that the programme was provided across the pilot sites. The 27 projects interpreted the YPDP delivery model slightly differently – partly tailoring to local need and partly relying on the types of service delivery with which they had previously been familiar (see background to projects section 3). Some key differences in the ways YPDP were delivered are described below.

Holistic vs. specialist model
Some projects aimed from the outset to deliver a 'holistic' set of services, while focused mostly on a single specialised activity (journalism, outdoor activities, arts etc) and aimed to offer additional activities as subsidiaries beside their core activity. Overall, this initial distinction influenced the pattern of usage of YPDP activities by participants. Many of those offering a specialist model, were acting as a formal alternative education provider to at-risk young people.

Compulsory vs. voluntary attendance
Another key delivery difference was whether attendance at the YPDP project was altogether voluntary or not. Whereas about half of projects did not compel young people to attend in any way, the rest recruited young people on the basis of their voluntary consent but once recruited their attendance then became required (see section 4). Twelve projects agreed that 'Almost all of their YPDP work is with young people who are statutorily expected to attend (i.e. carried out during the school day as an alternative to mainstream education)'. Seven projects said that they were not an alternative to mainstream education (and so delivered at times other than school hours). Eight described themselves as a mixture of statutory and voluntary attendance.

There was an area of great debate between project staff from the different models of attendance as to whether this affected their relationship with young people. Where attendance was compulsory in lieu of school, YPDP delivery sometimes had to be agreed with the LEA or a school, rather than determined entirely by the project itself.

Participation in programme planning
There was variation across the projects regarding the extent to which young people had a say either in what activities were offered or which they opted to take part in. Some projects offered a fixed form of delivery regarding on which days activities occurred and what activities were offered at different times. Others offered a range of activities simultaneously from which young people could choose.

In most YPDP projects young people worked with a staff member to put together an individual plan about which project activities on offer that they would like to participate in, depending on their own goals and interests. Some projects took this degree of participation much further, working with their participants to develop the entire activity plan for the group for a specific time period – so that the young people drove the activity agenda rather than the staff. In this model, the staff would then try to ensure the delivery of the programme that the young people wanted – by bringing in specialized staff or helping the participants seek out additional funding for special activities.

Key points – content of programme

- Overall, YPDP projects were mostly successful in delivering the full eight expected components of programme content. This wide ranging delivery of components represented a major shift in programme content for many of the YPDP projects.

- The majority of YPDP participants took part in at least six of the components in their time on the programme, meaning that they were exposed to a holistic experience, complete with a range of activities and opportunity to learn new skills. Significantly more YPDP than comparison group young people reported having done a wide range of activity components at their project.

- There was less weekly one-to-one mentoring then originally envisaged for the programme. However, YPDP staff acted as a liaison to other support services for nearly two-thirds of the participants, and as a link to parents for three quarters of the young people.

- There were differences across the projects regarding the ways that YPDP were delivered – most notably in terms of whether the programme was primarily regarded as a holistic service or a more specialist service; whether attendance was completely voluntary or whether there was some compulsory element; and the extent to which young people participated in shaping the content of or choosing the activities offered.

7. How was YPDP viewed?

One of the evaluation aims was to determine how acceptable the YPDP pilot programme was to young people, to parents, to project staff, and to other stakeholders. In this section we will explain the evaluation findings for each of these constituents groups.

7.1   Young people

Acceptability of the programme

Overall views
YPDP young people, on questionnaires and in interviews were overwhelmingly positive about their experience on the project. The vast majority liked the content of the programme, the ethos of the programme and the staff who worked with them.

> *'It's the best project I have been to. It helps me all the time.'* (YPDP young person)

> *'It's a totally different world [from school]. You can trust everyone. Everyone has been through what you have or similar. The respect level is so high, it's unreal.'* (YPDP young person)

> *'I loved it. It was excellent and the activities were good. I liked the staff. The staff treated me like an adult. Thank you to them.'* (YPDP young person)

> *'[My YPDP project] was great. I really enjoyed it. I would be naughty again if I thought I could go back!.'* (YPDP young person, attending a project that offered alternative education provision)

> *'It was one of the best places. Whatever the situation is, they help you. I trust them. They listen.'* (YPDP young person)

> *'It was dead good'.* (YPDP young person)

There were a few dissenting voices amongst young people about YPDP. These few were critical of individual staff or other participants; some disliked the activities on offer

> *'It was good, but it wasn't for me. But I did learn from it.'* (YPDP young person)

> *'Pretty much ok except I was always getting into fights with one particular boy, so I pulled myself out of the project'* (YPDP young person)

> *'I wouldn't approve of anyone going there. In between lessons skag heads (heroin addicts) came in to collect needles. I didn't like [the YPDP project].'* (YPDP young person)

Views on activities
We broke down the programme components into activities and asked young people to rate their enjoyment of these types of activities at the project. Table 2 below highlights that, in general, those young people who said they participated in specific

activities, enjoyed them. The most enjoyable activities were sports, as well as one-to-one support and arts.

There were no significant differences between those in the YPDP and comparison projects regarding the proportion of young people enjoying specific components in which they took part.

Table 2

Project activity	YPDP young people liking this activity	Comparison young people liking this activity
	n=1080	*n=780*
Sports activities	96%	91%
One-to-one support (mentoring)	93%	93%
Arts activities	92%	93%
Volunteering	89%	88%
Work experience	88%	84%
Health-related	86%	83%

'[My YPDP project] was fun. Learnt about sex ed, health and first aid, which was useful.' (YPDP young person)

'I remember kids faces smiling. Good activities – canoeing, skiing, motorbikings, go-carting, white water rafting, climbing. The staff were great to talk to and it was very good.' (YPDP young person, reflecting back on time on project)

'I thought it was amazing. They always did something different.' (YPDP young person)

Relationship with staff
YPDP young people were very positive, in general, about their relationship with staff on their project. In free-text boxes on the questionnaires when we asked if they wanted to tell us anything more about their experience on the project, we had a great number of glowing comments about the staff. A sample of these include:

'The staff were really, really friendly. They were more casual, more like friends than teachers. It was easier to understand what they were saying and to understand on a more casual educational level.' (YPDP young person)

'The staff are well funny and easy to get on with.' (YPDP young person)

'*The staff are brilliant. They make you so welcome. They talk to you as an individual one-to-one. They take you on good trips and make you feel safe and secure.*" (YPDP young person)

'The staff treated me like a person, not a monkey in a cage' (YPDP young person)

'[One YPDP worker] was spot on. Best youth worker I ever had! She treated me with respect, not stereotype adult looking down on kids. She saw my

point of view. She gave me a ref for college. I still see her about on her days off sometimes.' (YPDP young person)

'[A member of staff] was my tutor – he was the best one there. He always spoke to me. If I needed help, he was always there. He helped me find a job. He helped me stop skipping school.' (YPDP young person)

Interestingly, comparison young people were similarly glowing in their comments about staff on their projects.

The staff relationship was clearly an important part of the young person's experience on the programme. However, when asked whether, if they had a problem, they would find it easy to talk to staff at their project about it, similar proportions of YPDP and comparison young people said they would find it easy or difficult to do (see table 3 below). This questions was answered similarly by both young women and young men in both YPDP and comparison groups. The relationship with staff did not seem to vary hugely across YPDP projects, with most young people finding it quite easy or very easy to talk to staff at the project.

Table 3
Accessibility of staff
'If you had a problem, how easy would it be for you to talk to staff at project?'

	Comparison	YPDP
Very easy	35% (203)	39% (399)
Quite easy	42% (241)	42% (428)
Quite difficult	16% (92)	13% (133)
Very difficult	7% (37)	5% (54)

p=0.21

7.2   Parents

A small sample of parents and carers was interviewed in each of the YPDP case study sites. The interviews identified the extent to which parents were aware of the YPDP projects as well as their views on the programme content. They also provided information about the degree of involvement that the projects had with parents.

Overall, the parents we interviewed were positive about their child's involvement in YPDP. Specifically, parents/carers were generally positive about the relationship between behaviour in school and attendance on YPDP and thus spoke of encouraging their children to engage as much as possible.

Parents/carers sometimes had reservations about the general principle of rewarding 'naughty children' (including their own) with 'time out' in an environment that was perceived as more favourable than school, or were concerned about putting groups of badly behaved children together because of the potential for spreading bad behaviour.

There was a range of knowledge amongst parents about the actual activities that young people participated in on the YPDP projects and the aims of the programme. Most parents or carers we interviewed were aware of the activities that their children were participating in, and were generally very positive about the project, but personally had not received support from the project. Those with closer links to the projects (see section below), who had had most support from project staff themselves, tended to be most aware of the content of the project. In projects where

parents were not actively involved in the YPDP programme, the evaluation interviews found that some parents were unaware of the activities that their child was participating in on the projects.

Parental involvement in YPDP
It was intended that YPDP should involve parents. All YPDP projects had some involvement with parents, many accepted referrals from parents, and several worked with parents in a different part of their wider organisation. Projects, however, varied considerably in the degree to which they encouraged parents to become involved in project activities and the amount of support they offered to parents. At one end of the continuum, one project funded a parents' worker, invited parents on outward bound activity days and social events as an opportunity to bond with their child, supported parents in meetings with schools, and offered counselling to parents. Central to the project's ethos was the idea that working with parents was a crucial part of helping a young person.

> *'Excluded could mean suffering from a pain which is caused by what other people do to you and so work needed to be done with parents in order that they didn't do further damage '* (YPDP project worker)

Parents who were included and supported by YPDP projects found the experience valuable; they felt they related better with their child and felt supported more generally.

> *'We both went on like a family day and did like an activity course thing where you do bungy jumping, sort of like helping you bond more with your son, working as a team which was really good.'*   (Parent)

> *'Speaking about problems has really helped me and supported me through that year [since my son was excluded from school]. It helps both of us, not just my son'.(* Parent)

> *'Sometimes it's not just about the young person, it could be about the way that parents are relating to them, so [YPDP project staff] can be quite frank with you as well…and give you a bit more of an insight into approaches to dealing with young people. They're very calm and thoughtful.'*   (Parent)

At the other end of the continuum, some YPDP projects saw themselves as a safe, young person-centred space for those who came from difficult home circumstances, and were reluctant to involve parents in case this compromised the young person's independence and ability to trust staff. These projects recognised that parents often needed support but felt that others were better placed to carry out this work.

> *'[Involving families is] a tricky one 'cause we're about young people and we can't sort of shift that and spend a lot of time with parents. Some people didn't like the idea of their parents coming to the [project]. Work with parents, there's a massive need for it but other people do that work…'* (YPDP project worker)

7.3   YPDP project staff

On annual staff questionnaires and in interviews in case study sites, we found a very positive view amongst most staff about YPDP.

YPDP was not considered by some staff to be a programme that funded them to carry out and expand what they considered was 'just good youth work'. Staff morale was reported to be good, or very good by nine out of ten YPDP workers. For those who reported high morale, a variety of reasons for this were cited, including:

- Better provision to young people because of YPDP structure;

- Better trained, multi-skilled staff;

- Better partnership delivery and increased profile locally;

- Better management, improved policies, better resourced programme;

- Increased awareness of national/local political agenda;

- Greater understanding and ability to evidence achievement.

For the minority with lower morale, there were concerns about the focus on programme outcomes and 'constant evaluation'; exhaustion from working with very vulnerable young people; and fears about the sustainability of their project.

The main perceived difference by staff between previous programming and the YPDP approach was that YPDP was more structured and involved an expectation of delivering a wider variety of components. Staff generally appreciated having the opportunity to be pushed out of previous 'boxes' of working, and were, on the whole, positive about learning the necessary skills to deliver previously unfamiliar areas of work with young people. This more structured approach was credited by some as meaning that their participants received better, more holistic provision than they had previously. Although most staff said they would intend to retain these changes in post-YPDP delivery, a few were concerned that the programme had been too determined by adults, and should give more freedom to the young people to plan and develop.

> *'The YPDP programme has allowed us to focus on individuals who normally do not access mainstream provision. We have delivered quality work with some of the hardest to reach young people, empowering those engaged in the process. I think the support & the networks that have evolved have been excellent.'* (YPDP strategic co-ordinator)

The main staff criticism of the overall YPDP programme was that the target weekly hours and expected weeks of delivery were too rigid. Some staff reported feeling a great deal of pressure to meet engagement targets with young people, which they felt was unproductive for the overall quality of their work. They were positive about having the chance to work in a more intensive and long term way with these vulnerable young people, but they wanted more flexibility in the ways they operationalised this engagement.

7.4   Other stakeholders

Schools
Projects had varying levels of involvement with local schools prior to YPDP – the highest generally being where projects had traditionally offered sessions as part of an alternative education package to specific schools. The evaluation found, however, that many projects, moved to much closer partnership working with schools as a result of YPDP, whatever the nature of their pattern of delivery. Reasons for this closer partnership working included:

- during the three years of YPDP some projects moved to providing alternative education where previously this had not been a significant feature of their work;
- projects liaised more with schools as part of a more holistic package of support for individuals;
- the feeling that YPDP funding allowed them to invest time in partnership work to an extent that other sources of funding did not.

'*[YPDP] is very, very highly valued, highly prized resource and it has to be targeted at the right children who are gonna get most out of it.*'' (Deputy head teacher)

School staff interviewed in case study sites were very positive about the work of the projects in general and about the specific aims of YPDP. They valued the fact that YPDP targeted the most vulnerable pupils and that the intensity of the approach with this group was bearing fruit in terms of better behaviour and attendance.

*'They [project staff] can always find a way to engage with the children as learners and that's the key to us, anybody could baby-sit but that's not what it's about here, it's about an engagement with learning and if it means we have to do it differently, then… you know, it's finding the hook and that's what [the YDPD project] has given us this year, it's the hook to then get them to face up to other challenges.' (*teacher secondary school*)*

'There is no way that teachers would have had these young people in their classroom in the past, it is only because they are much more aware of the good [following time on YPDP] that they can do that they've been prepared to give them another chance in their own classrooms and then have achieved real success.' (teacher secondary school)

Other agencies
YPDP projects worked with other agencies in two main ways. Firstly they worked in partnership as a route to recruiting young people to the programme and supporting them through it. Secondly they were a source of help for delivering components of the programme. Data collected from staff in other agencies showed clearly that YPDP was seen as a valuable resource to have available locally. Nearly all staff from other agencies in case study sites that we interviewed were aware of YPDP and positive about the contribution that it was making in their area.

However, having multiple agencies involved meant that, at times, there were conflicts between YPDP projects and other agencies over confidentiality of information about young people and/or differing priorities and expectations of involvement on the programmes. These kinds of issues had to be addressed in the first year of the YDPD pilot, and on the whole were resolved satisfactorily.

Box 13

How were the comparison sites viewed by young people, parents and other key stakeholders?

As in the YPDP sites, interviews were carried out with key stakeholders in four comparison case study sites. These included young people, staff, parents and other agencies.

We detail below a summary of the key messages found from these groups by the evaluation. The most notable overarching message is that their views are broadly similar to the views held by YPDP constituents.

Young people: As described above, like YPDP, the majority of those attending comparison projects were very positive of their experience, on the whole. They were less likely to highlight in the breadth of services they had participated in, but were equally positive about staff relationships

Parents: In our interviews in the comparison case studies, we found in this small sample of parents that there had been less involvement with, and knowledge of, projects than we evidenced in YPDP. However those who knew about the projects that their children were participating in were positive about the experience.

Comparison project staff: staff completed questionnaires, as they had in YPDP projects. These showed that, on the whole, morale was high in these projects and the staff liked doing the work they were undertaking.

Stakeholders: – the stakeholders we interviewed about comparison projects in our case study sites were either very positive about the comparison projects or knew little about them. The profile of YPDP was higher in general, but comparison projects were still generally positively viewed in our small sample.

Key points - Views of YPDP

- YPDP was a well-liked programme, acceptable to all major stakeholders. Young people were especially complementary of the activities on offer and their relationships with staff.

- Parents were generally positive about the programme, but some were wary that it might be inappropriate to 'reward' naughty young people with activities.

- Staff liked working in a more holistic way with young people and thought that through YPDP they were offering a better service to their participants. They were critical, however, of perceived lack of flexibility around timing and length of engagement with participants.

- Other local stakeholders – schools and other agencies – had high awareness of YPDP and valued it as an additional community resource.

- Comparison projects were also very well liked by young people, staff and the small sub-sample of other stakeholders that we interviewed. Notably, the young people in the comparison group were similarly positive about their relationships with project staff as the YPDP young people were.

8.   How did YPDP operate at a strategic level?

The evaluation explored key strategic issues relating to the development and implementation of this programme: funding, co-ordination and sustainability. Our findings suggest that these national level issues had influence on the functioning of the programme. In this section we will discuss:
- the costs associated with delivering the YPDP programme at project level;
- the role of the NYA as the training and co-ordination agent for YPDP; and
- issues around the potential sustainability of the programme.

8.1   YPDP costs

The evaluation aimed to identify the explicit funding as well as the actual total costs of providing YPDP per participant This information was gathered through data provided by the NYA about each site's funding; a specific questionnaire survey on funding issues for all YPDP sites; and in-depth research with four purposively selected sites to identify the actual cost of providing YPDP per participant in these sites in 2005/6. We examined whether staff worked across programmes within their projects, whether equipment was used across programmes and whether YPDP paid more or less than normal overheads compared to other programmes.

Explicit funding
Total annual funding paid to YPDP projects increased year on year up to a maximum of £1,639,559 in 2006/7. Annual funding per site averaged £59,158 and varied from £27,100 to £88,048 per year. The number of YPDP participants per site per year averaged 29 and varied from 0 to 73. The overall mean funding per young person was therefore £2,021.

Views on funding
About two-thirds of YPDP projects reported on their economic questionnaire that funding was insufficient, and that YPDP made a smaller contribution to overheads compared to other projects.

> *'The expected range of activities to be provided and the number of additional staff required to deliver them far outweighed the level of funding provided. The shortfall was made up from other budgets and assistance from partnership agencies. Whilst acknowledging that there is never enough money, [it] limits services offered.'* (YPDP project manager)

> *'If young people were required to do 6 hrs (not more)[per week] - funding is 15% short of sustainable, effective, long-term delivery costs.'* (YPDP project manager)

A third of YPDP projects reported that the funding was sufficient, however. This group also said that YPDP made an adequate contribution to overheads.

> *'I think it's enough. I think I'd say, it's a proper funded project. Rather than looking for the crumbs and scrimping and saving like a lot of projects.'* (YPDP project manager)

A large majority of sites reported that YPDP was subsidised in some way by other budgets – either in terms of staff time, equipment or core costs.

> *'We've realised that some projects already have a lot of programmes [and] resources in place that mean they don't need to provide or add much more to meet YPDP needs, whereas for us to engage the young people for the 10 hours [per week], we need more money.'* (YPDP project manager)

> *'The programme would not have run within [our organisation] without significant additional funding from Social Services, Connexions etc.'* (YPDP project manager)

For some projects the issue was not the amount of funding per participant that was crucial, but the length of time the funding lasted for. The project staff who mentioned this were fairly equally divided between those that felt a three year pilot constituted 'long-term funding' and others who felt this was an insufficiently short period of time. Most acknowledged that funding for youth work is typically very short.

> *'[The biggest strength of the YPDP project] is having a good and decent amount of funding to support and develop a project over a reasonable length of time. It's not long term, long term, but it's at least something you can get to grips with, really'.* (YPDP project manager)

Case studies of actual costs
Four case study sites were chosen on the basis that they were representative of the other sites in terms of their earlier questionnaire responses. In particular we sought to find projects that were representative of the other projects in terms of their baseline staffing levels and the extent of cross-subsidy from YPDP to other areas of work and vice versa. This was because we assumed that these factors would predict the actual amount of money (as opposed to earmarked funding) that projects spent in providing YPDP.

The in-depth research confirmed that considerable cross-subsidisation occurred in terms of staff time and equipment. In all four case study sites, workers that were paid from other budgets undertook considerable YPDP work, while YPDP workers did not similarly work on other projects. No equipment purchased from YPDP funds was used on other projects, while in two case studies YPDP used equipment bought from other budgets. Three out of the four sites reported that YPDP paid proportionally less overheads than other projects. In our in-depth sub-sample, the total amount of estimated cross-subsidy in 2005/6 of YPDP from other projects ranged from £1,080 to £17,128 with the other two projects both having a subsidy of around £13,000. This represented a subsidy per participant of between £16 and £604, with the other two projects having subsidies of around £500 per participant. Cross-subsidy did not appear to be predictable on the basis of baseline capacity or the response to the questionnaire item on cross-subsidy as was initially hypothesised. If we assume the figure of £500 per client is about average for YPDP sites, this would suggest a total actual cost per participant of £2500. This was thus comparable to the U.S. $4000 funding per client in CAS-Carrera.

Several projects not involved in the case study work suggested that the overall costs were actually higher than our estimated costs per participant.

> *'It would be really good just to acknowledge that its probably more like £5000 per [young] person for the year, to really do it.'* (YPDP project manager)

Implications of programme funding

The cross-subsidisation of the programme, using existing resources (staff, infrastructure, equipment) to fund YPDP activities, meant that the extent to which a range and depth of activities could be offered was often determined by the additional resources that were available to the projects. Few projects cited funding levels as limiting their ability to deliver the components of YPDP. However, they did stress that they would have been able to do more of certain types of activities if funding levels had been higher and that they would have been able to provide more hours of programming if funds had allowed for more staff time.

> '*Staff-wise really we're just two full-time staff and, to work at schools all day (which would be amazing) you need more staff. You need to have four staff really to make a massive impact to help the young people, it's not free so … I guess actually it's about juggling it.*' (YPDP project manager)

8.2   NYA involvement as Training and Co-ordination Agent

The DH engaged the National Youth Agency as its agent primarily to ensure the YPDP pilot programme was delivered in the manner they had intended, helping to operationalise the national strategic plans at local level. Additionally the NYA was given the responsibility of delivering training for staff and facilitating information networks, so that learning within the pilot could be shared across the 27 projects.

In this section, we will explore what the NYA did in their role; what the local project staff felt about the support provided by the NYA; and the perceived value of having an external agent co-ordinating a pilot programme.

What the NYA did

There were a number of aspects to the NYA's involvement as training and co-ordination agents to YPDP. These aspects are described below.

1. Co-ordination of national conferences and events

The NYA organised national conferences for YPDP staff throughout the course of the programme. These conferences included a launch of the programme in February 2004 and four subsequent national conferences (two in the first year of the pilot, one in each subsequent year). These were two to three day events that provided an opportunity for staff training and networking, and for issues between the DH / NYA and staff to be considered in-depth.

The NYA also organised an 'end of first year' event with the DH at the House of Commons for YPDP staff and young people in May 2005. This was a celebration of the first year of the pilot, and provided an opportunity for young people to showcase their experiences on the programme.

2. Organisation of regional meetings with YPDP staff

The NYA co-ordinated three regional meetings with YPDP staff biannually, i.e. six sets of meetings in each year. These meetings provided an opportunity for project staff and the NYA to discuss operational issues and for sites to showcase their work. A representative from each site was expected to attend.

3. Co-ordination and delivery of training

The NYA co-ordinated a free training programme for YPDP staff. The topics of training were determined predominantly by feedback from projects about their

46

training needs. The NYA provided some of the training modules directly and worked with external training partners to deliver others. The training included:

- Young people, emotional resilience and mental distress
- Volunteering
- Young people, drugs and YPDP
- *Generation Sex (sex education)*
- Managing for the long term: support for managers
- *Getting Connected* training
- *Let's Leave it Til Later:* Delaying early sex

4. Provision of YPDP project support visits
The NYA provided support to project staff by visiting twice a year. They also undertook extra visits to projects that were experiencing difficulties. Overall they made approximately 200 project visits in total. In addition they provided telephone and email support to projects. The NYA also facilitated approximately 15 visits by DH staff to projects and accompanied DH staff on these visits.

5. Provision of information sources to projects
The NYA produced approximately 30 monthly e-newsletter to projects and produced six issues of a quarterly, printed newsletter. NYA produced publicity materials including a leaflet describing the YPDP pilot programme and four conference reports, as well as a case study document for use with potential funders.

6. Financial management
NYA managed YPDP financially over 12 quarterly periods, with responsibility for the disbursal of over £5 million. These funds covered the direct costs of delivery by the projects, as well as the NYA's central costs and those of its training partners.

What did YPDP staff think of the service offered by NYA?
Project staff were surveyed each year for their views on a number of aspects of the services that the NYA offered them. These aspects were:
- liaising with the DH on contractual and programmatic issues;
- support for financial returns;
- general project support;
- information sharing;
- regional and national meetings; and
- other training.

In addition, in case study sites, staff were interviewed for their views on whether they found the support of NYA useful.

On the whole, staff in YPDP projects were positive about the NYA's involvement throughout the three years of the pilot. The majority of staff found the general support that NYA provided was quick, appropriate and helpful. They valued the NYA staff's expertise and passion in relation to working with young people, and also their efficiency.

> *'They've been great… really, really good, and [NYA staff member] has always made it very clear to meet any help, any support, 'Whatever you want… give us a call, we'll do what we can,' and he has responded when we've been in touch about stuff.'* (YPDP project manager)

> *'They're a lot more hands-on [than other project managers], really passionate… I think that's really good, to see that passion.'* (YPDP project manager)

> *'[Concerning finances, NYA staff are] very accessible, respond really promptly and sort of have made things very straightforward and simple when you consider that we've got about five streams of funding. Anything to do with the NYA, it's always very efficient and very well set out, we just need to fill in this form, send it off.'* (YPDP project manager)

A small minority of staff (13%) saw information sharing as poor during the first year and around 10% found liaising with the DH to be poor through the three years of the pilot, but most staff viewed both these aspects as good throughout.

Staff from a few projects mentioned, however, that they did not receive enough support from the NYA when they were having difficulties. This minority thought that the NYA's role should be less as an enforcer and more as a supporter. Some staff felt that the degree of pressure they were put under, for example to recruit young people to YPDP, was detrimental at times. A few staff mentioned that they similarly disliked the pressure from the NYA to chase up young people for the evaluation. Some staff felt that the uncertainty about possible funding to carry on beyond the three year pilot had been poorly managed.

Staff consistently said they saw regional and national meetings, and support about finances, as well provided by the NYA. They liked the regional meetings; they especially valued the contact with staff from other projects and the opportunity to visit other projects that meetings gave them. Most staff liked the national conferences as an opportunity to network. They enjoyed the time out from their working environment to share learning and air concerns. A minority of staff thought that expenditure on hotels for these activities was an unnecessary extravagance.

Most staff described the training as being of high quality and felt that it was unusual for youth workers to obtain such good support.

> *'All the training that I've been on, has always been really positive and the conferences, meeting the other workers, it's been really brill.'* (YPDP project worker)

The training programme was well received by most. However, there were a small number of staff who found it lacking. Criticism of the training was that it varied in quality and that it was not always pitched at the right level. Staff accepted that it was difficult to match everyone's level of expertise, given the range amongst the staff group. Some felt that the two or three day training courses were too long and others felt that they could have received better training locally. Despite the training being free, and predominantly well received, a relatively small proportion of projects accessed each training.

What is the perceived value of having an external programme Training and Co-ordination Agent?

Over the course of the programme, the evaluation gathered evidence that suggested there was value in having had an external agency acting as the 'delivery agent' for YPDP. Implementation of YPDP was perceived to have been considerably more consistent than it would have been if there had not been input from the NYA as Training and Co-ordination Agent. Project staff credit NYA with having ensured that they delivered, to the best of their abilities, the programme they had signed up for,

rather than just continuing with the work they had always done. Although there remained diversity of delivery, it is likely that there would have been considerably less focus on the intended model of YPDP if NYA had not been acting as a coordinator of the programme.

Additionally, having an external Training and Co-ordination Agent meant that there was a distance between the funding body and the projects, which had some benefits for those at local level. It meant that it was easier to maintain focus on the core aims of the programme, rather than become too engaged in higher level questions of policy or the current topics of media interest. Although some changes to programme content did occur, reflecting changes in the policy agenda (e.g. a greater focus on obesity), these were relatively minor. Additionally, this distance from the funder may have allowed for dissent to be aired and discussed more easily with the NYA than it might have been with the DH. One example of this was the projects' concerns about the reality of a 52 week 'year of provision' for each young person. This showed that projects were able to share their concerns with the NYA which, noting that there was a consensus towards a 'year of provision' that allowed for staff and young people to have holidays, negotiated a reduction with the DH about expected weeks of retention of young people on the programme to 48 weeks. With the NYA's involvement, this change was negotiated with relative ease.

Evidence gathered from DH staff indicated that they found the dynamic of having a Training and Co-ordination Agent to be a fruitful one. This appeared to be especially true in terms of being provided with a regular overview of implementation issues by the NYA, which allowed for more timely and organised trouble-shooting of potential problems.

There were, however, some challenges encountered by the various parties in relation to the NYA's role. Nearly all the project staff valued the support that the NYA provided. However, in a few cases there were personality clashes between project and NYA staff and as a result, some projects would have preferred more direct dealings with the DH. As mentioned earlier, the NYA was seen at times as being too closely aligned with government, and thus not being enough of an advocate for the projects' own views.

For the NYA there were occasional drawbacks to its role. For instance, there were times when it was in the position of having to manage uncertainty, for example about future funding, over which it had no control.

8.3   Sustainability issues

During the YPDP pilot, it was clear to the evaluation that YPDP projects functioned more effectively when there was continuity of key staff. There was greater stability in those projects that provided open-ended or at least three year contracts for key staff. In the project where this happened, staff were more likely to remain in post through the crucial developmental and implementation periods of the programme. This continuity was not apparent in all YPDP projects however. Project function and sustainability was most affected when YPDP co-ordinators left during the course of the pilot period, as was the case in 40% of the projects.

As with all time-limited pilot projects, the end of the agreed funding period brings anxieties to those delivering services and uncertainty for those participating in these programmes. This proved to be the case for YPDP, particularly since the possibility of a fourth year of funding had been raised. The NYA had carried out a number of

activities in order to attempt to prepare projects for the end of the pilot. At the national conference held 16 months from the end of the pilot, the NYA ran workshops on sustainability issues. They also delivered a training course for managers, *Managing for the long term,* in the last year of the pilot. Despite this, some anxieties remained. Most project staff said they felt that the DH / NYA had not been clear about the issue of possible future funding beyond the three year life of the pilot; this had raised false hopes in some cases.

Project strategies for sustainability
Staff in case study sites were asked their views about future plans to continue the work of YPDP. Staff in some projects aimed to become self-financing by offering their services to schools on a place-by-place basis for individual young people. Other project managers were engaged in discussions with other statutory funders, such as local authorities. None of these projects were optimistic about replacing YPDP levels of funding and so they envisaged scaling down their work. Some projects aimed to approach different funders for funding for different components of the YPDP holistic model:

> *'We'll be describing the components and I may well be saying to someone, whoever, 'Okay, I want you to fund this component'.   Now we already get funding from all over the shop and it's a real nightmare trying to work out what goes on what but I can't see a way of getting big money at the moment at this late stage…'* (YPDP project manager)

Staff were optimistic about sustaining the ethos of YPDP, even if they had to cut back on the actual services they offered to young people once the pilot funding ceased.

> *'Regardless of whether we get any money we want to try and really use the YPDP model as a clear curriculum model for delivering youth work from our centre with 13 to 15 year olds. The guiding principle for what you should do in our open access traditional sort of youth centre, so it's that strong really.'* (YPDP project manager)

Core staff (whose posts had *not* been funded as part of YPDP) felt that they had learnt to work in a more holistic way by being a part of the pilot and that they would continue to do so after the pilot ended:

> *'Whatever work I do [at the project in the future] will include more of these components than it probably would have done… It's been good as a worker, definitely helped me develop and feel more confident delivering some of the [components] than I would have been before.'* (YPDP project worker)

Project managers felt that it would be unfortunate to lose newly trained workers at the end of the programme, and aimed to avoid this happening by finding other jobs within their organisation for these staff:

> *'It'd be a big loss for us 'cause [YPDP] feeds into a lot of other projects, we would lose the skill base of key workers. If we're lucky, staff could be re-deployed if resources from other areas are available, so we keep that training that's been invested in them and keep that enthusiasm and motivation for the youth work they do; that would be a key thing.'* (YPDP project manager)

Key points - Strategic issues

- Funding for YPDP did not cover the actual costs of running the programme. Funding and resources from other projects were used to cross-subsidise YPDP, especially in terms of overheads and core staff costs. Approximate overall costs per participant were, on average, £2500.

- Despite a wide variation in available resources, most YPDP projects managed to deliver at least some aspects of each component of the holistic programme. Limited resources did not mean that any specific component was unworkable, just that less time or resources could be spent on certain types of activities.

- Involvement of the NYA as the Training and Co-ordination Agent for YPDP was generally viewed positively by project staff. It was perceived to allow closer following of programme's aims and allowed programme issues to be resolved more easily.

- Once pilot status and funding was removed from the YPDP programme, as with other similar pilot programmes, staff felt it would be difficult to continue to deliver the model, despite strategies for carrying on aspects of the work.

- Maintaining key staff members was crucial in YPDP for the sustainability of the pilot programme. There was greater stability in those projects that provided open-ended or at least three year contracts for key staff, where staff were more likely to remain in post through the crucial developmental and implementation periods of the programme.

9.   How did YPDP impact on young people's lives?

In this section we will look at various indicators of the how the YPDP programme may have had impact on young people's lives. We begin with a discussion of who the young people were who were completing our questionnaires, and some of the issues involved in making a fair comparison between YPDP and other services. Further discussion of methodological issues related to these outcomes will be discussed in section 10.

This will be followed by analysis of the accreditations received as a result of YPDP, the perceptions of staff and young people of the benefits of the programme, and finally an examination of the short and medium term outcomes relating to mental well-being, substance misuse, sexual health, education and youth offending among YPDP participants and young people in comparison sites, drawing on data from the follow-up questionnaires. This comparison allows conclusions to be made about the potential effectiveness of the YPDP programme compared to existing provision.

9.1   Characteristics of the young people completing questionnaires

Key characteristics of the 2724 young people completing baseline questionnaires from both the YPDP and comparison sites are provided in appendix 3. At baseline, when the young people were on average 14.6 years old, and which for YPDP young people was typically within two months of them joining the project, YPDP participants were slightly more likely than those attending comparison sites to be: young men, socio-economically disadvantaged (i.e. living in non-privately owned accommodation; or in a household where no one was in paid work; or with a lone parent); and from a black or minority ethic group.

Of the 18 potential 'risk' factors measured at baseline, significantly more YPDP than comparison young people reported being 'at-risk' for three of these factors:
* dislike of school;
* truanting; and
* temporary exclusions.

On the other hand, significantly more comparison young people than YPDP young people reported being at-risk for four of these factors:
* permanent exclusions from school;
* attendance at a PRU;
* frequency of drunkenness; and
* experience of heterosexual sex.

9.2   Making a fair comparison

As explained in our Methods section (see section 3), to ensure that a fair comparison could be made when analysing outcomes at follow-ups 1 and 2, we made adjustments for the key differences we found in the YPDP and comparison groups of young people completing our baseline questionnaire, and in the case of follow-up 2 outcomes also undertook a propensity-score-based analysis.

Locating and encouraging young people to complete follow-up questionnaires at two additional time points was a challenging exercise for the evaluation, particularly when the young person was no longer attending the project. Although great efforts were made to retain the young people in the study, this was not always possible: we retained 61% at follow-up 1 (approximately 9 months post baseline) and 41% at

follow-up 2 (approximately 18 months post baseline) (see appendix 2 for more details regarding follow-up rates). When we looked at which young people completed follow-up questionnaires, we found that there was a difference between the YPDP and comparison groups in how many individuals filled in these questionnaires. To ensure that our analysis was fair, we undertook an additional analysis which weighted for these differences in who filled in their follow-up questionnaires. This analysis used a weighting technique which took into account those who did not complete their follow-up. Both unweighted and weighted analysis results are reported in appendix 3.

These adjustments help ensure that any effects found in our analysis of outcomes do not merely reflect existing differences between young people in YPDP and comparison sites either at baseline or follow-up (i.e. confounding and attrition bias, respectively). However, there is still a possibility that some differences remained in factors that we did not measure or measured incompletely.

9.3   Achieving accreditation

YPDP aimed to provide vulnerable young people with the opportunity to experience achievement. One such route was to enable young people to obtain formal accreditation for activities carried out as part of the project. Projects had different perspectives about what type of accreditation was most appropriate: some entered young people into accreditation programmes for outdoor activity skills (e.g. canoeing), others for practical skills (e.g. first aid), others for personal development curriculum (e.g. Getting Connected) and others for educational skills (e.g. writing).

According to data submitted by the YPDP project staff, approximately a third of programme participants, 707 young people, gained at least one formal accreditation. This ranged across projects from none to nearly all their young people receiving some formal accreditation as a result of participating in the programme.

The evaluation asked young people on their questionnaires whether they had received a certificate for anything they did as part of the project they attended. At both first and second follow-up, the YPDP young people were significantly more likely than comparisons to say that they had received some certification. Although this was not necessarily formal accreditation, these certificates allowed for a sense of achievement amongst young people who might normally be considered 'under achievers'. At first follow-up, over half of YPDP young people said they had received a certificate and by second follow-up, nearly three quarters said this had occurred.

Box 14

Amanda's story

'Amanda' was referred to a YPDP project by the Youth Offending Team because she was believed to be taking class A drugs and cannabis. She had also had contact with the police. She had low motivation and problems with attendance at school.

Home visits and phone calls by YPDP staff encouraged Amanda to become engaged with the project and she got involved in the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, residential trips, Arts Council Awards, as well as other project activities such as dance. She represented the YPDP project at a conference in London, performing her own drama and singing in front of over 250 people. She now teaches dance sessions, mentors young people and, since completing YPDP, has become a member of the Millennium volunteers. Amanda is no longer using class A drugs.

9.4 Views on impact of YPDP: young people and staff

In both YPDP and comparison projects, young people were asked on their questionnaires, at both follow-up points, about whether they felt attending the project had affected them in any way. Additional questions about this were asked of young people in interviews in case study sites. Staff were similarly asked on questionnaires and in interviews about their sense of the impacts of the programme on young people.

Overall, YPDP young people were very positive about the impact that taking part in their programme had had on their lives.

In the first follow-up questionnaire, a significantly greater proportion of young people involved in the YPDP programme than comparison projects reported that they thought that attending the project had helped them (92% vs. 86%, p=0.01). There was very similar reporting by young men and young women on the perception of project helpfulness.

When asked about specific ways in which the project could have helped them, young people reported very positive findings at first follow-up (when they were, on the whole, either still involved, or just finishing their time on the project). (See table 4) In all but two of the 12 pre-specified potential impacts, YPDP young people were significantly more positive than the comparison young people about the impact of their project. YPDP young people were particularly positive about impacts relating to life skills, especially communication and relationship issues. The areas where the fewest YPDP young people felt impact (and were not significantly more positive than the comparison group) concerned communication with teachers, and reading and writing.

Table 4
First follow-up – percentage of young people saying their project helped them on specific areas of impact

Area of impact	YPDP	Comparison	significant difference
Better at working with others	90%	86%	**
Better at talking to people and listening	88%	83%	*
Better at making/ keeping friends	87%	87%	
Know better where to go for help	85%	79%	*
Better idea of what I want and how I can get it	83%	78%	*
More confident / like myself more	81%	74%	*
Better prepared to get a job	79%	74%	**
Staying out of trouble better	76%	71%	**
Less angry or better able to calm down	71%	63%	*
Better at being healthy	71%	61%	*
Get on better with teachers	62%	67%	
Better at reading and writing	56%	50%	*

* Significant at p<=0.01, adjusted for cluster

At second follow-up, when nearly all the young people had left their programme, overall 87% of the YPDP young people still felt that the programme had helped them. When they were asked specific questions about whether in retrospect they felt their programme had had an impact on them, YPDP young people were significantly more positive than the comparison group regarding the impact the project had with linking them to other projects and helping them attend school, education projects or PRUs more regularly (see table 5).

Table 5
Second follow-up. Proportion of young people who said their project had impact on a specific area

Area of impact	YPDP	Comparison	significant
Take part in other projects	32%	21%	*
Not truant so much or start attending school	26%	16%	*
Start going to college	23%	24%	
Go to other education project or PRU	14%	9%	*
Get paid employment	9%	9%	
Helped in some other way	8%	2%	*
Get on a modern apprenticeship scheme	6%	4%	

* Significant at p<=0.01

In interviews and in open ended questions on their questionnaires at both time points, young people were very positive about the impact that the projects had on them, regarding especially: confidence, future aspiration, and re-engaging with education.

> *'[YPDP] made me realise that you should have education and don't wanna end up like a layabout or a drug user or a criminal or in prison. You don't have to argue, you don't have to beat someone up with your fists, you could beat someone up with your mind. Say they're arguing with you and they want you to start fighting, ask them 'Why do you wanna start fighting? Why are you doing this?''* (YPDP young person)

Young people's views on impact of YPDP on mental well-being
Young people said that their project work, especially one-on-one time with staff had made them gain in confidence in their own abilities and had made them more positive about their future.

> *'[The project] did a lot for me. I used to be bad, but they explained and asked why I did things and that helped me to change'* (YPDP young person)

> *'It helped me to be more confident and realise that I am the same as everyone else. I am not stupid'* (YPDP young person)

Re-engagement with education and greater aspiration for employment
In interviews and on questionnaires, young people credited YPDP with helping them to view education differently, both in terms of how important it could be for their future and in terms of relating better to the teachers.

'Because of [my YPDP project] I went to a PRU and I love it. Helped me not truant by showing me what I could do and what I was missing out on.' (YPDP young person)

'It made me think seriously about education and what I wanted to do and helped get back into college. Gave me a more positive drive to education' (YPDP young person)

'[Taking part in YPDP] gave me confidence in some ways, it gave me a boost to believe that I was capable of doing school work and going to college.' (YPDP young person)

[Taking part in YPDP] opened me up more to the work environment, helped with work preparation. [There's] more to getting a job than just turning up. [The project] help me appreciate that appearance, attitude and teamwork are important. (YPDP young person)

Getting into trouble

A further positive theme that was mentioned by many young people was that participation in YPDP had 'kept them out of trouble', either by helping them deal with anger issues or by providing them with an alternative to 'hanging around'.

'Before [YPDP] I was always on the streets, fighting and getting drunk. It gave me something to do and I enjoyed myself there.' (YPDP young person)

'It calmed me down. Doing activities tired me out and when I came home I stayed in and did not get into trouble with my mates' (YPDP young person).

'We used to get into trouble, they [YPDP staff] used to calm us down and talk to us and we learned how to take control of situations. (YPDP young person)

'Stopped me from messing about. Since going there I have not been in trouble with the police.' (YPDP young person)

Young people's criticisms of YPDP

A small proportion of young people (fewer than 1 in 20) mentioned in interviews or questionnaires that the YPDP programme hadn't helped them. Those who were critical usually mentioned that the project had not managed to engage them sufficiently to make them want to attend; others felt that the programme content was lacking; and some curtailed their involvement because of bullying from other participants. Examples of criticisms from young people included the following quotes:

'It didn't help me. I got kicked out for starting fights, etc' (YPDP young person)

'I don't feel it helped because I didn't give it a chance – only went for a short period of time.' (YPDP young person)

It didn't help because it was rubbish. Did the same thing over and over. (YPDP young person)

'Groups were sent home early, no proper lessons. It got silly in the end. I was naughty because I was bored.' (YPDP young person)

'It did not help at all – just a fun day out doing activities.' (YPDP young person)

'Other girls there made me feel like nothing. Two girls singled me out and I was bullied there. I thought I could get away from bullying at school, but there you go.' (YPDP young person)

Staff views on impact

The evaluation asked YPDP staff for their views on whether the programme was having an impact on participants. Universally, staff believed that the programme had at least some positive impact on young people. When asked to define the ways in which the programme had influenced participants, the majority of staff suggested that that the impact was primarily on the 'building blocks' for long term outcomes (e.g. self-esteem and confidence), rather than on individual short term outcomes.

'Does [YPDP] have an impact? Most definitely. Individuals grow in response to our work, increased confidence, achievements, resilience, making rounded & happier people.' (YPDP project manager)

'Increased self-confidence. Young people develop their telephone skills, make phone calls to organise trips. Increase their ability to access other services, e.g. independent travel to places outside of the county.' (YPDP project worker)

A third of staff we surveyed mentioned that the programme had already positively impacted on educational issues: aspiration, attendance, discipline. The attainment of accreditation on the project was mentioned as having had an influence in helping the young people re-engage with more formal education processes.

'[We've seen an impact on] school attendance; educational attainment, behaviour & social skills (for those in school). Not so much for hardest to reach groups, though.' (YPDP project manager)

Regarding health behaviours, few project staff said that the work on YPDP had had a transforming effect on sexual health and substance misuse. Rather, there were those that credited participation on the programme with increasing awareness around these (and other) health issues, and in some instances with the reduction (rather than an eradication) of risk taking behaviours.

Several staff members mentioned that they thought the benefits of YPDP would show more in the future, than they do at present. They suggested that there would be increased opportunities, for instance with volunteering and obtaining qualifications, when they were older or as time elapsed.

Some staff members were positive about the impact that YPDP had had on some of the participants, but talked about the missed opportunities with others. Some of these suggested that the programme intervention either came too late for some young people, whereas for others it would have been better if the intervention had lasted longer, or been later. One example given was that the discussions around sexual health are very different for 13 year olds who often haven't yet become sexually active compared with the discussions with the same young people two years later when many more of them will have experienced sex. This worker pointed out that by working with these young people for only one year, the development of this changing dialogue around these issues is curtailed too early.

The concentration on outcomes was seen by some staff as having been given too great a focus for those planning and delivering the programme. This view was coupled with others who were cynical about the ability of the evaluation to capture the true progress made by YPDP participants.

> *'The [YPDP] project itself, although being hard work, has been amazing. However while it is necessary for evaluation etc. it has always felt to me that we shouldn't compromise our work in order to produce certain outcomes. And that people seemed to forget it was, and is, about the young people and they are most important.'* (YPDP project manager)

> *'[The programme has had impact in] all sorts of ways. Self esteem, dealing with adults, group skills, etc, but very few that can be evidenced.'* (YPDP project manager)

9.5   Analysis of key outcomes

The following sections discuss the statistical findings related to the outcomes that were identified at the beginning of the evaluation as being key to showing whether the programme had the impact intended. These are separated into the themes of mental well-being, health, education and contact with the police. Further detailed results are available in the tables in appendix 3. The possible methodological and programme aspects that may have influenced these comparative statistical findings are discussed in section 10 of this report.

Mental well-being

> *'I think increasing self-esteem is really important because I think if you can do that, you're arming them really against a lot of other possible dangers, just that feeling that they are worth something and can do something with their lives, maybe makes it easier for them to make a positive choice, rather than a negative choice like offending and drugs, and because we do a lot of group work, you're often working with the young people and their peers anyway because they emphasise who they want in their group so I think that helps cause you're trying to create a positive ethos amongst that group and their peers'* (YPDP project worker)

Raising self-esteem was a central aspect of YPDP and of the US models which informed the programme. Through improving young people's emotional well-being, it was hoped that many risky behaviours would be reduced. The evaluation explored these issues through several measures included in the questionnaires with young people:

- *talking about problems*: (this is intended as a proxy for isolation);
- *levels of worry*: (this is a valid predictor of future mental health problems[25]);
- *levels of anger (measured at first follow-up)*
- *self-esteem (measured using the Rosenberg Scale[26] –at second follow-up)*

---

[25] Hobcraft, J. (2002) Social exclusion and the generations. In J. Hills, J. le Grand, & D. Piachaud (eds.) *Understanding Social Exclusion*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

[26] Rosenberg M (1965) Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Talking about problems
At both follow-up points, we found that similar proportions in YPDP and comparison arms reported finding it difficult to talk to friends about personal issues. For YPDP young people at first follow-up 16% found this difficult; by second follow-up it had dropped to 11%. Our adjusted, weighted comparative statistical analyses[27] showed that the likelihood of having difficulty discussing things with a friend was not significantly different between the YPDP and comparison young people at either time point.

Ease of communication with project workers was also explored at first follow-up. We found that similar proportions, four out of ten, of YPDP and comparison young people reported they would find it difficult to talk to a project worker if they had a problem. Our analyses showed no significant difference between the groups regarding difficulty in talking about problems with a project worker.

Levels of worry
At first follow-up we found that six out of ten young people in both the YPDP and comparison group reported that they often worried about things; this increased to just under three-quarters of the young people at second follow-up. Our analyses found no significant difference between the two groups on the likelihood of often worrying at either follow-up point.

Box 15

Mariam's story

'Mariam' was referred to YPDP as part of a group school referral. She was an asylum seeker from Afghanistan, with limited English and living in a difficult area. She worked on Getting Connected's 'All About Me' unit which looked at where she was from (e.g. drawing maps, painting flags, doing timelines of significant events in her life). A 'Ready, Steady, Cook' challenge ran for several weeks, where each young person had to cook a typical meal for the rest of the group, staff and invited guests. This reduced racial tensions within the diverse group and also led to links developing between the project and Miriam's family.

After her time on the project, Miriam was invited to volunteer at the girls group to help prepare food and help with art projects. Over the course of her time with YPDP, her English improved, her self-esteem increased and she became less isolated. Contact with the project only ended when she moved away from the area.

Levels of anger
At first follow-up approximately half of YPDP and comparison young people reported that they had often been angry in the last few weeks. Our comparative analyses showed no significant difference in the likelihood of being frequently angry.

Level of self-esteem
At second follow-up, we asked seven questions relating to aspects of self esteem, from which a self-esteem score was calculated. This score showed that just over a quarter of young people in both YPDP and comparison groups were rated as having lower self-esteem. Our analyses showed no significant difference between the two groups in the likelihood of having lower self-esteem.

---

[27] Adjusted for differences on key baseline variables, age at follow-up, PRU attendance and for project 'cluster'. It was also weighted for differential loss to follow-up. See appendix 3. All subsequent statistical analyses reported in this section were adjusted and weighted in this way.

Box 16

Distance travelled

Personal distance travelled was measured by comparing how individual YPDP and comparison young people progressed on key outcomes from the time when we first surveyed them through the follow-up time points.

On truanting, for instance, where national data shows that young people become more likely to truant as they progress through grades 8 to 10[28], we found at a corresponding time period that there was only a less than 5% increase in truanting behaviour amongst the young people involved in the YPDP or comparison projects. This was impressive, given the vulnerability of the young people involved in these projects and their high reported levels of dislike of school.

Similarly, there were only very small increases (2%) in levels of drunkenness. Even more encouraging for those attending these projects, there was an overall reduction in those whose behaviour became worse in relation to temporary exclusions and contact with the police, countering the national trends for these outcomes[29].

Health outcomes
A key objective of YPDP was to influence young people's health-related behaviours, particularly regarding substance misuse and sexual behaviour.

Substance misuse outcomes
The following measures were used to examine substance misuse at both follow-up points:
- *Alcohol consumption: (frequency of getting drunk in the last six months);*
- *Illegal drug use: (frequency of cannabis use in the last six months[30]).*

Alcohol consumption
At baseline significantly fewer young people in the YPDP group than the comparison group reported having been drunk at least once a month. At the first follow-up, the numbers reporting drunkenness became similar in the two groups with just over a third in both the groups reporting this behaviour. By the second follow-up, the proportion reporting at least monthly drunkenness remained the same for YPDP young people (39%) as at first follow-up, but had dropped for the comparison group. Our analyses showed that there was no significant difference in the likelihood of frequent drunkenness between YPDP and comparison young people at either of the follow-up points.

Illegal drug use
At baseline, the same proportion of YPDP and comparison young people reported that they had ever tried an illegal drug (86%). At that time, approximately a fifth of both the YPDP and comparison young people were using cannabis at least once a

---

[28] National Statistics (2007) Pupil Absence in Secondary Schools in England. SFR 11.2007. London, DfES
[29] Youth Justice Board (2007) Youth Justice Annual Statistics 2005/06. London, YJB
[30] Cannabis was selected as the most appropriate outcome measure of illegal drug use for young people given it is the most commonly used by this age group.

week. A smaller proportion of participants had used ecstasy, amphetamines or cocaine in the previous six months.

At the first follow-up questionnaire, there were approximately 15% who used cannabis at least weekly. The proportions using cannabis were similar between the YPDP and comparison groups at both the two follow-up time points and our analyses showed no significant differences between the groups.

The intra-cluster correlation coefficient for frequency of cannabis use was 0.19 (we had assumed 0.05 in our power calculation).

Sexual health outcomes

We focused on the following outcome measures relating to sexual health:
- *age at initiation of heterosexual sex* (previous research suggests that this is a valid predictor of later risk of teenage pregnancy[31]);

- *number of sexual partners* (this is intended to be a proxy measure for acquiring a sexually transmitted infection, although this has not been validated in any research to date; this was asked for the last 3 month period on second follow-up);

- *confidence in suggesting condom use* (these are important skills for preventing pregnancies and sexually transmitted disease);

- *use of contraception at last sex* (this is intended as an indicator of risk of future pregnancy and sexually transmitted infection)

- *teenage pregnancy* (only measured at second follow-up).

Age at initiation of heterosexual sex
At the time of completing the baseline questionnaire, the average age of participants was 14.56 years among YPDP young people and 14.65 years among comparison young people. At this point, a third of YPDP young people had experienced heterosexual sex, which was significantly fewer than in the comparison group (40%).

At first follow-up, 44% of YPDP young people had experienced heterosexual sex before the age of 16, slightly more than in the comparison group. At first follow-up, our analyses did not find these differences to be significant.

By the second follow-up questionnaire, over half the YPDP young people reported that they had had their first sexual experience before the age of 16. This figure was higher than those in the comparison group (40%), although this difference was not significant in our analyses. However when analysed by gender subgroups, it was found that significantly more YPDP young women had experienced sex by the age of 16 than comparison young women [OR 3.48 (1.49, 8.12) See Appendix 3 and the note below regarding intra-cluster correlation co-efficients[32]].

---

[31] Wellings, K., Nanchahal, K., Macdowall, W. et al (2001) Sexual behaviour in Britain: early heterosexual experience. *Lancet* 358, 9296, 1843-50

[32] The intra-cluster correlation coefficient for experience of heterosexual sex at follow-up 2 was 0.12 in contrast with 0.05 assumed in our power calculation.

Number of sexual partners
On the first follow-up questionnaire, the young people provided information on the number of sexual partners they had had over the last six months. Of those with sexual experience, just over a third of both YPDP and comparison groups had had more than one sexual partner in the last six months. At the second follow-up, 29% of YPDP young people and a similar proportion of comparison reported having had two or more sexual partners in the previous three months.

At either follow-up time point, in our analyses, the likelihood of having had two or more sexual partners did not differ significantly between YPDP and comparison young people.

Confidence in suggesting condom use
On the first follow-up questionnaire, all young people (including those who had never had sex) were asked how difficult they would find suggesting the use of a condom to a partner. One in ten YPDP and comparison young people thought this would be difficult to do. When our analyses were carried out, we found no significant differences between YPDP and comparison young people in the odds of them reporting this to be difficult.

Use of contraception
Confidence in suggesting condom use (or anticipated confidence) is only one of the steps towards actual use of contraception. In interviews with young people, various reasons were cited for not using contraception. The main ones were lack of pre-planning, drunkenness, apathy and inability to obtain contraception. Several also suggested they had experienced problems with using contraception such as allergy, forgetfulness or failure.

Of those young people who reported heterosexual sex at baseline, a very similar proportion in the YPDP and comparison groups (nearly 4 out of 5) reported having used contraception the last time they had sex. At both follow-up points, a similar proportion to those at baseline had used contraception at last sexual encounter. Our analyses showed no significant differences between YPDP and comparison young people in the likelihood of using contraception the last time they had sex.

Experience of pregnancy
At both follow-up points we asked young people about conceptions. Young women were asked whether they had ever been pregnant and young men were asked whether they were aware of their making a girl pregnant. When pregnancies had occurred, we asked about their age at the time and outcomes of the pregnancy. Pregnancies that happened before the baseline were counted as having occurred before the programme began and excluded. There were a total of 38 pregnancies reported post- baseline for YPDP young women (16%) and 13 for comparison (6%). These pregnancies spread across a wide number of the projects. Our analyses found this difference to be large and significant (odds ratio= 3.55; 96% confidence interval1.32, 9.50). The proportion of young men who said they were aware of making a girl pregnant (11%) was similar in the two groups.

> **Pregnancies amongst YPDP young women**
> - 63% were aged under 16 when they conceived
> - 61% of the pregnancies happened after their time at YPDP finished
> - 35% ended in miscarriage
> - Of those that didn't miscarry, 50% of those 16 – 18yrs had an abortion; 55% of those 13- 15 yrs had an abortion.

The difference in pregnancies to young women in YPDP and comparison projects is greater among the first year cohort of young people. However, the differences remained significant among the year-2 and year-3 cohorts as well. Regardless of what combination of factors we adjusted for in our analyses (e.g. previous pregnancies, area level teenage pregnancy rates) this significant difference between YPDP and comparison young women remained.[33] (See Appendix 3). Analyses of follow-up 2 data incorporating a propensity score (see Appendix 3) also did not differ from this pattern of associations. (See the note below regarding intra-cluster correlation co-efficients.[34])

Box 17

Kylie's Story

'Kylie' joined YPDP just before her 14th birthday. Her youth worker referred her because she had a great deal of conflict at home. Project staff noted that she was having difficulty engaging in a group setting and commitments at home also made it difficult for her to attend. Unlike many young people attending YPDP, she reported enjoying school, although, '*I skipped off some lessons. It was just me being a stupid immature teenager. I used to go to my boyfriend's house. He was older than me. In year 9 I didn't go to school at all.*'

Ten months after joining YPDP, the young person disclosed that she was pregnant. She was referred to teenage pregnancy services by project staff. She did remember attending the project for sexual health activities, however, this did not affect her behaviour, '*Yes they talked about condoms and the reason I didn't use one last was because I was drunk.*'

Talking about getting pregnant, she said, '*I was too young. I weren't drunk. He was my first boyfriend, my own true love. It would have been better to have waited until I was 19 or 20. I didn't mean to get pregnant but it really sorted me out. I used to go out all the time and get drunk.*'

After having the baby, she talked about her aspirations for her daughter, '*I wish my baby gets good teachers. I would never give her cigarettes. I am a good mum.*'

---

[33] Adjustments were made for baseline differences in: age, socioeconomic status, sexual risk behaviour, baseline pregnancies, PRU attendance and ward-level teenage pregnancy rates. The association remains in all adjustment models including those that adjust only for factors such as housing tenure where YPDP participants are more disadvantaged and not for factors such as baseline sexual activity where comparisons are more risky.

[34] The intra-cluster correlation coefficients for experience of teenage pregnancy at follow-up 2 was 0.08, in contrast with 0.05 assumed in our power calculation.

She had positive memories of the YPDP project where she had participated for a total of 118 hours, over 13 months. '*They talked to me and helped me… There was a man there … who was so lovely and we could talk to him.*'

Educational outcomes

YPDP also aimed to improve educational outcomes such as school attendance and attainment. One criteria for recruiting young people to YPDP was that they were excluded from school or at risk of school exclusion. Many projects targeted out-of-school youth and those experiencing difficulties at school. It was intended that delivering a holistic programme of activities to young people, some of which provide educational skills as well as others targeting self-esteem issues and related behaviour, which might influence their attitudes to, and relationship with, school. The evaluation specifically measured the following education-related outcomes:

- *views on school* (dislike of school is a valid proxy for school exclusion[35]);

- *truanting* (this is also a valid predictor for future drug misuse);

- *temporary exclusions from school*

- *number not in education, employment or training (NEET)* (measured only at second follow-up)*.*

At first follow-up, 63% of YPDP young people and 60% of comparison young people said that they were attending 'ordinary' secondary school. Reasons for non-attendance included permanent and temporary exclusions; long term truancy; and having finished year 11. Fewer YPDP than comparison young people who completed the questionnaire were attending pupil referral units (11% versus 20%). By second follow-up, the proportions in ordinary secondary school had dropped, as had those in PRUs, which was not unexpected given the age of the young people had increased, and many were opting to finish school altogether.

Views of school
We asked young people to report their feelings about school. At baseline, large proportions of the young people reported dislike of school: 67% of YPDP and slightly fewer of comparison young people. At follow-up, these figures were virtually unchanged. In our analyses, there were no significant differences between the two groups in the likelihood of disliking school.

Truanting
At baseline just under half of YPDP young people reported they had truanted in the previous six months. At first follow-up, in our adjusted and weighted analyses we found that significantly more YPDP young people (49%) than comparison young people (29%) had truanted in the last six months (odds ratio= 2.16; 95% confidence interval1.23, 3.77). Further analysis identified that this difference was predominantly

---

[35] Edwards, S. and Malcolm, H. (2002) The Causes and Effects of Truancy. *SCRE Newsletter*, Number17

caused by an increased number of YPDP young women truanting, especially in the first year cohort of the project (the difference reduced dramatically in the second and third years of the pilot). This trend indicates that with each year of implementation of YPDP, this truanting outcome difference for young women became less pronounced. This may have been related to some specific effect in the first year of the project which was removed as a result of the efforts of the YPDP project staff who targeted this area of work following the production of interim results.

By second follow-up, the proportion of YPDP young people truanting had dropped substantially (21%) and the difference between the groups had narrowed considerably and was no longer statistically significant.

Temporary exclusions from school
At baseline 44% of YPDP young people said that they had been temporarily excluded, at least once, in the last six months. This proportion was higher than in the comparison group. At first follow-up, the proportions of young people overall who said they had been temporarily excluded had fallen but remained non-significantly higher in YPDP than the comparison participants: a third of YPDP participants versus a quarter of the comparison participants. However there was a significant interaction with gender and the rate of temporary exclusions among YPDP girls was significantly higher than among comparison girls. This association remained significant in adjusted and weighted analyses. By second follow-up, the proportions who reported temporary exclusions in the previous three months were considerably lower and much more equal - just over 10% for both groups. Our analyses showed no significant differences between YPDP and comparisons.

Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)
At follow-up 2 we asked young people whether they were currently in any form of education, employment or training (or had this organised to begin this in the next three months, given that for some this questionnaire was completed in the summer). One in ten of both YPDP and the comparison young people reported that they were not in any form of education, employment or training. Our analyses confirmed that the likelihood of being NEET was not statistically different between the two groups.

Crime, anti-social behaviour and contact with police

Another intended outcome of YPDP was for reduced offending and convictions among participating young people. The evaluation measured this issue by asking young people about:

- *Contact with the police (being stopped, told off or picked up) in the last six months* (a predictor of a broad range of social exclusion related outcomes[36].

- *Warnings and convictions in the previous six months* (this was only asked at second follow-up, as a stronger outcome to distinguish seriousness of contact with police after their time on the programme.)

Over half (53%) of both YPDP and comparison young people reported at baseline having had contact with the police (been stopped, told off or picked up by them) in the previous six months. At each of the two follow-up points, those having contact with the police in the previous six months reduced for both groups of young people:

---

[36] Hobcraft, J. (2002) Social exclusion and the generations. In J. Hills, J. le Grand, & D. Piachaud (eds.) *Understanding Social Exclusion*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

by second follow-up this had fallen to approximately a third of the young people. A quarter of YPDP young people reported having had official warnings or convictions with the police in the six months prior to the second follow-up point; this was higher than in the comparison group (18%). However, at each follow-up, in our analyses, none of these differences were statistically significant.

Expectations and future life preparedness

Another intended outcome for YPDP was increased preparedness and aspirations for adult life. The evaluation measured this by asking young people at follow-up 1 about:

- Expectation about being a parent by age 20.

- Expectation about being in a steady job by age 20.

At baseline around half of YPDP and comparison group participants expected to be a parent by age 20 and this fell in both groups to around a third of participants by follow-up 1. Overall there was no significant difference between YPDP and comparison young people reporting this expectation at follow-up 1. However we did find a significant interaction between gender and this expectation such that YPDP young women were significantly more likely than comparison young women to report this expectation at follow-up 1. This sub-group association remained after adjustment for baseline differences and weighting for differential loss to follow-up.

At baseline around 90% of young people in the YPDP and comparison group expected to have a steady job by age 20 and this remained about the same at follow-up 1; there being no significant differences between the two groups.

Exploratory analyses

We carried out exploratory analyses on a range of programmatical features that we hypothesised might have influenced the statistical outcomes. Our evaluation was designed and statistically powered to examine outcomes associated with the programme overall rather than to explore how outcomes differed between different YPDP sites and participants. Because of this, our exploratory analyses were done to get some sense of whether there were obvious differences rather than to offer definitive information about this. These analyses all adjusted for cluster.

We divided the young people into the following categories for this analysis:
- those who attended YPDP projects that were entirely voluntary versus those where there was statutory expectation of attendance (versus comparison group);

- those in the YPDP groups not attending PRUs (versus those in the comparison group not attending PRUs);

- those who attended YPDP projects judged by the NYA to have delivered the programme to a high standard versus moderate standard versus adequate standard (versus comparison);

- those with greater involvement versus less involvement (weeks duration/hours on project) (versus comparison);

- those experiencing a more holistic package of participation versus less holistic;

- those who had a greater number of risk factors at baseline versus those with fewer.

Having run these analyses no clear cut trends emerged. We did not find that the key outcomes were likely to be more positively influenced if the YPDP programme was carried out in a specific way or focused on specific young people.

Key points - Impact results

- A third of YPDP young people achieved accreditation as a result of the programme.

- Young people themselves reported greater perception of impact in the YPDP programme than in the comparison group on a variety of factors.

- Staff believed the programme had an impact on young people, but also thought that the impact was primarily be on the building blocks for long term outcomes, rather than on individual short term outcomes.

- The evaluation recorded many individual stories of personal growth amongst young people attending YPDP. There were positive, encouraging examples of distance travelled – for both YPDP and comparison young people when compared to national average on involvement with the police and temporary exclusions.

- When making statistical comparisons between YPDP young people and similar young people attending other youth provision in the comparison arm, the programme appeared to have little *additional* positive short or medium term impact on personal outcomes

  o In the first year of the YPDP, when the programme was not yet fully operational, significantly more YPDP young people than those in the control group truanted from school; this difference disappeared in the later years of the pilot.

  o At follow-up 1, more young women in the YPDP than the comparison group reported temporary exclusions and expecting to be a parent by age 20 and these associations remained after adjusting for baseline differences and weighting for variable follow-up.

  o Teenage pregnancies were significantly more commonly reported at follow-up 2 among young women in YPDP than in the control group, even after adjusting for various combinations of baseline differences,

> differential follow-up as well as area-level factors.
>
> - o At both follow-up one and two, there were no significant differences between YPDP and comparison young people in terms of mental well-being, substance misuse, other educational outcomes, or crime and anti-social behaviour.
>
> - o The extent to which these findings are likely to be attributable to the interventions young people experienced and/or methodological issues will be discussed in section 10.
>
> - We found some evidence for outcomes reported by YPDP participants to be statistically somewhat better in years 2/3 compared with year 1, despite attracting similar participants in these years.

10. Discussion and recommendations

10.1 Brief summary of key YPDP evaluation findings

- The YPDP project experienced delays in early implementation, but by the end of the first year of the pilot, nearly all 27 projects were operating a programme that offered the key components of YPDP.

- The YPDP programme successfully met its targets in terms of recruiting the expected numbers of at-risk 13 to 15 year old young people.

- Overall the YPDP programme was largely successful at delivering a holistic range of activities to young people, offering the opportunity to learn a wide variety of skills. For the majority of young people this included some exposure to the range of expected components (education; life skills; health; sports, arts; mentoring; volunteering; and access to services).

- The projects were able to retain and engage many vulnerable young people for a relatively intensive and prolonged period (on average 173 hours over 40 weeks). Despite this, the average amount of time young people spent on YPDP was less than the original DH target and less than in the US CAS-Carrera programme. This did still represent a significant increase in the level of engagement that many of these projects had provided prior to YPDP.

- The pilot projects operationalised the YPDP programme in diverse ways. Ultimately this meant that there was not one clear model of YPDP being delivered. However, it is likely that variation would have been far greater had NYA not played a key role as training and co-ordination agent.

- YPDP implementation of a youth development ethos was considerably different from the way it had previously been implemented in the USA. Some of this was expected as it had been adapted for an English context. For example YPDP was intended to be delivered for one rather than the three years of the CAS-Carerra model and aimed to recruit young people on the basis of their risk of various outcomes rather than recruiting young people broadly defined as 'disadvantaged'. Apart from the below-target hours of engagement, other aspects also emerged as being different over the course of the pilot. Notably, the young people received less weekly mentoring and fewer referrals to health providers than expected and a greater proportion experienced YPDP as an alternative education provision rather than an addition to more standard education as had been the case with CAS-Carrera.

- The YPDP programme was well liked by the young people, the staff that implemented the pilot, parents and other key stakeholders.

- There were mixed findings in terms of perceived benefits: more YPDP young people than comparison young people perceived their programme as having been beneficial to them. A greater number of YPDP young people than comparison achieved accreditation as part of their project. Our qualitative work in case study sites provided examples that suggested benefits for some participants: in both YPDP and comparison sites young people reported that involvement in the project had helped them to change how they spent their time and who they spent it with. Improvements in self-confidence and the ability to get on with people better were key themes emerging from interviews with YPDP participants and staff.

- However, our comparative outcome analysis did not suggest that participation in YPDP was associated with higher rates of positive outcomes than in the comparison group. Although there were improved outcomes with time (positive distance travelled) on some outcomes for both groups of young people, YPDP young people were statistically no more or less likely than those from comparison sites to report on their questionnaires positive outcomes related to: self-esteem and mental well-being, substance misuse, or contact with police. For young women attending YPDP the statistical comparisons suggested that they had significantly less positive outcomes than the comparison group relating to truanting, temporary exclusions, expectations of being a teenage parent, sexual activity and teenage pregnancy. Possible factors relating to the programme and the evaluation methodology that may have influenced these comparative statistical findings are discussed further below.

- In-depth economic analysis suggested that YPDP cost approximately £2500 per participant. Funding from DH for YPDP did not appear to cover the full costs of running the programme. This meant that projects cross-subsidised YPDP by about £500 per participant, relating chiefly to overhead and core staff costs. Despite a wide variation in available resources, most YPDP projects managed to deliver at least some aspects of each expected component of the holistic programme. Limited resources did not mean that any specific component was unworkable, but that less time or resources could be spent on certain types of activities.

10.2   Strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation

As with any evaluation of social programmes being carried out in real world conditions, we are aware that our evaluation was not perfect in either design or execution. Despite this, we stand by the design and the methods we chose to employ as the best possible, given the challenges inherent in evaluating this pilot programme. In an effort to be transparent, we detail in this section our perceived strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation we undertook.

Strengths:
- The evaluation incorporated a comparative and longitudinal design, which meant it was able to assess whether the pilot programme provided additional value.

- The design involved an integral process evaluation, which allowed for a good understanding of what was being delivered and to whom across YPDP sites as well as some information on young people's views of provision across YPDP and comparison sites.

- The intervention and comparison groups were broadly similar at baseline.

- All the obvious potential confounders that could influence the findings were identified, measured and adjusted for in our outcome analyses.

- We achieved good rates of participation at baseline and follow-up 1 and reasonable rates at follow-up 2, considering the multiple challenges of carrying out an evaluation with participants of this age and vulnerability.

- Logistic regression as well as weighted analyses and, for follow-up 2 data propensity-score-based analyses, were carried out, rather than merely reporting descriptive statistics. This meant that we were able to more

accurately explore the extent to which outcomes differed between YPDP and the comparison group.

Weaknesses

- The evaluation was not able to randomly allocate sites to receive YPDP versus 'standard' provision because DH selected sites for the programme via competitive tendering. This meant that the majority were likely to have been selected based on the assumption that they had something about them in terms of capacity, experience and preparedness which might have been expected to lead to better outcomes regardless of any added value from the YPDP model (although other factors such as the need to encompass geographic, ethnic and gender diversity also influenced which sites were selected). This selection bias might thus tend to lead to our evaluation over-estimating quantitative measures of benefit.

- A randomised controlled trial (RCT) whereby individual young people would be randomly allocated either to receive YPDP or comparison programmes was deemed unfeasible primarily because it was clear that groups of young people would often be referred to YPDP together and secondarily because 'contamination' in the small provider agencies involved would have occurred. In the absence of such random allocation of individuals, ensuring our comparison group resembled those receiving the YPDP programme was challenging.

- Even if a cluster RCT design had been used, where whole projects would be randomly assigned to deliver YPDP or normal services, we would still have encountered challenges identifying and recruiting an appropriate number of young people in comparison sites (given that their lack of YPDP funding may have prevented them from working with as many young people in total, or as many of the most 'at risk' young people as the YPDP sites).

- Our outcomes relied on young people's self-reports. Because YPDP was an innovative and intensive programme it is likely that YPDP participants provided more favourable reports leading to some reporting bias with subsequent over-estimates of quantitative measures of benefit.

- In practice, young people were recruited to our comparison group using less rigid recruitment criteria than those on the YPDP programme ('vulnerable young people' rather than 'young people at risk of school exclusion, substance misuse or teenage pregnancy'. Nonetheless our groups were broadly comparable at baseline and we did adjust for a broad range of pre-hypothesised potential confounders where these significantly differed at baseline between the YPDP and comparison arm. Ultimately, however, we cannot completely eliminate the possibility that the participants in the two groups were dissimilar in some unmeasured ways as a result of these different recruitment criteria or that measurement error in some of the potential confounders at baseline might have reduced our control of confounding in the outcomes at follow-up.

- Carrying out research with vulnerable young people meant that there were challenges in locating and continuing to collect information from some of the original participants. We succeeded in finding and collecting questionnaire information at baseline and first follow-up (approximately 9-months after baseline) from a large proportion of the young people in our original sample. However despite major efforts, our data collection at second follow-up (approximately 18-months after baseline) was somewhat less complete. This

was primarily because a much larger proportion were no longer participating, or in touch with their projects. Although this 'loss to follow-up' was not systematically biased in terms of retaining the more vulnerable YPDP versus comparison participants (this varied according to the baseline measure of vulnerability in question), differential attrition between YPDP and comparison might still have led to some biasing of our statistical findings.

• Although we weighted for these differences in our follow-up analysis, this weighting necessarily relies on incomplete data and so is intended more as a check on whether attrition bias is likely to explain our findings rather than in order to generate a definitive estimate of effect. This weighted analysis suggested that attrition bias was unlikely to explain all our findings.

• The greater than expected intra-cluster correlation coefficients for example in heterosexual activity, teenage pregnancy and cannabis frequency will have reduced our power to detect small associations between YPDP participation and our key outcomes. Loss to follow-up will also have reduced the precision of our estimates of these associations, particularly at follow-up 2. While this cannot explain our findings of significant associations between YPDP participation and, for example, teenage pregnancy, it might have led to some real associations not being statistically significant in our analysis. This might conceivably be the case for example with regard to the non-significant associations between participation in YPDP and experience of weekly use of cannabis and warning/conviction at follow-up 2.

• Although we did survey workers' and young people's views on services in comparison sites and explore in depth what services were available in some case-study comparison sites, we did not collect detailed data on activity across comparison sites as we did with intervention sites. This makes it difficult to assess formally what overlap if any existed between the contents of services in YPDP and comparison sites. However, our survey of young people reported more holism within YPDP than comparison sites and discussions among our team also strongly suggested that overall work was less intense and less holistic in comparison compared with YPDP sites.

10.3   Discussion of findings

YPDP has shown it is possible to engage at-risk young people in an intensive programme, over relatively long periods, mostly on a voluntary basis. It provides evidence that the most vulnerable will participate actively in a broad package of provision which they find engaging; and that it is possible to integrate a health agenda into youth work with this group. YPDP has also shown that these young people are able to gain accreditation and to perceive changes in their own behaviour and aspiration as a result of participation.

We were warned by some youth workers at the beginning of this evaluation that we would not find quantitative evidence of effectiveness. Some staff felt that the work they did was too subtle and not sufficiently uniform to be accurately measured by evaluation outcomes. The evaluation aimed to ensure its design and methods took account of these staff members' concerns while still addressing the major question that we were originally commissioned to answer: 'how well does YPDP work at improving the lives of young people?'. We ensured that we asked questions about 'softer' outcomes (such as perceived ability to use condoms, views on school, worry, anger, ease of discussing personal problems with friends and with workers, and expectations about parenthood and future employment) as well as 'harder' ones such as teenage pregnancy. Previous evaluations suggest that such softer measures are

more likely to be 'sensitive' to detecting more immediate impacts among the target population.[37] We ensured that our comparison was, as far as possible, a fair one, given that a cluster randomized controlled trial could not be undertaken. We also ensured that our methods included qualitative, in-depth work, so that we could understand the contexts in which staff were working and young people were living.

The YPDP programme undoubtedly involved some excellent youth work and many individual stories of personal progress for young people. However, ultimately, our statistical comparative analysis did not show YPDP to add value across a broad range of pre-specified 'soft' and 'hard' outcomes compared with the other services being delivered in comparison sites. Furthermore and unfortunately, young women participating in YPDP reported significantly more truanting, temporary exclusions and expectations of teenage parenthood at first follow-up, and sexual activity and teenage pregnancy at second follow-up.

Various reasons for these findings could exist:

1. YPDP might have produced certain benefits that were not large enough to have been detected in our evaluation or in other areas of young people's lives which were not measured.

2. Methodological issues could have hampered the comparability of the two arms. As discussed in the previous section on strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation, in this non-randomised design, the comparison group was in all likelihood different from the YPDP group in ways that could not be adjusted for in our statistical analysis. However, it should be noted that at baseline the two groups were broadly similar and in fact the YPDP group was less engaged in various risky behaviours than the comparison group. Furthermore we undertook a variety of statistical analyses to compensate for any differences. It is possible, but very unlikely, that very large unmeasured differences at baseline between the YPDP and comparison group regarding factors that are themselves very strongly predictive of our outcomes could explain all of the large associations we found for example between young women's participation in YPDP and teenage pregnancies.

3. Our results could have been somewhat biased because of variations in the extent to which young people in the YPDP and comparison group were followed up in questionnaire surveys, particularly at follow-up 2 (at 18 months). However we were able to establish that certain baseline factors, could predict whether they were followed up or not. It appeared that for some baseline measures, the YPDP group retained the more risky group but for other measures the comparison arm retained more of those at risk. We 'weighted' our analysis to compensate for variations in the extent to which those reporting these factors at baseline were followed up in each group. It is however possible that in doing so we were not able to establish all the different ways in which follow-up varied between our groups so we cannot rule out some remaining bias. This may explain some or possibly all of the large association we found between YPDP participation and sexual activity as well as teenage pregnancy at follow-up 2. However it is less likely that these variations could explain the association we found between YPDP participation and young women's truancy at follow-up 1.

---

[37] Stephenson JM, Strange V, Forrest S, *et al*. Pupil-led sex education in England (RIPPLE study): cluster-randomised intervention trial. *Lancet*. 2004;364(9431):338-46.

4. Practically it may be that the work being done in comparison sites was actually of a very high standard such that YPDP was not comparatively better at targeting the needs of vulnerable young people. It is possible that comparisons were likely to have somewhat higher capacity at baseline than is generally the case among English youth work agencies because they had been motivated and in a position to bid for YPDP funding. It is possible that some of these agencies, although unsuccessful in gaining YPDP funding, decided to use some of the intended model in their subsequent work although we found no evidence of this. The inclusion of some PRUs in the comparison group may have also added an element of more targeted services involving a number of agencies in this group. However, PRUs accounted for only a fifth of our recruits to the comparison group and attendance at PRUs was adjusted for in our analysis.

Overall, both YPDP and comparison groups offered a range of activities to their participants, were well received by young people, and had similarly close relationships between staff and participants. Both groups of projects appeared to offer benefit for individuals in terms of 'distance travelled' on certain outcomes. There remained differences between what was offered by YPDP projects than comparisons, however. YPDP sites were clearly distinct from comparisons in terms of the full range of activities offered, the weekly contact time and the health work offered. Despite this, it is possible that YPDP simply did not provide additional, measurable, *extra* value on top of what was being offered in the comparison projects, to enough of the young people, to show a difference.

5. Additionally, the projects taking part in YPDP inevitably experienced a period of disruption and change to their services by taking part in the programme: new staff joined, additional components were delivered, different participants were recruited. In the first year especially, this meant that a coherent service was not always delivered. The comparison projects did not receive the extra funding or support that being part of YPDP brought, but they did not have to go through this sort of period of change, which may have created a more stable environment for their participant leading to some impact on outcomes. Some benefits might have been more apparent had YPDP been evaluated at a later point in its development.

6. It may be that the YPDP programme did not show greater effect because it was not delivered in the way it was planned: delivery did not achieve overall targets for intensity or duration of delivery, and there was some evidence of work being less structured than was intended. Additionally, the programme may have been delivered in too disparate a way across the 27 sites for a coherent positive 'programme effect' to emerge. There were multiple interpretations of the delivery model. Some sites delivered what was, in effect, an alternative education programme, which was not an original aim for YPDP and had not been a feature of the US CAS-Carrera programme. Our evaluation was not intended or powered to explore the effects of such diversity on our outcomes and our exploratory analysis of these did not identify any clear trends.

7. The YPDP programme worked with young people for an average of 40 weeks. In this they targeted participants whose lives were, in many instances, very chaotic and entrenched with difficulties. Although for some this length and depth of intervention was sufficient to change the direction of their lives, for others this programme may not have engaged with them for long enough,

or been sufficiently focused, to make measurable differences on hard outcomes in their challenging lives.

8. Some previous studies have reported unintended negative effects of interventions targeting at-risk individuals including young people. Various studies have provided empirical evidence that interventions which bring together at-risk participants (including young people and other individuals in group work) can, in doing so, alter participants' social networks. The Cambridge-Somerville youth work intervention is a well known example of a targeted intervention which inadvertently yielded long-term negative effects through such network effects[38]. Such interventions can expose participants to the influence of new friends who are, in some cases, more positive about and/or more engaged in risk behaviours (such as substance use and unprotected sex), resulting in increased rather than decreased rates of risk taking[39]. Our evaluation did not set out to explore YPDP impact on social networks. In our interviews with young people we did not identify much evidence of individuals' social networks coming to involve more risk-taking individuals or that this led to increased risk-taking behaviour among the bulk of YPDP participants, other than in some participants' reports of experiencing bullying during their participation. However, this may have been because we did not aim to explore these topics. Some parents interviewed did suggest that putting groups of badly behaved children together had the potential for spreading bad behaviour. The programme brought together groups of young people on the basis of their risk of various outcomes (rather than on the basis of their being generally 'disadvantaged' as CAS-Carrera had done) for regular and sustained periods including during evenings and weekends, including young women and men of different ages. In this regard it is likely to have differed somewhat from comparison projects: youth work agencies in comparison sites less commonly recruited individuals primarily on the basis of their riskiness and generally brought them together less intensively; and PRUs brought individuals together on the basis of their disengagement with school rather than their riskiness in terms of health outcomes (and accounted for only a fifth of our comparison group). Therefore, the possibility of effects on young people's networks cannot be completely dismissed.

9. Similarly, a previous study has found that identifying 'under-aspiring' secondary-school pupils and offering them advice actually reduced subsequent academic attainment compared to controls[40]. Because YPDP was targeted at young people deemed to be 'at-risk', the individuals involved may have felt they were labelled as problematic and lacking in potential. We did find that young women in the YPDP were more likely to expect to be a

---

[38] McCord, J. (2003) Cures that harm: unanticipated outcomes of crime prevention programmes. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 587:16-30.

[39] Imrie J, Stephenson JM, Cowan FM, *et al*; (2001) Behavioural Intervention in Gay Men Project Study Group. A cognitive behavioural intervention to reduce sexually transmitted infections among gay men: randomised trial. *BMJ.* 322(7300):1451-6.

Cho, H., Hallfors, D.D., Sanchez, V. (2005). Evaluation of a high school peer group intervention for at-risk youth. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(3), 363-374.

Palinkas, L.A., Atkins, C.J., Miller, C., Ferreira, D. (1996). Social skills training for drug prevention in high-risk female adolescents. *Preventive Medicine,* 25, 692-701.

[40] Fitz-Gibbon, C., Defty, N. (2000). *Effects of providing schools with names of under-aspiring pupils.* Durham: Curriculum, Evaluation and Management Centre, Durham University.

teenage parent, perhaps supporting the plausibility that involvement with YPDP was associated with changes in expectations. Our interviews suggested that a number of young people recruited to YPDP already felt labelled as 'at risk', prior to their involvement on the programme. This possibility of labelling also cannot be ruled out and could potentially have arisen despite the fact that YPDP aimed to emphasise young people's potential rather than their riskiness.

10. The lack of positive effect in the YPDP statistical impact findings are in line with some of the findings of some other more recent evaluations of youth development programmes, which have either not shown the same benefits, or shown variable benefits compared with the original evaluation of the CAS Carrera programme.[41] It may be that the youth development approach that initially appeared so promising is not as effective at changing key outcomes as originally hoped. Additionally or alternatively it could be that this model did not transfer culturally to the UK – what works with American teens may not be as appropriate in the UK.

In summary, the findings of the YPDP evaluation are complex: the process data points to a programme that was popular and well delivered in a holistic way to a group of very challenging and vulnerable young people. Participants and staff regarded participation as potentially beneficial. We found some support for this in: the extent of engagement with previously difficult-to-reach young people; the accreditation they received; and the distance travelled stories of many. However the evidence of *additional* impact from YPDP on short and medium term outcomes was not clear cut and there was also some evidence that some outcomes were less positive than among the comparison group. The evaluation team believes that a combination of reasons best explain this situation: the difficulties of providing an intervention in a consistent manner; the networking effect of bringing together the riskiest young people in YPDP; the assumption that a relatively short-term programme can alone substantially influence long-term, entrenched problems in the often chaotic lives of vulnerable young people; and the methodological challenges of measuring and making a fair comparison.

10.4   Recommendations

We recommend that any future implementations of the targeted youth development model, in the UK, should occur within the context of a randomised experimental evaluation. This should be preceded by a pre-trial formative phase to refine the intervention and ensure implementation is fully underway and fidelity is maximised prior to outcome evaluation. Any such implementation should also employ a logic model to clarify the intervention and the causal pathway expected to link this to key outcomes. This would guide implementation as well as evaluation and monitoring. Any such implementation would benefit from a training and coordination agent to provide support as well as to monitor and ensure intervention fidelity in line with the logic model, and be funded at least equivalent to the level that our economic evaluation identified as the true overall cost of YPDP.

A randomised evaluation of such an implementation would add to the research base that will help determine whether such programmes are ultimately beneficial in a UK context. Some of the outcomes on which the DH hoped for impact as a result of

---

[41] Kirby, Douglas. *Emerging Answers 2007: Research Findings on Programmes to Reduce Teen Pregnancy and Sexually Transmitted Diseases.* Washington D.C.; The national campaign to prevent teen and unplanned pregnancy.

YPDP were ambitious. Although the evaluation team agrees that these are appropriate long-term goals for a social intervention of this nature, we recommend that future programmes also continue to be given formal outcome targets that are of a more intermediate nature.

Our findings lead us to err on the side of caution. We would therefore suggest that any future implementation of the targeted youth development model in the UK should ensure that intervention does not inadvertently bring participants – and in particular young women - into contact with a more risky group of friends and associates. This might be achieved by: separating provision for groups of young women and young men, but also for those of different ages; working with broader groups of young people defined in terms of their general social disadvantage (as CAS-Carrera has done) rather by their particular risk of certain outcomes (as YPDP has done); and working with pre-existing friendship groups. To minimize any possibilities of labelling young people as 'problematic', we would recommend that youth development programmes should not in effect become a form of alternative education for vulnerable or disaffected young people but should continue to complement schools as CAS-Carrera has done. Further consideration should be given to the length and timing of future interventions, as staff felt that a longer programme offered at an earlier age would have had greater impact.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Methods

The YPDP evaluation was commissioned to answer key questions regarding the processes of planning and providing services to young people, as well as ascertaining whether the programme was able to support young people.
Key questions for the YPDP evaluation were: was YPDP provision in line with its aims in terms of those recruited, the duration and intensity of provision, and the range of activities delivered to each young person? The specific evaluation questions are detailed below.

Research questions: Processes of planning and provision
(a) What processes are involved in the central and local planning, and local provision of each YPD programme?
(b) Is the planning of the programmes appropriately 'joined-up' to other initiatives and services, both centrally and locally?
(c) How do programmes differ from each other in their planning and provision, and what are the reasons for these differences?
(d) How successful are the Learning Networks in spreading best practice?
(e) How do programmes evolve over time?
(f) To what extent do projects adhere to programme guidelines?
(g) What are the challenges for organisations and staff delivering such programmes?
(h) How do staff members perceive the Training and Coordination support programme and the challenges faced in its delivery?
(i) To what extent did the Training and Coordination Agent element meet its objectives?
(j) What guiding principles and other characteristics of the programmes, and of the staff involved, are related to success[42]?
(k) What characteristics of the area and level of involvement of the community are related to success?
(l) What elements make a project feasible and sustainable?
(m) In each area, how does the YPD programme complement existing youth provision?
(n) What difference, if any, does the baseline situation of the site with regards to existing or previous provision of youth services make to the success of the programme?
(o) What modifications to YPD programmes might be necessary to promote their successful application in other sites?

---

[42] We define programme 'success' as feasibility, acceptability, accessibility, appropriateness in meeting need, as well as effectiveness and cost effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes.

Research questions: Processes of uptake and impact

(p)	Who are the young people who stay involved and who are those who do not?
(q)	Which features promote accessibility and acceptability of the programme to those young people who are most in need of the services, as well as appropriate meeting of their needs?
(r)	How do young people feel about their involvement in the programme and the impact this has on them, their families, and the wider community?
(s)	How do these feelings vary between different groups, such as young men and women, various black and minority ethnic groups, and those with different sorts of needs?
(t)	How do parents/carers feel about their child's involvement and the impact this has on the child and on the family?
(u)	What do staff and other stakeholders think about the impact of the programme on participants, their families, and the wider community?

Research questions: Outcomes

(v)	Are YPD programmes effective in achieving key outcomes?
(w)	How does this effectiveness vary between young men and young women?
(x)	How does effectiveness vary between programmes in different sites?

Research questions: Cost-effectiveness

(y)	Are YPD programmes likely to be a cost-effective means of achieving desired outcomes?

Data collection

The study was approved by the Institute of Education research ethics committee. A variety of data collection methods were used over the three year evaluation. These are summarised in the table below.

Table 6. YPDP evaluation - Data collection

Method	Description and numbers involved
Data collection with young people	
Baseline questionnaire	*Carried out in YPDP and comparison sites* Total: YPDP - 1637 young people Comparison - 1087 young people
1st Follow-up questionnaire	*Carried out in YPDP and comparison sites* Total: YPDP - 1054 young people Comparison - 599 young people
2nd follow-up questionnaire	*Carried out in YPDP and comparison sites* Total: YPDP - 566 young people Comparison - 338 young people
Interviews with young people in case study sites	*Undertaken in 7 YPDP sites and 4 Comparison sites* Total: YPDP- 100 young people

	Comparison- 44 young people
Monthly monitoring data on participation	*YPDP sites only* Total: Data provided for 2439 young people
Data collection with staff and stakeholders	
Questionnaires with staff	*YPDP -years 1- 3; Comparison -years 1& 3* Total: YPDP - 120 staff, from all 27 sites Comparison - 72 staff from 30 projects
Interviews with case study staff	*Undertaken in years 1 and 3 in 7 YPDP sites and 4 Comparison sites* Total: YPDP - 27 interviews Comparison - 12 interviews
Focus groups with YPDP staff	*YPDP only – held with project staff at YPDP conferences in year 2* Total: 5 Focus groups
Interviews with parents	*Undertaken in 7 YPDP sites and 2 Comparison sites* Total: YPDP – 21 parents Comparison - 6 parents
Interviews with case study local stakeholders *(not project staff)*	*Undertaken in yr 3 in 6 YPDP & 4 Comparison sites* Total: YPDP - 22 stakeholders Comparison - 7 stakeholders
Interviews with national stakeholders	*Carried out in years 1 and 3* Total: 9 national stakeholder interviews
Observations of YPDP training and meetings	*YPDP sites only* Carried out at 10 staff training days; 6 YPDP national conferences and events; and 10 regional meetings.
Monitoring data on staffing and service provision	*YPDP sites only* Provided monthly by YPDP sites between July 2004 and March 2007

Costs of YPDP – methods of data collection

The evaluation aimed to identify the explicit funding as well as the actual total costs of providing YPDP per client. The NYA provided us with details of each site's funding and we calculated the number of clients per site per year from monitoring data (table 1). We then carried out a questionnaire survey aimed at all YPDP sites to explore their self-reports as to whether funding was appropriate, as well as their baseline capacity. On the advice of health economists at LSHTM, we then conducted very detailed, in-depth research with four sites to identify the actual cost of providing YPDP per client in these sites in 2005/6. This involved reviewing of documents, and structured interviews over the telephone with project or finance managers. We examined whether staff worked across projects, whether equipment was used across projects and whether YPDP paid more or less than normal overheads as compared to other projects considering what proportion of total work YPDP represented.

Data analysis

Comparative analyses were carried out for potential outcomes of the YDPD programme, using data collected from young people in YPDP and comparison sites on the first and second follow-up questionnaires. We present overall analyses as well as analyses stratified by gender for those outcomes at follow-up 1 and 2 where there is a significant interaction between gender and intervention (although the results themselves are not always significant in the analyses).

Outcome measures

We have earlier described the selection of our outcome measures relating to the Teenage Pregnancy, Sexual Health and Drugs Strategies. Here we explain the selection of our other outcome measures. We examined levels of alcohol consumption via a question on drunkenness in the previous 6 months as our expert advisory group recommended this was likely to be the most sensitive and practical measure with this group (a fuller examination of precisely how many alcohol units ingested in the previous month being impractical within our evaluation design). School exclusion was asked about directly as was dislike of school, as a predictor of exclusion[43]. Authorized and unauthorized absenteeism were examined via a question about truancy and dislike of school was also evidenced to be a proxy for this[41]. Educational attainment was examined via the question on dislike of school.[44] Participation in post-16 education, employment or training was examined only at follow-up 2. Offending and convictions were examined via a proxy question on contact with the police.[45] Mental health and self-esteem were examined via questions on self-esteem, worry, anger and ease discussing personal problems with others partly informed by existing evidence[43] and partly via consultation with YPDP staff. Involvement in volunteering was asked about directly and preparedness for adult life via questions on communication, as well as expectations for the future.

Confounders

These comparisons were made using logistic regression models that took into account baseline differences in pre-hypothesised potential confounders. We identified the following variables as potential confounders on the basis of a review of the research literature on the determinants of teenage pregnancy and other adverse sexual health outcomes, drug use and social exclusion among young people[46]:

- housing tenure
- first language
- ethnicity
- lone parent household
- workless household
- police involvement
- involvement of friends with police

---

[43] Edwards, S. and Malcolm, H. (2002) The Causes and Effects of Truancy. *SCRE Newsletter*, Number17

[44] Resnick MD et al Protecting adolescents from harm: findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent harm. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1997,278:823-832.

[45] Hobcraft, J. (2002) Social exclusion and the generations. In J. Hills, J. le Grand, & D. Piachaud (eds.) *Understanding Social Exclusion*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

[46] Evidence reviewed included: Bonell C, Allen E, Strange V, Copas A, Oakley A, Stephenson J, Johnson A. The effect of dislike of school on risk of teenage pregnancy: testing of hypotheses using longitudinal data from a randomised trial of sex education. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2005,59:223-230; Bynner J. Childhood risks and protective factors in social exclusion. *Children and Society* 2001,15:285-301; Resnick MD, Bearman PS, Blum RW, Bauman KE, Harris KM, Jones J*, et al.* Protecting adolescents from harm: findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent harm. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1997,278:823-832; Santelli JS, Beilenson P. Risk factors for adolescent sexual behavior, fertility, and sexually transmitted diseases. *J Sch Health* 1992,62:271-229.

- dislike of school
- parental interest in school
- truanting
- temporary exclusions
- permanent exclusions
- expectation of a job at 20
- expectation of parenthood at 20
- expectation of having had further education at 20
- frequency of drunkenness
- frequency of drug use
- heterosexual experience
- contraceptive use first sex
- contraceptive use last sex
- ease at speaking with female guardian
- ease at speaking with male guardian

The following were found to differ slightly but significantly between YPDP and comparison group at baseline and so were included in logistic regression models: housing tenure; living in a non-paid work household; living in a lone parent household, ethnicity, dislike of school, truanting, temporary and permanent school exclusions, heterosexual sexual experience, and alcohol use. We also adjusted for age, gender and PRU attendance at follow-up.

Weighted analysis
Further analyses were carried out that incorporated weighting for differential follow-up. For each arm we identified the factors at baseline that in univariate analysis predicted whether an individual provided data at the follow-up in question. For each arm these factors were then fitted into a model predicting follow-up. This model was then used to create a variable predicting probability of completing follow-up with a different value for each individual who provided baseline and follow-up data. Weights were then constructed from the inverse of these predicted probability values. Those with extremely large or small weights were then 'trimmed' to prevent a small number of outliers distorting the weighted analysis. The sum of the weights corresponded to the number of participants in each arm of the study who completed a baseline questionnaire. Weights were then assigned to each individual completing follow-up, with those undertaking follow-up but not baseline receiving a weight of one so that overall the sum of the weights equals the number of participants completing either or both baseline and follow-up. The weights were then used to weight analysis of outcomes at the follow-up in question, giving most weight to those outcomes reported by individuals who did report data at that follow-up but had a low probability of doing so according to their characteristics at baseline.

At follow-up one, the variables that predicted loss to follow-up included: language; friends' contact with the police; temporary exclusions; permanent exclusions; type of school; parental interest in school; alcohol use; ethnicity; educational expectations; and communication with female parent. Variables that predicted greater loss to follow up at this point in the YPDP group were: non-white ethnicity; non-English first language; low parental interest in school; and inability to discuss problems with female carer. In contrast the following variables predicted greater loss to follow up in the comparison group: drunkenness in past month; temporary exclusion; permanent exclusions; PRU education; low expectation of further education; and friends in contact with police.

At follow-up two, the baseline variables that predicted differential loss to follow-up included: contact with police; type of school; truanting; temporary exclusions;

permanent exclusions; expectation of parenthood at 20; drug use; sexual experience; ethnicity; tenure; workless household; non-owner-occupier housing tenure; and lone parent household. Variables that predicted greater loss to follow up in the YPDP group were: Black African/Caribbean ethnicity; temporary exclusion; expectation of parenthood. In contrast the following variables predicted greater loss to follow-up in the comparison group: heterosexual experience; temporary exclusion; contact with police; PRU education; permanent exclusions; truancy; and lone parent household. Additionally, a greater proportion of the respondents at fup2 had not completed a question about type of school attended at baseline – this was an artefact of two different versions of the baseline questionnaire.

Propensity score analysis

Statistical analyses incorporating a propensity score may produce more stable estimates of effects where the number of cases of an outcome is less than eight times greater than the number of model covariates, as was the case with some of our outcomes at follow-up 2. We therefore undertook an additional analysis of follow-up 2 outcomes including propensity score as a categorical covariate in models, with a random effect to account for the clustered allocation of the intervention. On the advice of senior statisticians we chose this application of propensity scores rather than any one-to-one matching-based approach because the intervention was allocated to clusters of individuals and individually matched analyses would not capture that aspect of the design. Participants were separated into quintiles using their propensity score and a scalar summary included in models. The effects of inclusion of this on otherwise unadjusted as well as adjusted, but not weighted models (as it would be statistically inappropriate to undertake the two forms of analyses simultaneously) are reported.

Exploratory analysis

Additionally, we carried out analyses that looked for trends within specific sub-groups. We used STATA version 7 to carry out these analyses. We carried out exploratory analyses, dividing the young people into the following categories when analysing outcomes:

- those who attended YPDP projects that were entirely voluntary versus those where there was statutory expectation of attendance (versus comparison group)

- those who attended YPDP projects judged by the NYA to have delivered the programme to a high standard versus moderate standard versus adequate standard (versus comparison)

- those with greater involvement versus less involvement (weeks duration/hours on project) (versus comparison)

- those experiencing a more holistic package of participation versus less holistic

- those who had a greater number of risk factors at baseline versus those with fewer.

Other data analysis

Monthly monitoring data collected from projects and staff questionnaires were descriptively analysed using SPSS. Qualitative data collected in interviews with staff, young people and stakeholders; through the young people's first and second follow-up questionnaires, and from the staff questionnaires were analysed thematically.

Table 7: YPDP and comparison projects – key information at baseline

	Name of programme	Area level demographic data					Project level data		
		*Location**	*U 18 conception rate**	*Deprivation rank**	*BME Proportions**	*Type of Area**	*Sector**	*Gender of participants**	*Key areas of focus*
1	GFS	E.England	H	M	L	Urban/seaside	Voluntary	Young women	Mixed
2	Shaw Trust	E.England	L	L	L	Rural/Seaside	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
3	Young Potential Bassetlaw	E. Midlands	L	L	L	rural	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
4	Ascent	E.Midlands	L/M	L/M	M	Rural+urban	Statutory	Mixed	Outdoor activities
5	Islington Children's Express	London	H	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Journalism
6	Mandiani	London	H	M	H	Urban	Statutory	Young men	BME support
7	ASSIST	London	H	L	H	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Alternative education
8	Havering Motorvations	London	L/M/H	L/M	L/M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Car mechanics
9	S. Tyneside YIP	North East	M	H	M	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Mixed
10	Scotswood	North East	H	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
11	B76 Barnardos	North East	H	H	L	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
12	STAY	North East	M/H	H	L	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Mixed
13	Passport to Health	North West	M	M	L	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Health
14	LADS	North West	M	H	L	Urban	Voluntary	Young men	Mixed
15	DISCUS	North West	H	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
16	HITS	North West	M	H	L	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
17	Copeland Rural Coastal Project	North West	L	L	L	Rural	Voluntary	Mixed	Outdoor activities
18	Motiv8	South East	M	L	M	Urban/seaside	Voluntary	Young women	Mixed
19	A+	South East	L	L/H	H	Urban+rural	Voluntary	Mixed	Asylum seeking yp – Alternative education
20	TRELYA	South West	L	L/M	L	Rural/seaside	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
21	Stepping Forward	South West	H	L	L	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Alternative education
22	Maypole	W.Midlands	M	H	M	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Mixed
23	Fairbridge SAFE	W.Midlands	M	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed

24	BEAT	W.Midlands	M	H	H	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Arts
25	Cupboard	York & Humber	M	L	L	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
26	CJ's Training	York & Humber	M	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Alternative education
27	TABOO	York & Humber	H	H	L	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Mixed
	Comparison sites								
106	Comparison site 1	E.England	L/M/H	L/M	L	Rural+urban/ seaside	Voluntary	Mixed	Arts
101	Comparison site2	E.Midlands	H	H	H	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
112	Comparison site 3 (proj.1)	E.Midlands	L	L/H	M	Urban+rural	Voluntary	Mixed	Auto mechanics
132	Comparison site 3 (proj.2)	E.Midlands	L	L/H	M	Urban+rural	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
102	Comparison site 4	London	H	H	H	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
118	Comparison site 5	London	M, L, H	L/M	H	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	BME support
119	Comparison site 6	London	L	L	D/K	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
123	Comparison site 7 (proj.1)	London	H	M	H	Urban	Voluntary	Young women	Mixed
130	Comparison site 7 (proj.2)	London	H	M	H	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
103	Comparison site 8	North East	M	H	D/K	Urban + rural	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
113	Comparison site 9	North East	M	H	D/K	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
124	Comparison site 10	North East	L	L	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
105	Comparison site 11	North West	L	L	L	Rural	Voluntary	Mixed	Mental health
109	Comparison site 12	North West	M	M	L	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Extended school; after school project
114	Comparison site 13	North West	M	H	M	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	Healthy living centre; health
120	Comparison site 14 (proj 1)	North West	M	M	L	Urban	Voluntary	Young women	Mixed
131	Comparison site 14 (proj 2)	North West	M	M	L	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
121	Comparison site 15	North West	M	M	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Outdoor activities
126	Comparison site 16	North West	M	H	L	Urban /rural	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
108	Comparison site 17	South East	H	L	D/K	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
116	Comparison site 18	South East	M/H	L/M	L	Urban+rural/s easide	Statutory	Mixed	Alternative education
129	Comparison site 19	South East	L	L	D/K	Urban/seasi	Statutory	Mixed	PRU

85

111	Comparison site 20	South West	L	L	L	Rural	Statutory	Mixed	Alternative education
115	Comparison site 21	South West	M	L	L	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
128	Comparison site 22	South West	L/M	L	D/K	Urban+rural/ seaside	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
107	Comparison site 23	W.Midlands	M	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
117	Comparison site 24	W.Midlands	M	H	D/K	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed
125	Comparison site 25	W.Midlands	H	H	D/K	Urban	Statutory	Mixed	PRU
104	Comparison site 26	York & Humber	M	M	L	Urban	Voluntary	Young men	Mixed
122	Comparison site 27	York & Humber	M	H	M	Urban	Voluntary	Mixed	Mixed

* criteria used in matching between YPDP and comparison projects/

Key

	Low (L)	Medium (M)	High (H)
Under 18 conception rate (per 1000 female pop aged 15 – 17 yrs, 2001; ONS)	<40	40.1 – 55.0	55.1+
Index of Deprivation (rank of average of ward scores)	70-345	36-70	1-35
BME (proportions of Black & Minority Ethnic groups in local population)	0-5%	6-33%	34%+

Appendix 2 Response rates

Table 8: YPDP young people's questionnaires: completion statistics

	Intervention (YPDP)	Comparison	Total
Ever participated on YPDP	**2371**		
Baseline	**1637**	**1087**	**2724**
of which	*(84%) full baseline*	*987 (91%) full baseline*	
	(16%) partial baseline	*100 (9%) partial baseline*	
	* 69% of those who 'ever participated' on YPDP filled in a baseline questionnaire		
1st Follow-up	**1054**	**599**	**1653**
of which	*810 (77%) full baseline*	*478 (80%) full baseline*	*80% full*
	202 (19%) partial baseline	*98 (16%) partial baseline*	*18% partial*
	42 (4%) no baseline	*23 (4%) no baseline*	*4% none*
	44% of those who 'ever participated' on YPDP filled in a 1st follow-up questionnaire		
1st follow-up Response rate from original baseline pool	**64%**	**55%**	**61%**
2nd Follow-up	**566**	**338**	**904**
of which	*414 (73%) full baseline*	*288 (85%) full baseline*	*78% full*
	135 (24%) partial baseline	*37 (11%) partial baseline*	*19% partial*

	17 (3%) no baseline	*13 (4%) no baseline*	*3% none*
	30% of those who 'ever participated' on YPDP in years 1 and 2 (n=1864) filled in a 2nd follow-up questionnaire		
2nd follow-up Response rate from original baseline pool (years 1 and 2 only)	*566 / 1333 (yrs 1&2)* **43%**	*338 / 868 (yrs 1&2)* **39%**	*904 / 2201 (yrs 1&2)* **41%**

From joiners and monitoring information:

Table 9: Differences between those YPDP 'participants' who completed baseline questionnaires and those who did not

	YPDP – completed baseline	**YPDP – didn't complete baseline**	**Total**
Ever participated on YPDP	**1637 (69%)**	**734 (31%)**	**2371**
Age at joining	**Mean: 14.2 years**	**Mean 14.2 years**	
Ethnicity - BME	352 (22%)	156 (25%)	
Gender - male	1024 (63%)	405 (62%)	
Total hours on YPDP	*Mean: 225 hours* *Range 2 -1359 hours* *IQR (96 – 306)*	*Mean: 89 hours* *Range 2 -745 hours* *IQR (21-125)*	**Significant difference between means**
Year of joining YPDP	*Year 1: 70%* *Year2: 72%* *Year 3: 60%*	*Year 1: 30%* *Year2: 28%* *Year 3: 40%*	**Significant difference by year**

Appendix 3 Outcome tables

Table 10 Baseline frequencies – all years

Measure		YPDP Intervention % (n)	Comparison % (n)
		Overall	*Overall*
Gender**	*Male*	62 (1015)	56 (610)
	Female	38 (622)	44 (476)
Age at completion of baseline (mean age; years)		14.56yrs	14.65yrs
Housing tenure**	*Privately owned*	27 (410)	39 (393)
	Not privately owned	73 (1095)	61 (613)
Family status: lone parenthood **	*Lives in lone parent family*	47 (627)	41 (391)
	Lives in non lone parent family	53 (710)	59 (554)
Family status: paid work in household*	*Non paid work household*	39 (493)	35 (319)
	Paid work household	61 (767)	65 (598)
Main language spoken at home	*English*	94 (1534)	96 (1029)
	Other language	6 (97)	4 (47)
Ethnicity*	*White*	77 (1226)	80 (845)
	Black or Minority Ethnic	23 (360)	20 (184)
Health issues at baseline			
Alcohol consumption in last 6 months *	*Drunk monthly or more*	36 (482)	40 (388)
	Drunk less than once a month	64 (870)	60 (576)
Drug use in last 6 months	*Tried drugs*	86 (1179)	86 (846)
	Not tried drugs	14 (200)	14 (141)
Experience of heterosexual sex**	*Has had sex*	34 (562)	40 (438)
	Has not had sex	66 (1075)	60 (649)
Contraceptive use – first sexual experience	*Did not use contraception*	20 (115)	22 (101)
	Did use contraception	80 (468)	78 (349)
Contraceptive use – last sexual experience	*Did not use contraception*	22 (126)	20 (89)
	Did use contraception	78 (436)	80 (349)

		YPDP Intervention % (n)	Comparison % (n)
Education issues at baseline			
Views of school*	*Dislikes school*	67 (913)	62 (608)
	Likes school	33 (452)	38 (366)
Perception of parental interest in school achievement	*Parent(s) not interested*	6 (76)	6 (54)
	Parent(s) interested	94 (1286)	94 (920)
Truanting behaviour –last six months **	*Skipped off school*	46 (584)	40 (356)
	Not skipped off school	54 (688)	60 (536)
Temporary exclusions from school – last six months**	*Temporarily excluded (1 or more times)*	44 (550)	38 (330)
	Not temporarily excluded	56 (712)	62 (543)
Permanent exclusions from school**	*Received permanent exclusion*	15 (183)	24 (210)
	Not permanently excluded	84 (1024)	76 (663)
Attendance at Pupil Referral Unit *(collected at first follow-up)***	*Attending a PRU*	11 (113)	20 (119)
	Not attending a PRU	89 (930)	80 (476)
Involvement with police			
Contact with police (stopped, told off, picked up) in last 6 months	*Contact with police*	53 (715)	53 (522)
	No contact with police	47 (639)	47 (454)
Best friends' contact with police in last 6 months	*Most friends – contact with police*	28 (379)	30 (291)
	Most friends – no contact	72 (974)	70 (673)
Communication issues			
Ease in discussing problems with mother (or female guardian)	*Difficult to discuss problems*	29 (383)	28 (268)
	Easy to discuss problems	71 (947)	72 (692)
Ease in discussing problems with father (or male guardian)	*Difficult to discuss problems*	44 (501)	46 (393)
	Easy to discuss problems	56 (631)	54 (463)
Aspirations for life at age 20			
Expectation of being in a steady job by age 20	*Probably no job by 20*	11 (144)	9 (91)
	Expect to be in job by 20	89 (1213)	91 (878)
Expectations of being a parent by age 20	*Likely to be a parent by 20 (or already one)*	48 (646)	50 (474)
	Unlikely to be a parent by 20	52 (696)	50 (472)
Expectations of college/University at/by age 20	*Unlikely to be attending/have attended further education*	31 (418)	35 (328)

		YPDP Intervention % (n)	Comparison % (n)
	Likely to be attending/ have attended further education	69 (928)	65 (618)

* P<0.05   ** P<0.01   Pink colour indicates significance

Table 11: Outcomes at follow-up 1

Outcome		Intervention % (n)	Comparison % (n)	Unadjusted OR* (95% CI) *P*	Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *P*	Weighted§ Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *P*	
		Overall	*Overall*	*Overall*	*Overall*	*Overall*	
Sexual health outcomes							
Experience of heterosexual sex	*Had first sex before age 16*	44 (435)	41 (236)	1.12 (0.66, 1.90) *p=0.68*	1.37 (0.85, 2.20) *p=0.19*	1.28 (0.78, 2.11) *p=0.31*	
	No first sex before age 16	56 (564)	59 (342)				
Of those with heterosexual experience, number of sexual partners in last 6 months	*2 or more partners*	34 (162)	35 (92)	0.96 (0.65, 1.41) *p=0.83*	1.20 (0.71, 2.04) *p=0.48*	1.28 (0.76, 2.15) *p=0.34*	
	1 partner or fewer	66 (312)	65 (169)				
Condom usage in sexual encounters in last 6 months	*Used condom less than half the time*	27 (121)	27 (65)	1.01 (0.72, 1.43) *p=0.93*	1.11 (0.67, 1.83) *p=0.67*	1.29 (0.76, 2.20) *p=0.34*	
	Used condoms half the time or more	73 (326)	73 (178)				
Perception of difficulty in initiating condom use	*Difficult to suggest condom use*	12 (115)	11 (61)	1.07 (0.77, 1.48) *p=0.68*	1.05 (0.75, 1.48) *p=0.75*	1.07 (0.75, 1.51) *p=0.71*	
	Easy to suggest condom use	88 (851)	89 (483)				
Substance misuse outcomes							
Frequency of cannabis usage last 6 months	*Used cannabis monthly or more frequently*	23 (241)	21 (123)	1.16 (0.62, 2.14) *p=0.64*	1.62 (0.96, 2.73) *p=0.07*	1.56 (0.93, 2.63) *p=0.09*	
	Used cannabis less than monthly or not at all	77 (795)	79 (469)				
	Used cannabis more frequently than weekly	15 (156)	13 (74)	1.24 (0.66, 2.34) *p=0.50*	1.49 (0.79, 2.82) *p=0.22*	1.41 (0.75, 2.68) *p=0.28*	
	Used cannabis weekly or less	85 (880)	87 (518)				
Frequency of excessive alcohol consumption in last 6 months	*Drunk monthly or more often*	37 (388)	37 (218)	1.02 (0.64, 1.64) *p=0.92*	1.02 (0.67, 1.56) *p=0.92*	0.98 (0.65, 1.47) *p=0.93*	
	Drunk less than once a month	63 (6254)	63 (376)				
Education outcomes							
Views of school	*Dislike school*	66 (673)	62(363)	1.19 (0.70, 2.02) *p=0.52*	1.09 (0.72, 1.67) *p=0.66*	1.08 (0.71, 1.64) p=0.70	
	Like school	35 (354)	38 (227)				
Truanting from school in last 6 months	*Skipped off school*	47 (341)	29 (119)	2.14 (1.19, 3.84) *p=0.01*	2.13 (1.22, 3.72) *P<0.01*	2.16 (1.23, 3.77) *p=0.01*	
	Did not skip school	53 (389)	71 (290)				

		Intervention % (n)	Comparison % (n)	Unadjusted OR* (95% CI) *P*	Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *P*	Weighted§ Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *P*	
Temporary exclusions from school, last 6 months	*Temporarily excluded (at least once)*	35 (265)	24 (99)	1.77 (0.98, 3.19) *p= 0.06*	1.67 (0.91, 3.07) *p=0.09*	1.60 (0.83, 3.07) *p=0.16*	
	No temporary exclusions	64 (476)	76 (315)				
Involvement with police outcomes							
Contact with police (*stopped, told off, picked up, warned, convicted*) in last 6 months	*Had contact with police*	45 (466)	42 (245)	1. 15 (0.72, 1.84) *p=0.55*	1.25 (0.82, 1.91) *p= 0.29*	1.17 (0.78, 1.75) *p=0.43*	
	No contact with police	55 (571)	58 (346)				
Mental well-being/ self esteem/ communication outcomes							
Levels of worry	*Often worry about things*	60 (624)	60 (360)	0.98 (0.71, 1.34) *p=0.88*	0.87 (0.60, 1.27) *p=0.47*	0.82 (0.56, 1.21) *p=0.32*	
	Don't often worry about things	40 (423)	40 (238)				
Level of anger in last few weeks	*Often angry*	45 (472)	46 (275)	0.97 (0.73, 1.27) *p=0.80*	0.89 (0.64, 1.22) *p=0.44*	0.94 (0.69, 1.25) *p=0.66*	
	Not often angry	55 (576)	54 (324)				
Ease in discussing personal things with close friend	*Difficult to talk to close friend*	16 (154)	14 (82)	1.08 (0.74, 1.59) *p=0.69*	1.29 (0.82, 2.03) *p=0.26*	1.40 (0.90, 2.18) *p=0.13*	
	Easy to talk to close friend	84 (836)	85 (481)				
Ease in discussing problems with project worker	*Difficult to talk to project worker*	44 (460)	43 (256)	1.03 (0.82, 1.29) *p=0.77*	0.98 (0.77, 1.26) *p=0.90*	1.03 (0.81, 1.31) *p=0.83*	
	Easy to talk to project worker	56 (586	57 (337)				
Expectation & future life preparedness outcomes							
Expectations of being a parent by age 20	*Likely to be a parent by 20 (or already one)*	34 (339)	30 (176)	1.16 (0.80, 1.68) *p=0.44*	1.22 (0.89, 1.67) *p=0.22*	1.18 (0.84, 1.64) *p=0.34*	
	Unlikely to be a parent by 20	66 (671)	70 (403)				
Expectation of being in a steady job by age 20	*Probably no job by 20*	10 (100)	8 (47)	1.22 (0.72, 2.06) *p=0.46*	0.91 (0.54, 1.23) *p=0.72*	0.98 (0.59, 1.61) *p=0.92*	
	Expect to be in job by 20	90 (934)	92 (534)				

* these unadjusted odds ratios take into account cluster (eg which project the respondent came from)

**adjusted for baseline variables: housing tenure; living in a non-paid work household; living in a lone parent household, ethnicity, dislike of school, truanting, temporary and permanent school exclusions, heterosexual sexual experience, and alcohol use. Also adjusted for age, gender and PRU attendance at follow-up.

§Weighted analysis compensates for missing returns at this follow-up.

Table 12: Outcomes at follow-up 1 stratified by gender

Outcome		young women % (n)		young men % (n)		Unadjusted OR * (95% CI) P		Adjusted OR** (95% CI) P		Weighted §adjusted OR** (95%CI) P	
		Interv	*Comp*	*Interv*	*Comp*	young women	young men	young women	young men	young women	young men
Temporary exclusions from school, last 6 months	*Temporarily excluded (at least once)*	33 (97)	15 (31)	38 (168)	34 (68)	2.86 (1.28,6.39) *p=0.01*	1.20 (0.72,1.98) *p=0.48*	3.65 (1.16,11.43) *p=0.03*	1.10 (0.59,2.04) *p=0.76*	3.38 (1.14,10.1) *p=0.03*	1.07 (0.55,2.12) *p=0.83*
	No temporary exclusions	67 (197)	85 (180)	62 (279)	66 (135)						
Level of anger in the last few weeks	*Often angry*	55 (222)	48 (136)	39 (250)	44 (139)	1.34 (0.93,1.93) *p=0.12*	0.80 (0.59,1.08) *p=0.14*	1.05 (0.59,1.85) *p=0.87*	0.76 (0.52,1.11) *p=0.16*	1.17 (0.67,2.03) *p=0.57*	0.81 (0.56,1.17) *p=0.25*
	Not often angry	45 (182)	52 (149)	61 (394)	56 (175)						
Expectations of being a parent by the age of 20	*Likely to be a parent by 20 (or already one)*	34 (131)	24 (66)	34 (208)	37 (110)	1.62 (1.04,2.54) *p=0.03*	0.88 (0.57,1.34) *p=0.53*	1.61 (1.07, 2.43) *p=0.02*	0.95 (0.60,1.52) *p=0.84*	1.61 (1.07,2.41) *p=0.02*	0.92 (0.56,1.50) *p=0.73*
	Unlikely to be a parent by 20	66 (259)	76 (212)	66 (412)	63 (191)						

* these unadjusted odds ratios take into account cluster (eg which project the respondent came from)

**adjusted for baseline variables: housing tenure; living in a non-paid work household; living in a lone parent household, ethnicity, dislike of school, truanting, temporary and permanent school exclusions, heterosexual sexual experience, and alcohol use. Also adjusted for age, gender and PRU attendance at follow-up.

§Weighted analysis compensates for missing returns at this follow-up.

Table 13: Outcomes at follow-up 2

Outcome		Intervention (YPDP) % (n)	Comparison % (n)	Unadjusted OR* (95% CI) P	Adjusted OR** (95% CI) t, P	Weighted § Adjusted OR** (95% CI) t, P
		Overall	*Overall*	*Overall*	*Overall*	*Overall*
Sexual health outcomes						
Experience of heterosexual sex	*Had first sex before age 16*	55 (294)	40 (130)	1.82 (0.97, 3.42) p=*0.06*	1.51 (0.84, 2.72) p=*0.16*	1.79 (0.96, 3.36) p=*0.07*
	No first sex before age 16	45 (243)	60 (196)			
Of those with heterosexual experience, number of sexual partners in last 3 months	*2 or more partners*	29 (101)	25 (42)	1.23 (0.70, 2.16) p=*0.46*	1.03 (0.54, 1.98) p=*0.91*	1.16 (0.57, 2.40) p=*0.67*
	1 partner or fewer	71 (242)	75 (124)			
Condom usage in sexual encounters in last 3 months	*Used condom less than half the time*	25 (69)	26 (38)	0.97 (62, 1.53) p=*0.91*	0.99 (0.65, 1.51) p=*0.95*	1.03 (0.66, 1.61) p=*0.90*
	Used condoms half the time or more	75 (207)	74 (111)			
Substance misuse outcomes						
Frequency of cannabis usage last 3 months	*Used cannabis more frequently than weekly*	16 (88)	11 (38)	1.48 (0.71, 3.11) p=*0.29*	1.44 (0.72, 2.89) p=*0.30*	1.97 (0.93, 4.17) p=*0.08*
	Used cannabis weekly or less	84 (468)	89 (300)			
Frequency of excessive alcohol consumption in last 3 months	*Drunk monthly or more often*	39 (216)	32 (109)	1.32 (0.75, 2.35) p=*0.39*	1.07 (0.68, 1.70) p=*0.76*	1.20 (0.78, 1.84) p=*0.39*
	Drunk less than once a month	61 (341)	68 (228)			
Education outcomes						
Truanting from school in last 3 months	*Skipped off school*	21 (58)	15 (24)	1.62 (0.66, 3.95) p=*0.28*	1.53 (0.64, 3.66) p=*0.33*	1.82 (0.69, 4.81) p=*0.22*
	Did not skip school	79 (212)	86 (142)			
Temporary exclusions from school, last 3 months	*Temporarily excluded (at least once)*	13 (43)	12 (21)	1.16 (0.50, 2.70) p=*0.73*	1.00 (0.35, 2.85) p=*0.99*	1.09 (0.32, 3.78) p=*0.88*
	No temporary exclusions	87 (277)	88 (157)			
NEET	*Not in education, employment or training*	10 (35)	11(63)	1.08 (0.52, 2.24) p=*0.82*	0.68 (0.34, 1.36) p=*0.28*	0.62 (0.29, 1.34) p=*0.22*
	In education, employment, training	89 (303)	89 (503)			

		Intervention (YPDP) % (n)	Comparison % (n)	Unadjusted OR* (95% CI) *P*	Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *t, P*	Weighted § Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *t, P*	
Involvement with police outcomes							
Contact with police (*stopped, told off, picked up, warned, convicted*) in last 6 months	*Had contact with police*	35 (196)	32 (105)	1.19 (0.69, 2.03) *p=0.52*	0.87 (0.46, 1.62) *p=0.65*	0.90 (0.48, 1.69) *p=0.75*	
	No contact with police	65 (357)	68 (227)				
Official warnings or convictions in last 6 months	*Had official warning or conviction*	25 (140)	18 (61)	1.51 (0.83, 2.76) *p=0.17*	1.43 (0.82, 2.51) *p=0.20*	1.67 (0.90, 3.13) *p=0.10*	
	No warning or convictions	75 (416)	82 (274)				
Emotional well-being							
Self esteem scale	*Lower self esteem*	26 (144)	27 (92)	0.93 (0.57, 1.52) *p=0.76*	0.99 (0.63, 1.56) *p=0.97*	1.02 (0.62, 1.67) *p=0.94*	
	Higher self esteem	74 (413)	73 (245)				
Levels of worry	*Often worry about things*	71 (396)	74 (251)	0.85 (0.62, 1.15) *p=0.29*	1.01 (0.76, 1.36) *p=0.90*	1.09 (0.81, 1.47) *p=0.56*	
	Don't often worry about things	29 (160)	26 (86)				
Ease in discussing personal things with close friend	*Difficult to talk to close friend*	11 (59)	13 (43)	0.81 (0.42, 1.58) *p=0.53*	0.80 (0.43, 1.49) *p=0.48*	0.75 (0.35, 1.60) *p=0.45*	
	Easy to talk to close friend	89 (498)	87 (295)				
Teenage conceptions							
Teenage pregnancy since baseline (young women) +	*Has been pregnant*	16 (38)	6 (13)	2.68 (1.35, 5.32) *p<0.01*	3.55 (1.32, 9.50) *p=0.01++*	5.48 (2.18, 13.75) *p<0.01++*	
	Hasn't been pregnant	84 (206)	94 (189)				
Caused a teenage conception since baseline –young men	*Caused a pregnancy*	11 (37)	11 (17)	1.00 (0.44, 2.28) *p=0.99*	0.86 (0.35, 2.07) *p=0.72*	1.18 (0.45, 3.09) *p=0.73*	
	Hasn't caused a pregnancy	89 (311)	89 (143)				

* adjusts for cluster

**adjusts for cluster, age at follow-up, gender, PRU attendance, and baseline variables: tenure, dislike of school, truancy, temporary and permanent exclusions from school, having had heterosexual sex, frequency of drunkenness, ethnicity, whether living in a lone parent household or one where no adults were working.

+ Includes all from follow-up 2 plus those who reported a pregnancy at follow-up 1, but did not complete follow-up 2.

++ In addition to adjustments mentioned above, this model also adjusts for pregnancy pre-baseline and ward level rates for teenage pregnancy (derived from young woman's postcode area)

Table 14: Outcomes at follow-up 2 – stratified analysis by gender

Outcome		young women % (n)		young men % (n)		Unadjusted OR * (95% CI) P		Adjusted OR** (95% CI) P		Weighted§ adjusted OR** (95%CI) P	
		Interv	*Comp*	*Interv*	*Comp*	young women	young men	young women	young men	young women	young men
Frequency of cannabis consumption	*Used cannabis more frequently than weekly*	14 (32)	8 (14)	17 (56)	16 (24)	2.03 (0.82, 5.04) P=0.12	1.10 (0.48, 2.51) P=0.83	1.33 (0.47, 3.83) P=0.58	1.74 (0.65, 4.67) P=0.26	2.27 (0.71, 7.33) P=0.16	2.50 (0.86, 7.28) P=0.09
	Used cannabis weekly or less	86 (191)	92 (170)	83 (277)	84 (130)						
Truanting from school in last 3 months	*Skipped off school*	26 (29)	9 (8)	18 (29)	21 (16)	3.58 (1.31, 9.75) P=0.01	0.86 (0.29, 2.54) P=0.78	1.90 (0.62, 5.83) P=0.25	1.62 (0.20, 12.99) P=0.64	3.19 (0.82, 12.50) P=0.09	0.90 (0.10, 7.88) P=0.92
	Did not skip school	74 (81)	91 (80)	82 (131)	79 (62)						
Temporary exclusions from school, last 3 months	*Temporarily excluded (at least once)*	13 (17)	5 (5)	14 (25)	19 (15)	2.73 (0.75, 9.92) P=0.12	0.66 (0.32, 1.35) P=0.25	3.15 (0.46, 21.49) P=0.23	0.63 (0.23, 1.76) P=0.37	4.35 (0.66, 28.7) P=0.12	0.64 (0.19, 2.18) P=0.46
	No temporary exclusions	87 (112)	95 (90)	86 (160)	81(66)						
Contact with police	*Had contact with police*	27 (61)	21 (38)	41 (135)	44 (67)	1.39 (0.78, 2.48) P=0.26	0.89 (0.50, 1.58) P=0.68	0.98 (0.44, 2.15) P=0.96	0.73 (0.38, 1.42) P=0.35	0.88 (0.41, 1.91) P=0.75	0.83 (0.41, 1.64) P=0.58
	No contact with police	73 (164)	79 (142)	59 (193)	56 (85)						
Official warnings or convictions	*Had official warning or conviction*	20 (45)	13 (23)	29 (95)	25 (38)	1.72 (0.88, 3.37) P=0.11	1.22 (0.59, 2.53) P=0.58	1.65 (0.74, 3.72) P=0.22	1.36 (0.61, 3.07) P=0.45	1.54 (0.69, 3.45) P=0.28	1.72 (0.71, 4.18) P=0.22
	No warning or convictions	80 (181)	87 (159)	71 (235)	75 (115)						
Experience of heterosexual sex	*Had first sex before age 16*	58 (127)	33 (60)	53 (167)	48 (70)	2.73 (1.42, 5.24) P<0.01	1.21 (0.55, 2.65) P=0.63	2.53 (1.09, 5.92) P=0.03	1.04 (0.46, 2.40) P=0.91	3.48 (1.49, 8.12) P<0.01	1.39 (0.59, 3.31) P=0.45
	No first sex before age 16	42 (93)	67 (120)	47 (150)	52 (76)						

Number of sexual partners in last 3 months	*2 or more partners*	17 (25)	10 (9)	39 (76)	41 (33)	1.75 (0.66, 4.69) *P=0.26*	0.90 (0.56, 1.45) *P=0.67*	0.76 (0.26, 2.27) *P=0.62*	1.11 (0.51, 2.40) *P=0.78*	1.33 (0.35, 5.10) *P=0.67*	1.05 (0.47, 2.37) *P=0.90*
	1 partner or fewer	83 (122)	90 (77)	61 (120)	59 (47)						
Levels of worry	*Often worry about things*	85 (186)	81 (143)	63 (201)	66 (98)	1.30 (0.82, 2.07) *P=0.26*	0.85 (0.56, 1.30) *P=0.46*	1.29 (0.79, 2.11) *P=0.29*	0.91 (0.60, 1.39) *P=0.66*	1.77 (0.98, 3.19) *P=0.06*	0.83 (0.53, 1.29) *P=0.40*
	Don't often worry about things	15 (33)	19 (33)	37 (120)	34 (50)						

* these unadjusted odds ratios take into account cluster (eg which project the respondent came from)

**adjusted for baseline variables: housing tenure; living in a non-paid work household; living in a lone parent household, ethnicity, dislike of school, truanting, temporary and permanent school exclusions, heterosexual sexual experience, and alcohol use. Also adjusted for age, gender and PRU attendance at follow-up.

§Weighted analysis compensates for missing returns at this follow-up.

Table 15: Outcomes at follow-up 2 (propensity score analysis)

Outcome		Unadjusted OR* (95% CI) P	Adjusted OR** (95% CI) t, P
		Overall	*Overall*
Experience of heterosexual sex	*Had first sex before age 16*	1.61 (0.94, 2.75) P=0.08	1.67 (0.93, 3.00) P=0.09
	No first sex before age 16		
Of those with heterosexual experience, number of sexual partners in last 3 months	*2 or more partners*	1.11 (0.67, 1.83) P=0.67	1.10 (0.59, 2.08) P=0.75
	1 partner or fewer		
Condom usage in sexual encounters in last 3 months	*Used condom less than half the time*	0.93 (0.58, 1.50) P=0.76	0.93 (0.59, 1.48) P=0.76
	Used condoms half the time or more		
Frequency of cannabis usage last 3 months	*Used cannabis more frequently than weekly*	1.20 (0.63, 2.30) P=0.57	1.36 (0.63, 2.95) P=0.43
	Used cannabis weekly or less		
Frequency of excessive alcohol consumption in last 3 months	*Drunk monthly or more often*	1.25 (0.73, 2.14) P=0.41	1.04 (0.64, 1.69) P=0.86
	Drunk less than once a month		
Truanting from school in last 3 months	*Skipped off school*	1.22 (0.55, 2.73) P=0.62	1.33 (0.61, 2.91) P=0.47
	Did not skip school		
Temporary exclusions from school, last 3 months	*Temporarily excluded (at least once)*	1.04 (0.48, 2.25) P=0.92	0.93 (0.31, 2.83) P=0.90
	No temporary exclusions		
NEET	*Not in education, employment or training*	0.89 (0.47, 1.70) P=0.72	0.71 (0.34, 1.46) P=0.34
	In education, employment, training		
Contact with police (*stopped, told off, picked up, warned, convicted*) in last 6 months	*Had contact with police*	0.99 (0.65, 1.53) P=0.98	0.72 (0.40, 1.27) P=0.24
	No contact with police		
Official warnings or convictions in last 6	*Had official warning or conviction*	1.32 (0.77, 2.29)	1.46 (0.82, 2.61)

		Unadjusted OR* (95% CI) *P*	Adjusted OR** (95% CI) *t, P*
months	*No warning or convictions*	*P=0.31*	*P=0.19*
Self esteem scale	*Lower self esteem*	1.00 (0.62, 1.61)	1.04 (0.66, 1.64)
	Higher self esteem	*P=0.99*	*P=0.86*
Levels of worry	*Often worry about things*	0.83 (0.62, 1.12)	1.00 (0.74, 1.34)
	Don't often worry about things	*P=0.22*	*P=0.98*
Ease in discussing personal things with close friend	*Difficult to talk to close friend*	0.78 (0.43, 1.41)	0.77 (0.44, 1.37)
	Easy to talk to close friend	*P=0.40*	*P=0.37*
Teenage pregnancy since baseline (young women) +	*Has been pregnant*	2.38 (1.23, 4.61)	4.02 (1.46, 11.08)
	Hasn't been pregnant	*P=0.01*	*P=0.01++*
Caused a teenage conception since baseline –young men	*Caused a pregnancy*	0.82 (0.37, 1.80)	0.93 (0.33, 2.63)
	Hasn't caused a pregnancy	*P=0.61*	*P=0.89*

* these unadjusted odds ratios take into account cluster (eg which project the respondent came from)

**adjusted for baseline variables: housing tenure; living in a non-paid work household; living in a lone parent household, ethnicity, dislike of school, truanting, temporary and permanent school exclusions, heterosexual sexual experience, and alcohol use. Also adjusted for age, gender and PRU attendance at follow-up.

Table 16: Outcomes at follow-up 2 – stratified analysis by gender (propensity score analysis)

Outcome		Unadjusted OR * (95% CI) P		Adjusted OR** (95% CI) P	
		young women	young men	young women	young men
Frequency of cannabis consumption	*Used cannabis more frequently than weekly*	1.68 (0.79, 3.60) *P=0.18*	0.88 (0.40, 1.96) *P=0.75*	1.42 (0.49, 4.15) *P=0.51*	1.60 (0.57, 4.51) *P=0.37*
	Used cannabis weekly or less				
Truanting from school in last 3 months	*Skipped off school*	2.69 (1.10, 6.62) *P=0.03*	0.67 (0.26, 1.83) *P=0.43*	2.49 (0.17, 36.46) *P=0.50*	2.02 (0.68, 6.00) *P=0.20*
	Did not skip school				
Temporary exclusions from school, last 3 months	*Temporarily excluded (at least once)*	2.09 (0.64, 6.84) *P=0.22*	0.62 (0.30, 1.28) *P=0.19*	1.59 (0.25, 10.02) *P=0.62*	0.55 (0.16, 1.86) *P=0.33*
	No temporary exclusions				
Contact with police	*Had contact with police*	1.26 (0.80, 1.97) *P=0.31*	0.71 (0.41, 1.24) *P=0.23*	0.94 (0.43, 2.03) *P=0.86*	0.57 (0.29, 1.11) *P=0.10*
	No contact with police				
Official warnings or convictions	*Had official warning or conviction*	1.57 (0.81, 3.05) *P=0.17*	1.05 (0.51, 2.15) *P=0.90*	1.78 (0.80, 3.98) *P=0.15*	1.35 (0.54, 3.33) *P=0.51*
	No warning or convictions				
Experience of heterosexual sex	*Had first sex before age 16*	2.53 (1.34, 4.75) *P=0.01*	1.02 (0.51, 2.06) *P=0.95*	2.81 (1.22, 6.46) *P=0.02*	1.16 (0.50, 2.72) *P=0.72*
	No first sex before age 16				
Number of sexual partners in last 3 months	*2 or more partners*	1.36 (0.56, 3.29) *P=0.49*	0.91 (0.57, 1.45) *P=0.68*	0.67 (0.23, 2.01) *P=0.47*	1.28 (0.57, 2.89) *P=0.54*
	1 partner or fewer				
Levels of worry	*Often worry about things*	1.32 (0.81, 2.15) *P=0.26*	0.82 (0.53, 1.26) *P=0.36*	1.30 (0.79, 2.16) *P=0.29*	0.88 (0.57, 1.38) *P=0.57*
	Don't often worry about things				

* these unadjusted odds ratios take into account cluster (eg which project the respondent came from)

**adjusted for baseline variables: housing tenure; living in a non-paid work household; living in a lone parent household, ethnicity, dislike of school, truanting, temporary and permanent school exclusions, heterosexual sexual experience, and alcohol use. Also adjusted for age, gender

101

Founded in 1990, the Social Science Research Unit (SSRU) is based at the Institute of Education, University of London. Our mission is to engage in and otherwise promote rigorous, ethical and participative social research as well as to support evidence-informed public policy and practice across a range of domains including education, health and welfare, guided by a concern for human rights, social justice and the development of human potential.

The views expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Health or Department for Children, Schools and Families. All errors and omissions remain those of the authors.

This report is available to download from: http://www.ioe.ac.uk/reports