

URBACT

YOUNG CITIZENS' PROJECT

Baseline Report



PROJECT PART-FINANCED
BY THE EUROPEAN UNION
European Regional Development Fund



Table of Contents

PROJECT OUTLINE	3
This Report	4
1 BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE	4
1.1 Partner Cities	4
1.1.1 City Characteristics	4
1.1.2 Core Service Delivery	5
1.1.3 Interest in the Project	5
1.2 Youth Participation Policy, Institutions and Initiatives	6
1.2.1 Institutions of and Initiatives for Youth Participation	6
1.2.2 Other Programmes/Initiates	8
1.3 Involving Young People	9
1.3.1 Barriers to Young People’s Participation	9
1.3.2 Breaking-down Barriers	9
1.4 Additional Information	9
1.4.1 In the Toolkit?	9
1.4.2 Target Audience?	10
1.4.3 The Benefits of Transnational Working	10
2 CONCLUSIONS	10
3 APPENDIX ONE: BASELINE RESPONSE MATRIX	11
City Characteristics	11
Core Services Provided to Young People	12
Number of Young People affected by services	13
Specific Interest in the Project	14
Youth Participation Policy and Institutions	15
Barriers to Young People’s Involvement.....and some Solutions (in bold)	16
What Would You Like to See in the Toolkit?	17
4 APPENDIX TWO: YOUNG CITIZEN’S PROJECT CONTACTS	18
Project Team	18
Belfast	18
Birkirkara	18
Bristol	18
Evosmos	18
Hetton & Murton	18
Liverpool	18
Mazeikiai	18
Misterbianco	18
Sabadell	18
Experts	18

Project Outline

The Young Citizens' Project is constituted under Priority 1 (Exchange and Dissemination of Knowledge), Measure 1 (Thematic Networks) of the URBACT Programme.

Our network is comprised of seven full partners, four from the United Kingdom and one from Greece, Italy and Spain and two 'expert city' partners from the new member states of Lithuania and Malta.

Building on their existing experience of working with young people each project partner will draw together a group of up to ten young people to form the focus groups that will drive forward the project's research. The focus groups will be facilitated locally by individuals from the organisations delivering the work, with support from the thematic expert and project co-ordinator.

The aim of our project is to produce a 'toolkit' of best-practice models for/of young people's participation. By consensus, project-partners have determined that this toolkit will be primarily aimed at statutory bodies and will aim to provide them with a practical guide to including young people in decision-making processes and devolving power to them.

The lead partner has decided to take the approach of allowing broad local autonomy in the design and delivery of the focus groups. Network partners have a wide variety of different starting points (understood as partners' perspectives on and experiences of young peoples' participation), a situation that is reflected more broadly across the European Union. Because of this our intention is not to attempt to identify a single model that can be generalised to all European cities, but to identify a number of models placed firmly within their specific cultural, social, economic and political contexts which other European cities will be able to draw on to inform their own approaches to young people's participation in decision-making. Research will be co-ordinated through a framework established by the project co-ordinator and our thematic expert. Partners will submit a proposal for their focus group based on a format developed by the co-ordinator and thematic expert who will then provide partners with feedback, including suggested changes to their proposals.

This decentralisation, with its focus on producing locally based research findings within the context of a mutually agreed research framework, allows for the development of findings which are properly rooted in their—often very specific—urban contexts.

A second element of our work, separate from the focus group based research will be a number of exchange visits in which focus group participants from each partner will visit another city. The aim of these exchange visits is to give the young people involved the opportunity to look at alternative ways of approaching the problem, in terms of initiatives and institutions of youth involvement and decision-making and enable them to contrast these experiences with what they are used to. Each group of young people will produce a report on their experiences. The exchanges are scheduled to occur during the summer of 2005.

This Report

This report is intended to draw together the findings of the Baseline Questionnaire completed by all Young Citizens' Project network partners in August 2004, to outline commonalities and differences between network partners' demographic, social and economic circumstances, current youth provision and interests in and approaches to young people's inclusion.

The Appendix contains the matrix of partner's responses to the initial baseline questionnaire drawn up by the lead partner to further this process.

All partners' baseline questionnaire responses can be downloaded from our web space on the URBACT website by following this link: http://www.urbact.org/upload/urbdoc/Baseline_Responses_by_City.zip

1 Baseline Questionnaire

Since the ability to generalise from our (qualitative) research findings is important it is necessary to carefully map the context within which we work.

The baseline questionnaire's findings reflect the opinions and knowledge of project partners, its central purpose being to establish the starting point from which each partner would be working and to help us to identify how best to proceed with our work. With these aims in mind, the questionnaire sought to identify partners' attitudes to and understandings of the participation and barriers to participation of young people and to begin to map the context within which focus group research will be conducted within each partner city.

1.1 Partner Cities

This section of the baseline questionnaire explored a number of issues indirectly related to the subject of our project such as the characteristics of partner cities, the kinds of core services they offer to young people, and levels of young people's engagement with these services before moving on to questions about partners' specific interests in and aspirations for the project.

1.1.1 City Characteristics

Partner cities, with the partial exception of Sabadell, share many of the same problems in terms of deprivation, with low educational achievement and frequently high levels of unemployment amongst young people. While the extent of these problems is frequently set in a more general context of industrial decline, deprivation in many partners exists in pockets which have been frequently excluded from recent economic growth. Exceptions to this—for various reasons—are Hetton & Murton, Misterbianco and (as mentioned) Sabadell.

The boundaries of Hetton & Murton are defined by the Urban II programme and the programme spans areas administered by the City of Sunderland, Easington District and County Durham; it is therefore more uniformly deprived than many other partners are. Similarly the Commune di Misterbianco, while a single administrative unit, is wholly within the boundaries of its Urban II programme and fifty-percent of its population suffer high levels of socio-economic deprivation. Finally, Sabadell

stands alone as a relatively wealthy city (compared to other Spanish cities of similar size), although when compared to other Catalan cities it has the fourth highest unemployment rate. Nevertheless, in the second half of 2003 only 5% of young people under the age of 25 were unemployed, partly due to an increase in temporary employment opportunities. Two important issues in the city are the availability of social spaces for young people and access to housing for young people, both problems highlighted by the resurgence in the number of young people squatting in the inner city.

The largest town in Malta, Birkirkara has a population of around 21,000 around 10,000 of whom are young people. A dormitory town with limited open spaces and significant traffic problems, particularly those caused by arterial roads, which divide traditionally strong communities. Mazeikiai District is a mixed rural and urban area in the north-west of Lithuanian bordering the Republic of Latvia has a population of around 67,000, 23.5% of which are aged 15-29. While the region varies in terms of social and economic indicators, high unemployment rates, crime and violence amongst young people are problems across the region.

1.1.2 Core Service Delivery

Studies have shown a broad fault line between Northern and Southern Europe in terms of the history and contemporary circumstances of youth provision. Where Mediterranean countries have a relatively small but growing number of young people engaging with youth organisations, in Central and Northern European countries the numbers are higher (and the organisations older) but relatively stagnant.¹

This fault line—understood in terms of the types of core services offered to young people—is evident to some extent within our network with the core services offered by Evosmos, Sabadell and Misterbianco being *relatively* limited to areas such as the provision of information (around issues such as health, education and training) and of facilities for sports and cultural activities. UK partners offer a number of core services along similar lines, including after school provision, youth clubs and summer schemes, exchange visits and outdoor pursuits. Birkirkara and Mazeikiai offer many similar services also, including: cultural and sports projects, careers and further training information, exchange programmes

The contrast between what Mediterranean and UK partners offer is found in the way in which some of these services are delivered. UK partners are more likely to target 'at risk' or excluded young people through detached as well youth workers attached to youth centres while in Hetton and Murton's and Bristol's responses to the baseline questionnaire significant emphasis is placed on participatory initiatives and encouraging young people to become engaged in shaping provision of services.

1.1.3 Interest in the Project

Responses to the baseline questionnaire reveal a variety of interests motivating partners' involvement in the network. To some extent, this diversity reflects individual interpretations on what the question was asking them and on the extent to which individual partners had—at that time—developed their ideas of what they were going to investigate in focus groups.

¹ *Youth Transitions, Youth Policy and Participation: A State of the Art Report* (Working Paper 1) Andreas Walther, Gry Morech Hejl, Torben Bechmann Jensen and Amanda Hayes February 2002 (p.39) published online at: <http://www.iris-egris.de/yoyo/pdf/YoyoWP1StateofArt.pdf>

Some partners (for example Hetton and Murton) focused their responses on only those issues which they had determined would be the subject of in-depth investigation over the course of the project (namely democracy and decision-making). Others approached the question from the perspective of particular areas of interest or concern to their institution/department (e.g. Belfast, Evosmos, Liverpool and Misterbianco, Mazeikiai and Birkirkara). Finally, Bristol's responses to the questionnaire were more conditioned by normative aims (e.g. desire to create/nurture a more inclusive society) than by specific thematic interests (although such normative conceptions obviously have an impact on all of the thematic interests of the project).

1.2 Youth Participation Policy, Institutions and Initiatives

This section of the questionnaire looked at some areas of more particular relevance to the development of the project, asking partners to discuss existing institutions and initiatives for engaging young people, both internal to and external to their organisations, and how they function. It also asked partners to analyse what they saw as the strengths of these institutions or initiatives.

In their responses to sections 2 and 3, network partners demonstrated a range of experience in engaging with young people through participatory structures or initiatives. There is some suggestion that whilst broad crosscutting organisations are more common in the UK than in the Mediterranean countries (all four UK partners have youth fora which are intended to deal with a cross section of issues, rather than being specifically themed) participatory organisations were not absent from all non-UK partners. Youth participation in Mediterranean partners cities is however focused through narrower organisations often based around a single theme and event (for example, Evosmos' Education Festival) and is more aimed at providing young people with opportunities to participate than explicitly led by young people. An exception to this is Birkirkara whose young people have a local youth council as well as being connected to the national youth council; similarly, Mazeikiai also has an elected District Youth Forum that also appoints members to the Lithuanian Youth Parliament.

The lesson we have taken away from this (admittedly cursory) review of the situation is that (as highlighted above) a case-by-case and clearly contextualised approach to conducting our work is most appropriate.

1.2.1 Institutions of and Initiatives for Youth Participation

The presence, or lack of participatory institutions or initiatives for young people — in combination with the ways in which they operate and the levels of autonomy and control given to the young people — goes a long way to define project partners' starting points. While existing along a continuum in terms of their development, all project partners have examples of participatory institutions or initiatives that they are involved in facilitating or delivering.

Misterbianco and Sabadell are both at the lower end of the scale in terms of the sophistication of the participatory youth initiative/institutions which they are engaged in, but while neither have a youth forum, council or parliament with a broad remit, both have participatory initiatives with narrow but important focus. Sabadell's Dies de Nit (Days of Night) participatory nighttime leisure initiative has unfortunately been discontinued due to withdrawal of funding. Sabadell is currently engaged in developing new project around similar themes. The project will establish a public debate around issues such as inter-generational understanding of the acceptance of differences between people and the consequences of this. It aims to raise public awareness and understanding of the issues and to feed into proposals to improve leisure, culture and coexistence in Sabadell. The project is being designed with the participation of young people at every stage. Young people are repre-

sented on the project steering group, will be key to designing how the debate will be conducted and, of course, involved in the debate itself and will hopefully be enabled to influence policy directly through the project.

Evosmos also has a (Municipal) Youth Council, part of a national scheme. Young people up to the age of 25 are elected for two years to the Municipal Youth Council and able to discuss issues that concern their constituents with Municipality councillors. Each member of the council is responsible for a portfolio (e.g. publicity, press, contacts with other organizations, contacts with the municipal authority, etc.). They have no decision-making authority or budget to control. One problematic element of the scheme is that its structures and procedures are not always tailored for (or sufficiently explained to) young people, often meaning that the documentation of their proposals is not good as it could be and their influence is not felt strongly enough.

Birkirkara's Youth Council shadows the statutory local council with young people being elected to positions of youth mayor and counsellors with portfolio's which mirror those in the local council. As with Evosmos the youth council presents its deliberations to the statutory local council.

The effectiveness of youth parliaments and councils also varies amongst British partners with the Bristol Youth Parliament having little or no ability to make decisions. Easington District Youth Council (within Hetton & Murton) provides a positive example. The forum was established in May 2004 and through an adult steering group has proxy legal status and the ability to develop and commission projects. The forum establishes flexible nine to twelve month priorities towards which it works and is divided into five sub-committees dealing with issues such as the environment and the strategic planning sub-group, members of which will be engaging directly with the Young Citizens' Project. Of course its income and therefore budget is necessarily limited; however quite innovative ways of raising funding have been developed for the youth forum, for example for every ton of recycling collected in the district the Youth Council receives £1 which is controlled by forums' the environmental group as a small grants pot (they recently received £1,000 to distribute). The Youth Forum has also been granted control over the deployment of the district mobile cinema.

In Belfast, the city council and the Belfast Education and Library Board (Youth Service) are at the embryonic stage of setting up 'shadow youth councils'. These bodies are very much at the planning stage which the findings of the Urbact Young Citizens Project will inform in terms of their future development. The community/voluntary sectors bodies that are participating in the Belfast laboratories have their own youth fora which will provide an interesting dynamic in the Belfast deliberations.

Liverpool offers a number of participatory initiatives including a Youth Service Youth Council, membership of the UK Youth Parliament and a Schools' Parliament. The latter is elected from those schools which have Schools' Councils (the majority). The city also funds and supports a Youth Engagement Team, the four core members of which are young people who work with the support of more experienced workers. The YET has a small budget from which it is able to fund projects devised by young people and provide advice to elected Area Committees who control the allocation of youth participation resources.

Bristol cites the example of its Urban Partnership Group (UPG) as a good example of a participatory initiative. The UPG is responsible for distributing its Urban2 funding and around fifty-percent of its members are young people below the age of

30 with more than forty-percent being below the age of nineteen. The South Bristol Urban 2 Programme has around €11 million of ERDF funding to distribute to local projects and the young people on the partnership people have real decision-making powers with the potentially to have a considerable impact on their communities. Nevertheless the programme has a fixed life-span and is unlikely to develop into a permanent structure for decision-making by young people. Once its funding expires South Bristol Urban 2's legacy—in terms of young people's participation—will exist only in its examples of good practice and in the participatory projects in has funded (and only in those projects which are suitable for mainstreaming). There will be little or no on-going opportunities for young people to be significantly involved in determined the distribution of resources within their communities.

1.2.2 Other Programmes/Initiates

Network partners were on the most part able to highlight a number of other projects and initiatives within their cities, most involving funding streams through which young people are both targeted and afforded some opportunity to participate in grant making. For example, Evosmos is involved in an EQUAL project that has a measure specifically aimed at supporting young artists from socially disadvantaged backgrounds. The EVS Programme (part of the European Programme YOUTH (Action 2) runs voluntary work exchange visits between Evosmos and other European cities and is operated on a participatory basis with young people able to plan exchange proposals and take part in their implementation.

Belfast draws money from the EU funded Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland which includes a measure through which statutory, community and voluntary organisations are able to bid for money to conduct participatory work with young people. Because of the way that it is structured this affords the opportunity of exploring a range of different models, unfortunately it also means that these experiments have limits life spans and funding is not necessarily available for mainstreaming. In Hetton and Murton a group of young people, form the steering group for two projects run by the local Councils (City of Sunderland, Easington District and Durham) and Connexions (the nationwide support services for young people in the UK, mainly aimed at providing education, training and careers advice to young people). In the same area the UK Children's and Young People's charity Barnardos runs a community allotment project steered by young people.

In Bristol the Single Regeneration Budget (or SRB, a national funding stream focusing on quite tightly defined geographical areas) has funded a number of projects with the support of Young Peoples Services (a department of Bristol City Council). Such projects have usually been structured around themes such as inclusion or improving the environment. As with other cases the short-term and fragmentary nature of such projects is a weakness.

In Liverpool, the City Council Regeneration Team is seeking to involve young people in the design of service delivery. In that regard, they have made resources available to the Youth Service to develop young people's involvement and spread its examples of good practice. Within this process young people are employed as young workers on mobile provision and are supported to participate on various decision-making bodies. Whist the Youth Engagement Team was initially externally funded it has now main-streamed and is run on a permanent basis, (although the young workers still get 2 year contracts.

While adequately resourced this scheme also suffers from its short-term nature, and the poor prospects for sustainability which this implies. At the heart of this is the failure to adapt the core operations of funding organisations to include young people.

1.3 Involving Young People

1.3.1 Barriers to Young People's Participation

Project partners were in near unanimity regarding what they saw as the main barriers to young people's participation. For six out of seven partners the attitudes of adults — who it is felt far too often dismiss young people's contributions out of hand — was a significant barrier to the meaningful participation of young people. A close second was the complex of problems surrounding the bureaucracy of adult institutions: these problems include issues of the inaccessibility of the language used by such institutions, the complexity of bureaucratic structures and the effects these can have on young people. Another element, closely related to this, is lack of legal frameworks for seriously involving young people in real decision-making. Finally funding was highlighted as an important problem, with the emphasis being on funding which the young people themselves would have some control over.

1.3.2 Breaking-down Barriers

In terms of breaking down these barriers partners highlighted:

- The need for long-term commitment
- The need to develop capacity
- The need to integrate young people's concerns into all stages of activities
- The need to feedback to young people the results of their involvement
- The need to mainstream training in working with young people amongst their organisations' employees
- The need to counter the negative publicity to which young people are frequently subjected

1.4 Additional Information

In this section of the questionnaire we ask two questions specifically aimed at drawing out our network partners' view on where the project should be going, these were what would you like to see in the toolkit? And, whom do you hope to influence? The results of both of these questions were extremely positive from Bristol's perspective as they demonstrated strong agreement both with the approach that we felt would be best to take (as outlined briefly above) and with the target audiences we most want to influence through our work.

1.4.1 In the Toolkit?

Four central points, two of structure and two of content, emerge from partners' responses to the questionnaire

Partners want:

- (1) Complete examples based on structured case studies which include details of the processes involved from idea to results.
- (2) Modelling of these case studies where appropriate alongside critical analysis detailing strengths as weakness of the approach(es) taken.
- (3) Studies that demonstrate how young people can be engaged in decision-making and how their involvement can be sustained.
- (4) Studies that demonstrate how young people are able to handle making meaningful decisions that challenge professionals and other adults to take them seriously.

1.4.2 Target Audience?

As noted in the introduction, Young Citizens' project partners by consensus have prioritised influencing statutory decision-makers through the work of the project. Two other audiences stand out as particularly important:

- Young People themselves: in terms of publicising positive examples of young people's empowerment
- Service providers/professionals

1.4.3 The Benefits of Transnational Working

Partners' most frequently defined the benefits of involved in transnational working in terms of opportunity and a number of key opportunities emerged from their responses to the base line questionnaire:

- Opportunity to experience different approaches to young peoples' participation, borne out of different political and cultural contexts
- Opportunity to learn how other partners deal with the perceived risk of involving young people in decision-making
- Opportunity to learn form the best practice developed by others, to avoid repeating their mistakes and to learn form their positive experiences.

Partners also saw transnational work as providing the young people involved in the project with important experiences in terms of demystifying Europe, broadening their horizons and boosting their confidence.

2 Conclusions

All in all, responses to the baseline questionnaire reveal a number of key similarities and differences between partners. Turning first to differences, it is quite apparent that, as noted in the project outline that introduces this report, partners' starting points vary in terms of the breadth and depth of participation opportunities available to young people and consequently in terms of partner experience of young people's participation in decision-making. These variances are not however problematic, indeed they are desirable as a reflection of the wider reality across Europe, and an understanding of them has informed the approach which we are taking to the delivery of the project. In spite of these differences in terms of their experience, partners share a number of key similarities particularly in terms of their perceptions of the barriers to young people's participation, barriers which this project seeks to address. These differences as well as these shared values, we hope, will enable our partnership to produce a toolkit that will be coherent in its attitudes towards young people's participation and inclusive in its ability to address the broad range of starting points that exists across Europe.

3 Appendix One: Baseline Response Matrix

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
City Characteristics	<p>Pop: 277,391</p> <p>Belfast experiences the highest levels of multiple deprivation out of the 26 Local Government Districts in the province.</p> <p>Sectarian violence and intimidation remain matters of particular concern.</p>	<p>Pop:</p> <p>B'Kara is a dormitory town with limited open spaces and a traffic problem especially because arterial roads cut right through it.</p> <p>The town has mix of different areas, some of which may harbour youth unemployment, educationally unqualified youth, and a growing number of immigrant youth who may be finding it difficult to feel included within the community and are consequently being rendered invisible.</p>	<p>Pop: 110,000</p> <p>Situated in the outskirts of Thessaloniki in the Macedonia region of northern Greece</p> <p>Rapid urban expansion and population growth due to migration and immigration in past 20 years.</p> <p>Recent improvement in educational levels.</p> <p>An industrial area with heavy industry in decline.</p> <p>High unemployment rates especially among Young People (official sources: 16 to 17%)</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure due to rapid expansion a problem which focuses a lot of local government's attention and resources.</p>	<p>Pop: 439,473 Pop: 10-29 yrs 130,703</p> <p>Urban area which experiences economic deprivation</p> <p>12 of the 30 most deprived wards in England are located in Liverpool</p> <p>Population: 439,000</p>	<p>Pop: 67,000</p> <p>Mazeikiai District is situated in the north-west of Lithuania. In the north having a common border with the republic of Latvia. The population is over 67 thousand. 23.5 per cent of the total are 15 – 29 years of age. Mazeikiai District area covers both urban and rural territories. There are some socio-economic differences between the areas; high unemployment rates; cases of crime and violence among young people.</p>	<p>Pop: 44,695</p> <p>High-levels of socio-economic deprivation amongst 50% of the population.</p> <p>Problems of micro-delinquency, low educational achievement, and the misuse of drugs by young people.</p>	<p>Pop: 185,000</p> <p>A very homogeneous city although there is some socio-economic variation between the city centre and the outskirts.</p> <p>There are no particular concentrations of deprivation or social exclusion</p> <p>There are slightly greater levels of unemployment and educational failure among young people in the outskirts of the city.</p> <p>More recently here has been a growth in the number of young people from the city's periphery becoming involved in neo-fascist groups</p> <p>While in the city centre there has been a resurgence of squatting.</p>	<p>Pop: 34,000</p> <p>The Urban 2 area covers two local authorities: Sunderland City and Easington District Council and is run by the Hetton and Murton Partnership</p> <p>The area suffers from collapse of coalmining industry</p> <p>Only 31% of young people achieve five GCSEs grades A-C (national average 49%)</p> <p>There is high employment affecting the 16-24 age group</p> <p>Both authorities encompass significant numbers of wards fall into the top 10% most deprived wards nationally.</p>	<p>Pop: 380,615 Pop (10-29 yrs): 114,963)</p> <p>Bristol exhibits many symptoms of multiple deprivation but for very different reasons.</p> <p>However all areas of the city directly targeted suffer from high incidences of long term unemployment, lower than average incomes, poor school attainment and attendance, and lower than average life expectancy and relatively high crime.</p>

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
Core Services Provided to Young People	<p>After school provision at 24 locations</p> <p>Youth groups at 22 locations</p> <p>Summer schemes for the community sector</p> <p>Inter-Agency youth interventions (in partnership with other statutory bodies)</p> <p>Special youth projects</p> <p>Funding of community organisations that provide different forms of youth services</p>	<p>Youth Empowerment Centre, principle aims are to:</p> <p>(1) Help youth organizations in the locality run cultural, social and sports projects</p> <p>(2) Encourage young people to join existing organisations</p> <p>(3) Help them set up new organisations</p> <p>(4) education, careers, housing advice</p> <p>(5) educate youth through the organization of seminars, discussions, and courses</p> <p>(6) IT education and internet services exchanges, both locally and internationally</p> <p>(7) Financially support young people to voluntary work</p>	<p>Provision of information for Young People on education, employment and volunteering.</p> <p>Training programmes.</p> <p>Youth cultural events (including theatre, music, graffiti art, etc.</p> <p>Youth exchange programmes.</p> <p>Volunteer exchange programmes.</p> <p>Partnership working with social, cultural and sports organisations within Thessaloniki prefecture and at EU level.</p>	<p>Youth Clubs providing a range of educational programmes</p> <p>Adult mentoring</p> <p>Citizenship programmes focusing on personal and social responsibility</p> <p>Activities to develop cultural and artistic expression</p> <p>Outdoor and residential activities focusing on team building</p> <p>Youth exchange programmes at local and international level</p> <p>Outreach and mobile provision of services to Young People</p>	<p>Provision of self-expression training after school and outside school;</p> <p>Informal education;</p> <p>Adult education (over 18);</p> <p>Provision of information about future professional career possibilities and training programmes;</p> <p>Employment programmes;</p> <p>Youth exchange programmes;</p> <p>Sport based services;</p> <p>Crime and violence prevention programmes;</p> <p>Summer programmes for local community children and young people.</p>	<p>Sports facilities</p> <p>Youth information and points</p>	<p>Access and dissemination of information for Young People through 24 decentralised points in secondary schools and other educational institutions</p> <p>Vocational training courses and housing provision at reduced costs</p> <p>Healthy living initiative: dealing with issues such as sexual health, drugs misuse, diet, etc.</p> <p>Support to formal education</p> <p>Social and cultural development and leisure: 10 municipal 'civic centres' in which space is provided for young people to programme events.</p>	<p>Youth Clubs</p> <p>Detached and outreach youth work</p> <p>Study support through libraries</p> <p>Youth work in school based provision</p> <p>Youth Participation</p> <p>Arts, music and drama based work</p> <p>Out of Centre and adventurous work</p> <p>Sport based work</p> <p>Youth Information</p> <p>Inclusion based work</p> <p>International youth exchange work</p> <p>Accreditation predominately through the Duke of Edinburgh Awards programme.</p>	<p>Four main areas of work:</p> <p>(1) disability and inclusion</p> <p>(2) lesbian, gay and bisexual young people's support and awareness</p> <p>(3) participation in the democratic process and local involvement</p> <p>(4) race equality</p> <p>(5) Combination of detached working (with young people in the places that they go to, particularly those at risk of crime, drugs and alcohol) and centre based work.</p>

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
Number of Young People affected by services	<p>23.9% of the City's population is aged between 10 and 24 years.</p> <p>Belfast City Council provision is open to all Young People who wish to avail themselves of the service.</p> <p>Youth Services estimate that 45% of 5-9 years olds; 53% of 10-15 years olds; 33.8% of 16-18 year olds and 6.7% of 19-25 year olds engage in youth activities across the whole of Northern Ireland</p> <p>No statistic data for Belfast alone is available.</p>	<p>Up to 100% of young people (10,000 young people)</p>	<p>300 participants in information campaigns</p> <p>150 participants in cultural events</p> <p>2,500 participants as spectators in youth events</p> <p>26 volunteers 40 in exchange programmes (with 30 on the waiting list)</p> <p>12 collaboration organisations</p> <p>38 Collaboration youth organisations</p>	<p>Provide services for Young People between 11 and 25.</p> <p>Priority age group is 13-19 of which they are 46,000.</p> <p>Currently cater for 8,000 between 13-19 and 3,500 in the wider age group making a total of 11,500.</p>	<p>Approx. 60% of young people.</p>	<p>No specific figures available, number of users runs into several hundreds at least.</p>	<p>39,403 young people between the ages of 18 and 30.</p> <p>In 2003 the Service of Information to Young People provided 28,883 consultations and service study rooms received around 19,000 visits.</p>	<p>The District of Easington has a population of 93,985, with 29,075 under 25 (31%) and 22,666 aged 10-30 yrs (24%).</p> <p>The City of Sunderland has a population of 280,807, with 90,086 young people under the age of 25 (32%) and 74,903 aged 10-30 yrs (27%).</p>	<p>Approximately 25,000</p>

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
Specific Interest in the Project	<p>Employment Skills: youth unemployment is an on going concern in Belfast.</p> <p>Crime & Drugs Misuse which have resulted from the damaging impact of political conflict on civil society in Northern Ireland</p> <p>Democracy & Decision Making: specifically strengthening engagement with young people</p> <p>Non-statutory and innovative education methods: seeking to build on existing partnership work.</p>	<p>Improving the environment (limited open spaces, problem of arterial roads dividing communities)</p> <p>Democracy and Decision-making (as a way of rebuilding a traditionally strong sense of community)</p> <p>Healthy living, sport and food. (Problem of obesity linked to less active life style of young people.)</p> <p>Innovative education methods (importance of human rather than natural resources for Maltese economy)</p> <p>Employment skills and opportunities.</p>	<p>Culture and sports as a means of social integration and of involving young people, particularly those from disadvantaged social groups.</p> <p>Language as a resource of communication, information, understanding and expression.</p> <p>Healthy-living and the environment as key to improvement in quality of life.</p>	<p>Democracy & Decision Making.</p> <p>Culture & the Arts, contribution to and benefit from City of Culture 2008 status.</p> <p>Access to non-statutory education.</p> <p>Healthy living.</p> <p>Drug and alcohol misuse and it impact on youth crime.</p> <p>Provision of services for vulnerable young people.</p> <p>Combating the negative image of young people</p> <p>Young people's involvement in urban regeneration.</p>	<p>Democracy & Decision Making: We are interested in investigating ways for involving young people.</p> <p>Employment Skills: unemployment is a problem in Mazeikiai.</p> <p>Culture and Sports: encourages closer co-operation among young people.</p> <p>Language: means of communication among different nations.</p> <p>Healthy-living and the environment: a key to improve the quality of life.</p>	<p>Young people's job insertion and entrepreneurial job creation.</p> <p>Cultural development of young people.</p> <p>Drugs misuse treatment.</p> <p>Involving more young people in sports.</p>	<p>Use of arts, sports and culture as social education and integration.</p> <p>Also feel that providing employment information and opportunities is complementary: provision of resources for young people empowers them to self-education.</p>	<p>Democracy & Decision Making: the Hetton & Murton Urban II Programme is interested in investigating ways in which young people can become involved in its decision-making processes.</p> <p>Sunderland City is interested in investigating ways in which young people can be involved in the shaping of future youth strategy and the development of a Youth Participation Network.</p> <p>The district of Easington is hoping to involve young people in a new strategy and planning sub-group of its Youth Forum.</p>	<p>Need for fresh ideas and perspectives on young people's involvement</p> <p>Need to engage more young people in the processes of local management</p> <p>Need to take decisions closer to the community that the decisions impact on</p> <p>Want to narrow the power gap between those articulate and motivated young people who currently act as youth spokespeople and the majority of young people who believe that they are never listened to or taken seriously.</p> <p>Want to create/nurture a more inclusive society</p>

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
Youth Participation Policy and Institutions	<p>Northern Ireland Youth Forum: including representatives from Belfast nominated via affiliated youth groups.</p> <p>Belfast Youth Forum: still at an embryonic stage of development with Belfast City Council in the process of exploring best practice in the establishment and running of the forum.</p> <p>Belfast Education & Library Board: participation is based on nominations from among the young people who use the service. The board is also still at a developmental stage.</p> <p>1 Youth Action N.I. 2. Opportunity Youth</p> <p>Both these agencies have their own youth fora and provide a range of services for young people - they also place a strong emphasis on peer education projects.</p>	<p>The council, through its YEC has formed its first Local Youth Council some months ago. The idea is to give the opportunity for youths to have a go at decision-making, with its challenges and opportunities.</p> <p>The National Youth Council</p> <p>Local Parish Youth Commissions</p> <p>Students' Councils in schools</p>	<p>Municipal Youth Council: which suffers from a lack of youth participation</p> <p>Education Festival: to encourage the artistic expression of young people but is under funded.</p> <p>Education Office: which supports artistic and environmental student groups but lacks student participation.</p> <p>Sports Office: which covers a great number of sports activities but suffers from a lack of facilities</p> <p>Informal Groups for activities such as graffiti, skateboarding, music, which lack a structure for co-operation with the public sector.</p>	<p>Area Advisory Groups, part of the formal structure of the council they advise elected Area Committees on the allocation of youth participation resources, are fed information by the Youth Engagement Team.</p> <p>Youth Engagement Team consisting of four young workers (with more experienced workers in a support role) with a small budget to support projects and programmes devised by young people.</p> <p>Youth Parliament, part of the national network of Youth Parliaments of young people with fulltime support staff.</p> <p>Schools' Parliament elected from those schools which have Schools' Councils (the majority).</p>	<p>Lithuanian Youth Parliament (elected representatives from Mazeikiai District)</p> <p>Mazeikiai Youth Forum</p> <p>Municipal Youth Council</p> <p>Different youth projects</p> <p>Elected Schools Parliaments at every school with School president.</p>	<p>The 'Subject-making community' Project aimed at rehabilitating youth at risk of drug addiction and delinquency. Run by young people who plan and organise cultural and sports events.</p>	<p>Currently there are no young people's fora are able to participate.</p> <p>The Dies de Nit pilot project offered some opportunity of young people's participation but had unfortunately been discontinued for budgetary reasons.</p> <p>Sabadell is currently organising a, standalone rather than ongoing, public debate on citizenship and fellowship amongst citizens, the debate will include young people along side statutory and civil society organisations.</p>	<p>Easington District Council established a Youth Forum to influence community development</p> <p>The young people work around five thematic areas; environment & leisure - health-crime & community safety - education & training - media & communication</p> <p>The forum also has commissioning and fundraising powers</p> <p>The forum is made up of 50 11-16 year olds from across the district representing a cross-section of the youth diversity</p> <p>Future plans are for a strategic and planning group to be established, a 5-11 years group and 16-19 group.</p>	<p>Youth Parliament</p> <p>The Gabblers debating Society</p> <p>'Here By Right' initiative targeted at young people seeking their view on local issues of importance</p> <p>Youth Forum in South Bristol and the 'Greenhouse' Project in Filwood ward</p> <p>South Bristol URBAN II aims to give young people a key role in actually making decisions concerning the ERDF money awarded to Bristol.</p> <p>Youth wings of political parties</p> <p>Other youth projects tend to operate on a structural basis (around a central issue) for a fixed period of time. They are supported by Youth Services, usually through a dedicated worker</p>

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
Barriers to Young People's Involvement.....and some Solutions (in bold)	<p>(1) The attitudes of adults. (2) The complexity of bureaucratic organisations. (3) Shortage of time/resources to dedicated to involving young people. (4) Lack of knowledge (both council to young people and visa-versa). (5) Timing and venue choice in public meetings etc. (6) Lack of long-term strategic commitment to the involvement of young people.</p> <p>(1) Understanding. (2) Long-term commitment. (3) Development of capacity to involve young people.</p>	<p>A growing sense of individualism</p> <p>The lack of open spaces,</p> <p>Educational pressures and patterns of leisure</p> <p>Declining sense of community</p> <p>Socio-economic barriers, decision-making bodies are still dominated by particular socio-economic groups</p> <p>A growing disenchantment with institutions.</p> <p>Promoting diversity within statutory bodies</p> <p>Mentoring young people to become involved</p> <p>Co-opt young people to decision-making bodies</p> <p>Strengthen sense of community to promote involvement</p>	<p>(1) The attitudes of adults. (2) The absence of a legislative framework, which makes collaboration complicated. (3) Lack of settlement – buildings that can be self-governed by non-legislated groups.</p> <p>Developing: (1) Methods of collaboration. (2) Methods of funding (e.g. sponsorship (3) Reforming the ways in which services operate.</p>	<p>(1) The attitude of adults (an indicator of which is the lack of resources earmarked for involvement of young people in decision-making). (2) Young people's belief that adults do not take them seriously has a negative impact on their willingness to participate.</p> <p>(1) Release of more resources to support youth involvement. (2) Improvement of the quality of feedback following consultations. (3) By having honest and equal debate with young people. (4) By empowering young people as peer educators. (5) By countering negative publicity of young people with better contact and understanding.</p>	<p>Socio-economic barriers</p> <p>The attitude of adults and lack of commitment to involve young people in decision-making</p> <p>Low motivation of young people in the necessity of participation and becoming active citizens.</p> <p>Development and adoption of models for youth participation</p> <p>Development of long term strategies on local and national level</p> <p>Investigating new ways of supporting and funding the initiatives of young people.</p>	<p>(1) Complexity of bureaucratic proceeding. (2) 'Low level school conditions' discouraging youth involvement and creating a lack of trust between adults and young people.</p> <p>(1) Necessity of favouring closer contact with the population (including young people?) in order to involve them in public decision-making process.</p> <p>(2) Wider and synergetic participation of all associations dealing with young people and youth problems.</p>	<p>(1) The attitude of adults (who often feel that young people lack civic values). (2) Attitude of young people who are excluded from involvement and demotivated by feeling that their opinions are not valued by adults.</p> <p>(1) Development and adaptation of models of participation to make it more appealing to young people.</p>	<p>(1) Adult attitude to/perception of young people. (2) Levels of support/training available to young people to aid participation. (3) Poor transport (lack of services) is a barrier to participation.</p> <p>(1) Youth forum will consult with the wider population through a newsletter that will be delivered to every household within the district.</p> <p>(2) Training for council employees in communicating with young people.</p> <p>(3) Through the development of good practice examples of positive youth engagement in decision-making.</p>	<p>(1) Low educational achievement (2) lack of significant role models (3) dumb culture and the celebration of intellectual failure (4) the attitude of adults who believe that young people do not have the capacity to make worthwhile contributions</p> <p>(1) make youth consultation a real exercise and not something that happens as an afterthought (2) report back to young people on decisions that have been made (and the reasons for it) (3) Make youth engagement a priority for the 'active citizenship' agenda, without being patronising (e.g. 'rock the vote')</p>

	Belfast	Birkirkara	Evosmos	Liverpool	Mazeikiai	Misterbianco	Sabadell	Hetton & Murton	Bristol
What Would You Like to See in the Toolkit?	<p>(1) Exploration, critical analysis and summary of a range of approaches to working with and involving young people.</p> <p>(2) Practice models with relevant inputs and outputs shown</p> <p>(3) A range of practice tools which can be of practical use to organisations seeking to engage positively with young people.</p>	<p>(1) Details of different strategies that were tried and worked including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * their context * the conditions necessary for such strategies to work well * time frames * resources needed <p>(2) Ideally, strategies which seem to have failed and why, should also be included because they serve as eye openers for others who might want to experiment with such strategies, even if in different contexts.</p>	<p>(1) Completed examples (including: initial idea, participation/ organisational framework, budget, and results).</p> <p>(2) Examples of types of young people's organisations (including: the strengths and weakness of their collaboration with the public sector, what they do and how they are financed}.</p>	[No response]	<p>(1) Practical models of youth involvement in decision-making processes</p> <p>(2) Examples of experiences from all over Europe</p> <p>(3) Learn about youth institutions, programmes and initiatives with longer- term positive experience.</p>	<p>(1) Examples of specific interventions on behalf of young people by local authorities.</p>	<p>(1) Examples of experiences, ideas and lessons learned from across Europe.</p>	<p>(1) Examples of work initiated by/ implemented by young people that will challenge other young people to see the value of engaging in decision-making processes.</p> <p>(2) Practical ways for young people to challenge adults/ professionals to make the involvement of young people in decision-making more meaningful effective.</p> <p>(3) A range of tried and tested approaches that allow young people and professionals choice.</p> <p>(4) Peer examples in plain English format: enjoyable, relevant and productive.</p>	<p>(1) Benefits of engaging and involving young people</p> <p>(2) Methods of recruitment and retention for young volunteers</p> <p>(3) Recognition that what young people say is valuable</p> <p>(4) Youth involvement in actual decision making, not just consultation</p>

4 Appendix Two: Young Citizen's Project Contacts

Project Team

Steve Morris (Project Manager)

t. +44 (0)117 903 9795

e. s_morris@bristol-city.gov.uk

Laurie Ray (Project co-ordinator)

t. +44 (0)117 903 9793

e. laurie_ray@bristol-city.gov.uk

Beth Ewins (Finance & Monitoring Officer)

t. +44 (0)117 903 36419

e. beth_ewins@bristol-city.gov.uk

Belfast

Bill McClinton

t. +44 (0) 28 9032 0202

e. mcclintonb@belfastcity.gov.uk

Birkirkara

Mario Mallia

t. +35 (0)6 79 79 060

e. woody@maltanet.net

Bristol

Kanwal Dhillon

t. +44 (0)117 927 6301

e. BRLSKD@bristol-city.gov.uk

Evosmos

Ioanna Malatou

t. +30 (0) 23 10 706 66

e. kks@evosmos.gr

Hetton & Murton

Alison Clark

t. +44 191 517 3208

e. Alison.Clark@sunderland.gov.uk

Liverpool

Chester Morrison

t. +44 0151 233 2770

e. Chester.Morrison@liverpool.gov.uk

Mazeikiai

Edvardas Eicinas

t. +370 698 74380

e. e.eicinas@mazeikiai.lt

Misterbianco

Mariangela Torrissi

t. +39 095 464662

e. torrisi.mariangela@urban2.it

Sabadell

Natàlia Subirats Besó

t. +34 93 745 53 42

e. nsubirats@ajsabadell.es

Experts

Axel Pohl (Thematic Expert)

t. +49(0)7071 7952

e. axel.pohl@iris-egris.de

Pauline Geoghegan (Expert attached to the URBACT Secretariat)

t. +32 4782 24 733

e. pauline.geoghegan@skynet.be