

Costing street-based youth work

Tom Wylie



The **Joseph Rowntree Foundation** has supported this project as part of its programme of research and innovative development projects, which it hopes will be of value to policy makers, practitioners and service users. The facts presented and views expressed in this report are, however, those of the author and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation
The Homestead
40 Water End
York YO30 6WP
Website: www.jrf.org.uk

© National Youth Agency 2004

First published 2004 by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this report by photocopying or electronic means for non-commercial purposes is permitted. Otherwise, no part of this report may be reproduced, adapted, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

ISBN 1 85935 225 1 (pdf: available at www.jrf.org.uk)

A CIP catalogue record for this report is available from the British Library.

Prepared by:
York Publishing Services Ltd
64 Hallfield Road
Layerthorpe
York YO31 7ZQ
Tel: 01904 430033; Fax: 01904 430868; Website: www.yps-publishing.co.uk

This report can be downloaded from the JRF website (www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/).

Introduction: the nature of this exercise and of street-based youth work

The research study 'Reaching Socially Excluded Young People' (see Appendix 2) is the first major national study of street-based youth work. It focuses particularly on detached and outreach work with socially excluded young people and demonstrates the growth of such work in recent years. This growth has largely been through short-term projects with particular groups thought to be at high risk, such as the young unemployed, or on particular themes such as crime prevention. The study shows, too, that geographical coverage is very uneven with wide variations in funding. Short-term funding creates problems of staff recruitment and retention and weakens the durability and success of service provision.

The small complementary study (see Appendix 2) reported here endeavours to cost street-based youth work in order to provide a better basis for planning the development of this form of youth work, which shows evidence of important benefits to disadvantaged individuals and communities. It follows up on the conclusion of the main research study: that 'street-based youth work offers one of the few ways of making and sustaining contact, and working effectively with, disaffected, socially excluded, young people' – and yet the ad hoc method by which it is funded means its accessibility to these people remains sporadic and patchy. The Government gives priority to addressing the difficulties of this socially excluded group, yet has found it difficult so far to solve their problems directly within the school system. It would therefore seem that investment in more systematic and sustained provision, working alongside and in co-operation with other services including schools, colleges and Connexions, is worthwhile. But how much would this cost, relative to extra investment in these other services? This study's central purpose is to illustrate the order of magnitude of the spending required to make a difference.

The term 'street-based youth work' describes an imperfectly defined art rather than an exact science. It springs from the long-standing endeavours of various philanthropic and, later, public bodies to draw young people into a particular service or activity or to ensure that specific messages, on matters such as their health, were delivered to those who were not inclined to use building-based provision. In some settings, notably rural areas, street-based work is also used as a device for providing a service to young people in situations where the use of a suitable building is not feasible. This variety of focus and intensity for street-based work provides one of the main difficulties in costing it. At one end of the spectrum, the detached or outreach element is only a minor element of a project's work and is provided by, say, a couple of voluntary or part-time workers on a few evenings to complement a wide range of other activities offered by the organisation. At the other end of the spectrum, some

youth projects use street-based work as their predominant approach and employ full-time personnel with a professional qualification. A few also use mobile youth facilities such as a converted bus which is driven regularly to different housing estates or villages to provide a base in which young people can meet, and often carries a range of posters or video equipment to prompt discussion on social issues. As with detached work generally, a bus may be used in response to specific concerns, for example by being deployed on a specific Friday evening in a town centre to provide support, information and advice.

Whatever the scale and intensity of the street-based work, some features are common. Projects aim to establish a regular presence in an area so that young people become familiar with the workers and know that help is available should a time arise when they need it. Workers also aim to establish regular contact with individual young people and to build a relationship of trust on the basis of which they can begin to address issues identified by those individuals. These frequently include such matters as bullying and harassment, unemployment, housing, pregnancy and relationship breakdown. Conversation and spontaneous discussion may lead to more organised activity such as specific arts and media-based activities, sporting activities and taking groups of young people away for short residential programmes. Some projects work to establish semi-permanent groups with regular meetings for groups of young women or young men; minority ethnic groups; young carers and peer education groups. They may also encourage young people's progression into other projects.

A central feature of detached and outreach methodology is that workers are proactive in approaching young people to introduce themselves and to explain why they are there and what they could offer.

Cost of provision

The following analysis of the cost of providing street-based youth work more systematically across the country takes several stages:

- First, it looks empirically at how much is being spent in an illustrative sample of nine projects in different types of area. In each case, it calculates unit costs per young person served.
- Second, informed by the breakdown of the costs of various elements of these projects, it estimates how much it might cost to provide a satisfactory service with certain stated elements serving a given number of young people each week, and hence estimates a standard unit cost.

- Third, it scales up these estimates by considering how much it would cost to provide a project to serve a given population of young people in each of the most deprived areas of the country.
- Fourth, it puts such costs in context by comparing them to the amount spent on secondary schooling in those areas.
- Finally, it illustrates what level of provision would be delivered within these costings with reference to the example of a particular area, Leicester.

This analysis has been based on information gathered from individual projects and from recent micro-analysis of patterns of disadvantage provided by the University of Oxford's Index of Multiple Deprivation. Analysis of actual costings of projects are not based on a detailed audit of accounts, but by information gathered in telephone interviews. In relation to some costs, interviewees either did not have the information because it was paid from a central fund or they were unable to disaggregate it from other aspects of their work – in which case estimates were made based on costs in other projects. The calculations on costings must therefore be regarded as indicative rather than precise. However, the reported costs of a range of different projects were sufficiently similar to be confident that the calculated unit costs are at least of the right order of magnitude, and that the final estimate of total costs therefore gives a useful estimate of the level of resource required to fund a systematic service.

Actual costs in nine projects

A breakdown of actual project costs is shown in Table 1. This analysis seeks to distinguish between those young people who are 'contacts' (C) and those who are 'participants' (P): the former are known to their worker but do not engage in some of the more developed relationships or activities. Costs were notionally allocated to each of these, but such distinctions and numbers must also be treated with some caution as many projects are only just beginning to keep records in this way. For the purpose of this survey projects were asked to give their best estimates of the numbers in each category as the basis for judging how many young people can be reached for a particular cost.

The length of a detached work session reported in this study varied between 2.5 hours and 3.5 hours. This included a minimum of 0.5 hours for preparation and evaluation. The average was a 3-hour session with 15 minutes at the beginning and end for preparation, recording and evaluation.

Table 1 Projects, costs and reach

Project	No. of staff F-T/P-T	No. of sessions per week	No. of YP C/P per week	Annual cost (£)	Cost per session (£)	Cost per YP C/P (£)
Inner City London Borough	1/1(.5)	4	60/48	57,959	314	25/39
Inner City Northern Town	3/1 (20% of time spent on detached work)	4	40/24	20,662	112	3/6
Inner City West of England	1/5	10	150/70	53,143	115	6/16
Midlands Town	1/6	6	250/200	54,855	198	4/6
South West Town	2/5	8	90/70	75,958	206	17/23
West Midlands Town	2/1	5	80/60	58,540	254	12/21
Seaside Town (Urban Mobile)	1/10	7	140/80	75,768	234	11/20
Rural Mobile	1/11	5	80/60	59,535	258	16/21
Rural team	1 (20%)/3	5	125/100	58,407	253	10/12

C = 'Contact' (less intensive involvement) P = 'Participant' (more intensive)

The number of detached work sessions operated by projects in this study was as follows:

- Four sessions per week 2
- Five sessions per week 3
- Six sessions per week 1
- Seven session per week 1
- Eight sessions per week 1
- Ten sessions per week 1

Contact on a sessional basis with young people across the nine projects ranged from 12 to 40. The average number of contacts per session is 20 with most projects saying that they have regular contact with 12 young people each session.

In some instances precise figures of contacts were unavailable either because the information was held centrally, or it was difficult to distinguish the detached work element from other work and services delivered by the organisation. As a result, in some cases an approximation was made by the interviewee or a notional percentage of salary has been applied to provide a constant across the projects.

None of the projects had a single funding source. One voluntary organisation had six sources of funding, each requiring funding applications, monitoring and evaluation reports at different time intervals and using different criteria. This worker estimated that 40 per cent of his time was spent on writing applications and reports to secure the funding to keep the work going. Funding sources included the local authority,

Single Regeneration Budget, Connexions Positive Activities for Young People programme, Neighbourhood Support Fund, local charities and (free) use of church premises. An element for such administrative work is included in the costing.

The following were the two main categories of costs involved in these projects:

Staffing and associated costs

When out on the streets workers usually work in twos or, occasionally, in threes. However, work on the street has also to be supported and coordinated usually by a project coordinator or senior worker, a proportion of whose time may also be spent involved in direct street-based work.

Where the street-based workers are paid, whether full-time or part-time, workers are paid on JNC level 2. Those who have a senior worker or coordinating role are normally paid at the higher end of this scale. A London borough is proposing to employ detached workers on JNC level 3 because the principal youth officer says it is difficult to recruit people to the work and judges it to be more demanding and challenging than centre-based work. Staff paid on a sessional basis are paid between £7 and £10 per hour for a team leader.

Six of the nine projects had regular administrative support available ranging from four hours per week to 25 hours per week. The average was ten hours per week and pay in the region of £8 per hour. On-costs to cover National Insurance and pensions ranged from 6 per cent to 19 per cent.

Detached workers need some form of office base from which to operate; a place where they can store resource materials and keep records and in some case meet with young people for specific activities. In most cases this means sharing space with other people. Most common is sharing an office in a youth centre or 'camping out' in an area's youth service office. One church-based voluntary organisation has free use of a room adjacent to the church. Office space is seen by most as a hidden cost which may not always be charged to the project.

Most have budgets for telephones, and in particular mobile phones which are regarded as essential personal safety equipment for the streets. Funds for training and staff development are mostly ad hoc: this is a particular weakness in a form of work for which initial training may not have fully prepared staff and in which emerging social needs often compel new responses and up-to-date knowledge.

Most projects have a very small budget for educational materials and resources and for some programme activity. They rely upon obtaining free posters, leaflets and other resources from agencies keen to promote a particular concern or issue. Some projects have been able to purchase capital equipment such as computers and media equipment as part of the initial start-up costs resulting from a successful funding application. Other equipment is borrowed from different agencies and can be one of the positive benefits of partnership working. These costings, however, do not make any assumptions about the necessary funding of other organisations to which young people may be referred.

In voluntary organisations the senior worker is usually also the overall project manager. In these cases the manager's time is usually split 60/40 between management of the project and face-to-face work. They are likely to be responsible for other programmes as well as detached work as most voluntary organisations have had to diversify their activities in order to secure funding from different bodies. Few of the external funding streams provide funding to cover core management, administration and training costs.

In the case of local authorities, where a senior worker is in charge of a project their time is usually split 40 per cent supervision and coordination and 60 per cent face to face work. In some local authorities a senior worker may have responsibility for more than one detached work team, in which case these percentages are likely to be reversed.

The cost of senior managers in a local authority is not included in the calculations of most project costs and their supervisory role appears to be taken for granted. A notional figure for this is allowed in the calculations below. Nor do the full costs of corporate services, such as personnel and legal, necessarily get passed on to the individual project but are normally retained at the level of the overall Youth Service.

Mobile provision

Two of the projects in this study operated mobile provision. In the case of one project the purchase price of the vehicle was £35,000 in 1999 and in the other it cost £17,000 to convert and fit out a vehicle at about the same time, although the original purchase price is not known. As well as the usual running costs of tax, depreciation, insurance, servicing and fuel, the local authority requires a six weekly safety check costing £50 each time.

Other projects have arrangements for hiring local community transport and one local authority leases mini buses to projects at a cost of £16,800 each per annum.

On the basis of this limited survey there is no evidence that the cost of providing detached work depends primarily on whether the project is serving an inner city estate, small town or rural area. Clearly, offering any kind of service in a rural area can cost more per individual served but variations in cost are more likely to be due to factors such as staffing levels, decisions about the intensity of the work and hence the costs of a base from which to operate; and whether or not the project has some form of mobile provision. In many rural areas such mobile provision is all that is available. Variations in unit costs usually reflect the greater needs of some young people and the intensity of work with some groups. The unit cost of 'participants' in this study range from £6 to £26 and compares favourably with the unit costs of attendance by young people in building-based provision.

A costing model

The unit costs shown in Table 1 above fall mainly into two clusters, other than in inner London where costs are atypically high: a group where costs are £3–6 per contact and another group where they are £10–£17 per contact. This is likely to be because some projects provide a very partial service, often based largely on volunteer work and only available part of the time. The group in the higher band are closer to providing satisfactory coverage, but not all will provide every desirable element.

The calculation below (Table 2) endeavours to draw together the various cost factors identified above and to offer a model for costing a project which would represent good practice, including the availability of managerial supervision, staff development and mobile facilities.

The budget is based on a detached youth work team operating five, three-hour sessions per week, for 46 weeks per year and on JNC 2003 rates.

A budget of this kind would provide the following unit costs – at the more superficial 'contact' and the more engaged 'participant' levels respectively:

Contact with 20 young people each session, five sessions per week, 46 week per year	£16.14
Participation of 12 young people each session, for five sessions per week, 46 weeks per year.	£26.90

Note that this is compatible with what is actually being spent towards the upper end of the examples reported in Table 1 above.

Table 2 The costs of a project

Staffing	
One full-time detached work coordinator JNC nationally qualified scale 2 mid points 8 to 11	28,191
One part-time, 18 hours per week detached worker JNC locally qualified rates level 2 mid points 5 to 8	8,208
Two sessional workers, working two x three hour sessions per week each @ £8.00 per hour	4,992
Administrative support for four x three hour sessions per week @ £8.00 per hour	4,992
<i>Total</i>	<i>46,383</i>
On-costs	
NI and pensions @15 per cent of salaries	6,957
Staff development and INSET @ 3 per cent of salaries	1,391
Travel and expenses @ 3 per cent of salaries	1,391
<i>Total staffing and on-costs</i>	<i>56,122</i>
Operational overheads	
Office base, rent heating and lighting @ 4 per cent of salaries	2,183
Telephones, including mobiles	1,200
Stationery and copying	1,000
Computers (including hand held note books)	1,500
<i>Total office overheads</i>	<i>5,883</i>
Resources and equipment	1,000
Programme fund (for residentials, etc.)	1,000
Management costs	
A notional management overhead based on 10 per cent of staff salaries	4,638
Transport costs	
Purchase price of vehicle £35,000 @ 10 per cent depreciation per year	3,500
Running costs: tax, insurance, fuel and safety checks	2,620
<i>Total transport costs</i>	<i>6,120</i>
Total project cost	
Staff including on-costs	56,122
Operational overheads	5,383
Resources and equipment	1,000
Programme fund	1,000
Management costs	4,638
Transport	6,120
<i>Total</i>	<i>74,263</i>

Scaling up street-based youth work

The next part of this costing study endeavours to scale up street-based projects to secure better coverage across the country. It is based on work by Oxford University in particular their Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD2004) (see Appendix 2).

At present, local authorities, Connexions Services and voluntary and community organisations decide whether and on what basis they may introduce or support street-based work. Some see it as a way of complementing other forms of youth provision in an area; some as a way of meeting the bench marks established by government for the ‘reach’ of youth services in their publication ‘Resourcing Excellent Youth Services’ (DfES 2002): the relevant benchmark is ‘25 per cent of the 13–19 population’. Some services, notably the Connexions Service, deploy street-based work in order to contact hard-to-reach individuals. There can be particular difficulties in providing services in rural areas where the numbers of young people are small and scattered and where a rural standard for accessibility still exists. The figures provided above provide the basis for local decision-making of this kind (and Appendix 1 provides worked examples). The rest of this paper provides a methodology for rolling out street-based youth work projects to a larger number of areas in England.

Assumptions

The paper makes various assumptions. These include project costs of £75k per annum (as above); each project would reach some 125 young people per week and work intensively with 25 of them.¹ Such a street-based project would be provided for each area with a population of young people, aged 13–19 years, of 2,500.

One conclusion that can be drawn from the information about projects is that they already constitute a range of different possible approaches. Such provision could either:

- provide a basic service where no other form of youth provision exists e.g. in rural areas or some outer-ring housing estates;
- target a particular subset of the youth population, e.g. the hard to reach or those not in education, employment or training (NEET);

1 This is compatible with the estimate above that the project would work intensively with 12 people on this basis a day for 5 days a week, because some of the 25 individuals would participate in more than one session.

- focus on the population who decided not to use other services for young people;
- address specific, but changing, locations and issues ('trouble-shooting').

Clearly the assumption about the target group to be adopted would have strong implications for the costs of any rollout of youth work provision. It would also require information about the scale of existing provision in a locality, about the distribution of young people in the NEET category (itself probably a highly mobile group status-wise, according to Youth Cohort Study analysis) and about the take-up of existing youth provision. Provision for young people, especially for street-based projects has to be area based or focused.

In order to consider nationwide roll-out it is necessary to explore what proportion of *areas* might be targeted and to what degree (in the light of existing provision for young people).

The paper also presents some costs of other local services for young people that may guide the debate by acting as benchmarks.

Local area deprivation, population of young people and educational costs

The very recently released Index of Multiple Deprivation for England (IMD2004) now covers, as its basic local 'building block', the 32,480 Super Output Areas (SOAs). These are sub-ward geographies of a reasonably socially homogenous type with similar sized populations of about 1,800 people. Using 2001 census data shows that there are an average of about 130 young people aged 13–19 in each SOA (with a total 13–19 population of over 4m in England).

The IMD2004 has a number of domains of deprivation on which each SOA is measured, using a mix of local indicators. The most relevant domain for our purposes is the Education sub-domain for young people which cover six items (from KS2 score to entry to HE). The most disadvantaged 10 per cent of SOAs contain about 500,000 young people aged 13–19. The most disadvantaged 5 per cent (1,624 SOAs) of such SOAs contain 260,000 young people aged 13–19. Young people tend to be over-represented in more disadvantaged areas.

At one extreme with an intensively targeted level of provision we could, in principle, place one street-based youth work project in each of these most educationally disadvantaged SOAs (i.e. the most disadvantaged 5 per cent). The costs would be approximately £122m (assuming no additional costs for mounting a programme of

this size), though some of those areas will already be provided for by existing provision. This may be regarded as unrealistically expensive as it would only cover 5 per cent of young people, though a slightly higher proportion of those most at risk (basically targeting areas in this way picks up *more* young people at risk, but is not an efficient way of targeting *all* such people). It would also be a very substantial addition to the local budget (approximately 21 per cent of the cost of local secondary schooling) but there will, nevertheless, be implications for mainstream services.

As these areas typically have relevant populations of about 100+ young people, it might make more sense to provide a detached mobile youth provision to *clusters* of such areas. Many of the most deprived SOAs will be close to or adjacent to each other. The type of coverage envisaged would mean that a detached youth work project of the kind specified could cover *multiples* of such SOAs, by using mobile facilities.

The proposal to provide street-based youth projects for areas with a population of 2,500 young people (unless this was widely defined to include those aged say 11–25), would have a very large population base – roughly 20 SOAs and a total population of more like 40,000. This would provide relatively low level of coverage (but could be a reasonable target for less disadvantaged areas or perhaps as an aggregate for the country at large). On this basis, using our benchmark cost of £75K per project, one would need only about £6m (81 projects in the most disadvantaged 5 per cent) to place projects in enough areas to cover the most disadvantaged 5 per cent (as these would be largely in urban concentrations.). This may be regarded as rather narrow in scope and would be about 1 per cent of the total secondary school spend (see below). Scaling up might mean some increased costs as more of the target SOAs would be in isolated urban or rural areas.

Comparisons with expenditure on local secondary schooling

Street-based youth work is not a substitute for adequate secondary education provision, but can be seen as a complementary strategy capable of helping some young people who have hitherto participated poorly in the school system. It can also complement and be partly funded by out-of-school services such as Connexions, which similarly aims to prioritise excluded groups, and spends a total of £450m a year. In considering where to devote resources in efforts to combat the exclusion of this group, policy makers may do well to set the cost of expanding youth work alongside the cost of spending more on schools, colleges and various other services.

Using the Section 52 data on average school costs for all maintained secondary school pupils and attributing this to pupil home postcodes gives approximate

estimates for secondary school expenditure (11–16 only). Note these are maintained school budget costs *only* and do not take account of LEA or other costs. The most disadvantaged 5 per cent of SOAs have total maintained secondary school costs of just under £600m pa, with average per pupil costs of just over £3,100. Less disadvantaged areas tend to have fewer young people and slightly lower educational spend on average. Thus the most advantaged 5 per cent of SOAs on the educational measure have a secondary school total spend of about £340m but, with fewer pupils, an average per pupil cost of about £2,800 pa.

These figures give us some potential benchmarks on the scale of local costs of deploying detached youth work provision. We might start with the assumption that one project per five SOAs might be the target in the most disadvantaged 5 per cent of SOAs, with some form of sliding scale as the areas became less disadvantaged. This sliding scale would be appropriate as the trajectories followed by young people in these different types of areas are very different. Thus, in the most disadvantaged 5 per cent of SOAs, the proportion of young people entering higher education is about 7 per cent; in the top 5 per cent it is some 75 per cent. However this is a gradual change and there is no obvious cut point. The approximate costs of this level of provision (one detached youth work project per 5 SOAs in the most disadvantaged 5 per cent nationally) would give a total cost of about £24m (or about 4 per cent of the current educational expenditure on local secondary schooling). There are 1,624 SOAs in each 5 per cent group. Table 3 gives some ‘ball park’ figures. No account of geographical clustering has been made in these calculations. This clustering might

Table 3 Details of Super Output Areas, educational costs and numbers

Percentile of SOA	No 11–16	Total secondary school spend (£m)	Total 13–19 (2001 Census)	Number of projects (1:5 in top 5 per cent: 1:6 in next 5 per cent, etc.)	Total costs @£75K per project (£m)
1st most disadvantaged 5 per cent	187,500	585	254,955	325	24.375
2nd “ “	170,961	528	239,903	271	20.325
3rd “ “	162,083	504	228,543	232	17.4
4th “ “	156,108	485	223,169	203	15.225
5th “ “	152,768	472	219,078	180	13.5
6th	145,637	445	212,063	162	12.15
7th “ “	142,329	427	206,829	148	11.1
8th “ “	141,771	420	203,906	135	10.125
9th “ “	137,699	407	200,953	125	9.375
10th “ “	136,374	394	197,328	116	8.7
TOTAL (for most disadvantaged 50 per cent of areas)	1,533,230	4,667	2,186,727	1,897	142.275

reduce costs (if the most disadvantaged SOAs were adjacent) or increase them (if they were very scattered). There would also be scope for spreading the impact to adjacent SOAs not in the most disadvantaged decile.

These figures are simply illustrative and could be adjusted, for example to give a national average figure of one street-based youth work project for 2,500 people. This would suggest a total of 1,650 projects nationally (in England) to be distributed differentially. This could be done by stepping down the number of SOAs to be covered, for example starting at 1:8 (projects to SOAs) rather than 1:5 gives a total of 1,370 projects and total costs of £103m. One could also increase or decrease the taper (currently it simply includes one more SOA at each 5 per cent of disadvantage step).

An alternative or complementary approach would be to build up information from a local area – this would deal better with questions of clustering and overall coverage, for example in balancing the needs of innercity, outer-urban, small town and rural areas.

A worked example, from Leicester and neighbouring districts is at Appendix 1.

Conclusion

These ground-breaking reports demonstrate how individuals and communities benefit from street-based youth work. The development of this form of practice offers a critical dimension to various aspects of social policy, in particular in re-engaging socially excluded young people currently out of education, employment and training. This costing paper is itself ground-breaking in demonstrating how a form of youth work intervention can be scaled up. The most disadvantaged 5 per cent of areas with a total of 255,000 young people aged 13–19 could be reached for £25m, or about 4 per cent of the amount spent on secondary education in these areas. For a modest investment, sustained over time and influencing mainstream services, the lives of many of the most marginalised young could be transformed.

Appendix 1

A worked example: Leicester

Leicester City has approximately 187 SOAs. These contain approximately 27,500 young people aged 13–19. Of these SOAs, 41 are in the most disadvantaged 10 per cent on the education domain (and 23 are in the most disadvantaged 5 per cent). The total secondary school level spend in Leicester (11–16) sums to about £50.5m (based simply on aggregating per pupil expenditure).

There are clusters of educationally very disadvantaged SOAs (ie in top 10 per cent) in Abbey Ward, Beaumont Leys, Braunstone Park, Eyres Monsell, Freeman, and New Park. Another six wards (Aylestone, Charnwood, Humberstone & Hamilton, Spinney Hills, Thurncourt, and Westcotes) contain one or two disadvantaged SOAs. Taking account of only those SOAs in the most disadvantaged decile on the educational measures give the following numbers of SOAs in each ward and their total population aged 13–19. Secondary school expenditure figures for all maintained pupils aged 11–16 in the area are also given.

Geographical analysis can identify the way that these SOAs cluster together spatially (eg the wards may be adjacent). This data shows the number of young people living in those parts of Leicester which are in the most disadvantaged 10 per cent of SOAs in England. In two wards, Braunstone and New Parks, there are more than 1000 young people aged 13–19. Adjoining areas, while less disadvantaged on these particular measures, also contain significant levels of deprivation. Thus targeting a limited number of these clusters in Leicester would potentially pick up more

Table 4 Top decile SOAs in Leicester City (source IMD2004)

Wardname	No. of SOAs in top decile: education	Total 13–19 residents (2001 Census) in these most disadvantaged SOAs	Total educational spend (11–16) (2001–2) in £ pa
Abbey	4	629	849,000
Aylestone	1	128	165,500
Beaumont Leys	4	817	826,800
Braunstone Park	8	1,362	3,192,780
Charnwood	2	384	935,900
Eyres Monsell	5	840	1,729,700
Freeman	4	705	1,612,350
Humberstone & Hamilton	2	293	639,550
New Parks	7	1,137	2,631,900
Spinney Hills	1	104	201,750
Thurncourt	2	346	683,000
Westcotes	1	105	133,650
TOTAL	41	6,850	13,601,880

disadvantaged young people than those in the target SOAs. Typically the same wards have other SOAs in disadvantaged categories (e.g. top 20 per cent). Data on adjacent areas would be able to fine tune this judgement.

Setting up of the order of 8 projects in Leicester which would target these more disadvantaged clusters, looks a realistic programme: they ought to be able to cover these areas and pick up some of the adjacent areas outside the most disadvantaged decile. A mobile facility and deployment would enable some work to engage with young people where they congregate, for example in shopping centres which also attract young people from more isolated communities.

In the smaller urban settlements north and west of Leicestershire disadvantage is rather more scattered. We have taken the four districts that include Loughborough and on to the outskirts of Derby. In these four districts there are 277 SOAs but there are only another six SOAs in the top decile and 12 in the second decile on the education measure for young people. Loughborough (in Charnwood District) itself has the highest with three SOAs in the top 10 per cent. This underlines the need for careful operational planning if isolated pockets of disadvantage are to be addressed.

Using the sliding scale of provisions suggested in Table 3 it would be possible to work out potential levels of coverage. This would then have to be examined on the ground to check proximity (if SOAs were physically clustered or not) and to take into account existing provision.

Table 5 Distribution of SOAs in Leicester and Neighbouring Districts by Decile of the IMD2004 Educational Sub Domain for Young People (High=most disadvantaged)

Decile	Leicester	South Derby	Charnwood	Hinckley	NW Leics
Highest	41	–	4	1	1
2	17	3	4	3	2
3	19	4	8	7	11
4	19	5	7	7	9
5	22	9	11	11	10
6	26	9	12	6	9
7	11	2	18	11	9
8	13	8	20	8	4
9	10	9	12	9	2
10	9	5	4	3	–

Appendix 2

A note on sources and authorship

- 1 *Reaching socially excluded young people: A national study of street-based youth work* (National Youth Agency/Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2004) is the principal document on the work itself.

The research was carried out by David Crimmens, Principal Lecturer in Social Work at the University of Lincoln and Humberside, Fiona Factor, Director of Youth and Community Studies at the University of Luton, Tony Jeffs, Senior Lecturer in Community and Youth Work at the University of Durham, John Pitts, Vauxhall Professor of Socio-Legal studies at the University of Luton, Jean Spence, Lecturer in Community and Youth Work at the University of Durham, Carole Pugh who was a Research Fellow at the University of Luton and is currently a Youth Worker in York and Penny Turner who was also a Research Fellow at the University of Luton and is currently a Research Associate in the Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge. The analysis was based on a national survey of projects, 31 telephone interviews with project heads, 11 project visits, group and individual interviews with youth workers and young people, a user survey, user case studies and the administration of a social exclusion inventory to 96 young people.

- 2 *Costing street-based youth work* – the exercise reported in this document.

In addition to the material provided by the extensive research reported above, a small scale survey was carried out through telephone interviews with the senior workers of seven detached youth work projects and the principal youth officers of two local authorities by Terry Cane for The NYA. The nine interviews on which this costing study is based represent a broad cross section of detached youth work throughout England. Six are local authority funded and three voluntary organisations and reflect provision in the inner city, large towns (including a seaside sort) and rural areas. The analysis of how such projects could be rolled out nationwide was carried out by George Smith of the SDRC Research group of the Department of Social Policy and Social Work at the University of Oxford.

All the figures in this paper are presented by way of illustration. The assumptions about level of coverage are also broadly illustrative and presented in ways that can easily be varied. The actual IMD data and numbers of pupils are from published sources. The calculation of school costs is based on Section 52 Returns. The responsibility for their presentation and use in this form is that of Tom Wylie, Chief Executive of The National Youth Agency, who prepared this report based on the evidence cited.