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1. Executive summary

Choices was a £4 million national Home Office programme aimed at the voluntary and community sector to support their involvement in preventing and reducing substance misuse and related offending by vulnerable young people aged 10-19 years. Funding was provided to 11 national voluntary organisations who aimed to work with around 190 additional local voluntary and community organisations between October 2011 and March 2012 (a six month time period).

The 11 national voluntary sector organisations were asked to build upon proven approaches but with an emphasis on developing more innovative and new ways of working to deliver more effective solutions for local communities. An additional aim of the programme was to add value to existing local services and avoid duplication of activities locally.

The Keighley area of Bradford was identified as the target location for the Barnardo’s run Choices programme. Keighley is characterised by high levels of deprivation, comparatively large proportions of young people not in education, training or employment (NEET), concerning levels of substance misuse amongst school age children, and (like many towns) some complex challenges to face around social isolation, antisocial behaviour, child sexual exploitation and engagement of young people in gangs.

The Choices funding represented an ideal opportunity to
- build on Barnardo’s work and expertise in Bradford and Keighley,
- expand the vital work being carried out by existing statutory and voluntary organisations,
- test emerging ideas developed through the local Community Budget pilot, and
- to promote the use of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) across the district.

In the design of the Choices Programme, Barnardo’s also wished to:
- recognise the value of early intervention and prevention work;
• draw on existing research into the risk factors and counter-risk factors of offending and substance misuse;
• use a whole family approach; and
• test out a model of partnership working.

Barnardo’s Choices operated a key worker model, using a multi-agency panel (MAP) and employing the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) in referral and assessment. Referral partners included (statutory services) Bradford Youth Offending Team (YOT), West Yorkshire Police, Bradford Connexions, Extended Schools Services, Bradford Youth Service and (voluntary sector partners) including Project 6 and Barnardo’s Turnaround project.

Young people and families were offered a targeted, tailor-made package of support designed to reduce the risk factors, and promote the counter-risk factors, linked to offending and substance misuse. A support package for a young person or family included one or more of the following: family support, tackling substance misuse, addressing offending behaviour and referral to other appropriate agencies, positive activities, one-to-one support, alternative education and training and enjoyable activities. The core model included a number of evidence-based interventions, including family group conferencing and restorative justice.

Forty-one young people were referred to Choices; 25 were successfully engaged and 21 completed the programme. There were 17 males and four females involved and the most common age of young people was 12. All the young people had multiple needs (of a relatively high level) including exclusion from school or attending a learning support unit, a range of family issues (including, parental depression, bereavement in the family and witnessing domestic violence), parental substance misuse, low self esteem, and antisocial behaviour or offending.

Barnardo’s undertook both an outcomes based and process evaluation of the Choices programme. The outcomes evaluation investigated whether Keighley Choices reduced the risk of occurrence or reoccurrence of substance misuse and/or offending of young people ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention, in Keighley. This was done by assessing interim (short term) outcomes; whether young people showed a shift towards safer thinking and behaviour on factors known to correlate with or counter offending and substance misuse. The Teen Star version of the Outcomes Star¹ and detailed, structured
case studies were used to measure outcomes on six domains (Drugs and alcohol; Health and wellbeing; Safety and security; Structure and education; Behaviour and citizenship; Family and other key adults).

A process evaluation focused on whether Keighley Choices increased the capacity of local organisations to identify and respond appropriately to children and young people at risk of substance misuse and/or offending. The research questions asked:

- Did the model (set-up and delivery) enable identification, engagement and provision of appropriate support to the relevant young people?
- Did the model increase the use of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF)?
- Did the model increase partnership working and cross-fertilisation of ideas in Keighley?

The process evaluation used semi-structured interviews with 11 stakeholders from Barnardo’s, the MAP (Multi Agency Panel), the Strategic Steering Group and partner agencies.

At the end of the six month Choices programme:

- **Positive outcomes** overall had been achieved by **15 out of 19 young people**.
- **Impressive changes** were seen in young people’s ‘Safety & Security’ (almost three-quarters of young people reported positive change), in **Structure and Education** (63% reported positive change) and in **Wellbeing** (63% reported positive change) which were the areas that the interventions focused most strongly on.
- The high numbers of young people showing a positive change in Safety & Security reflected a real shift in many young people’s attitudes to staying safe and avoiding risky situations (particularly with peers).
- For those who had achieved positive outcomes in Education & Structure, the changes were quite dramatic – six out of 12 young people showing a positive outcome had shifted two points or more on the Teen Star – moving from being ‘stuck’ in their current situation to making real changes in their life.
- Young people also developed characteristics known to counteract the risk of offending and substance misuse; in particular there were reports of **some very positive improvements in self-esteem** and in **family relationships**.
• Case studies backed up the findings from the Teen Star analysis and also provided evidence of increased understanding and respect for others and some improved ability to control anger.

Attitudes and behaviour towards substance misuse and offending themselves changed only marginally, but this was not unexpected. Offending behaviour in particular can be very entrenched and often influenced over a longer period by changes in other aspects of life; it is therefore quite possible that more impressive changes would occur for these young people if the programme had continued longer.

The mix of interventions offered to families was impressive, both in breadth and quality, though there was not enough time for the different services to start to interface as ‘one programme’. The different interventions received some very positive feedback from families and stakeholders alike. Of particular note were the Dance United Yorkshire (DUY), Cycle Recycle and Brathay residential activities.

Capacity building of smaller local organisations was good: partner agencies benefitting from the Choices funding were Project 6, Dance United Yorkshire, Brathay, Cycle Recycle and Barnardo’s Voices. The model built on existing strong partnership working and seemed to further enhance some relationships between the local voluntary and statutory sector. The Common Assessment Process (CAF) was used to improve assessment and partnership working – seven children and young people had a CAF completed, who would not have done otherwise – and there was evidence of shared training and learning opportunities, particularly in family group conferencing and restorative justice skills.

The evaluation concluded that Barnardo’s Choices programme was a very promising pilot – offering an interesting multi-agency, key worker model, good capacity building of smaller, local organisations and some very positive outcomes for young people.

Recommendations are made to local commissioners and providers that might help to build on the success of Choices, including:

• Consider working with the Government’s newly appointed Local Authority Coordinators for the Troubled Families Programme to investigate whether, and how, the Choices model could be developed to meet emerging priorities.
• Use this evaluation to open up discussion locally about how some of the Choices’
good practice can be developed and shared with new budget holders (for
example, through Community Budgets or Police and Crime Commissioners).
• Consider how cost efficient, fun, structured, whole family activities can be offered
to more families – perhaps by looking at options within the community.
• Ensure that individual programmes, such as Cycle Recycle are evaluated in their
own right, to add to the evidence base about what works and why, for this cohort.
• Local debate as to how services can be better configured or expanded to ensure
that early intervention and prevention is provided to 8-13 year olds at risk of
offending.

For more information about any of the projects and services involved in the Choices
Programme, please refer to the list of contacts provided in Appendix 1.
2. Background

2.1. The aims of the national Choices Programme

Choices was a £4 million national Home Office programme aimed at the voluntary and community sector to support their involvement in preventing and reducing substance misuse and related offending by vulnerable young people aged 10-19 years.

Funding was provided to 11 national voluntary organisations who aimed to work with around 190 additional local voluntary and community organisations - engaging with over 10,000 young people - between October 2011 and March 2012. Programmes were expected to target vulnerable groups of young people, including young people who: exhibited early behavioural problems, were disengaged from school, involved in early substance misuse; had family members or peers involved in problem behaviour; or were experiencing challenges in their home lives.

The 11 funded voluntary sector organisations were asked to build upon proven approaches but with an emphasis on developing more innovative and new ways of working to deliver more effective solutions for local communities. An additional aim of the programme was to add value to existing local services and avoid duplication of activities locally. The funding was provided to cover the period from 1st October 2011 to 31st March 2012.

The Home Office's intention was to use the learning from the Choices Programme to add to the evidence available to local commissioners, including Police and Crime Commissioners, to demonstrate the benefits of locally developed, innovative approaches to reducing and preventing substance misuse and related offending by young people.

2.2. The needs and priorities in Bradford and Keighley

The Keighley area of Bradford was identified as the target location for the Barnardo’s run Choices programme. Barnardo’s already had a strong presence in the Bradford area: delivering a Junior Youth Inclusion Programme (group work with eight to 13 year olds to address early offending behaviour) in Keighley; Education and Training provision for vulnerable young people; Turnaround - a project to increase self-esteem, resilience and
knowledge around reducing the risks of sexual exploitation; parenting support work at a Parent Partnership Service; and a Young Carers service on behalf of Bradford Council.

Keighley is a town and civil parish located in the North West of the Metropolitan Borough of Bradford in West Yorkshire. In the 2001 census, the town was found to have a population of 51,429 of which 79% reported themselves to be White British and 18% reported being of Asian or British Asian origin.

Keighley contains three distinct ward boundaries; East, West and Central Keighley. All three rank amongst the 20% of most deprived wards in the country\(^2\) and the outlying social housing estates in particular have high concentrations of child poverty\(^3\).

**Poverty and deprivation**

Keighley Central is characterised by large Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities\(^1\). Almost 20% of children are living in families with an income less than 60% of the national average (compared to 6% of children in England as a whole) and a quarter of children are living in families receiving income support or jobseeker’s allowance\(^4\).

In the East and West wards, communities are largely made up of White British families. The West ward in particular is characterised by low income families and almost a quarter of children are living in families receiving income support or jobseeker’s allowance\(^5\).

Research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2010 examined the lives of communities on Bradford’s traditionally ‘White estates’, including two estates on Keighley’s western outskirts. They summarised that there remains a sense of community but that fear and insecurity are serious problems for residents and that people feel they are seen as the ‘lowest of the low’\(^6\). The researchers also found that social lives are suffering because fear has led to ‘no go’ areas within estates. ‘Taboo’ subjects of domestic violence and sexual abuse, though not publicly acknowledged, have created serious trauma and mental health issues for some communities.

---

\(^1\) The 2001 census showed the population of Keighley Central to include 32% Pakistani origin (compared to 15% in Bradford as a whole) and 5% Bangladeshi origin (compared to 1% in Bradford). Data from West Yorkshire Observatory Custom Statistics [http://www.westyorkshireobservatory.org/](http://www.westyorkshireobservatory.org/)
Not in education, training or employment (NEET)

The latest available figures (for the month of February 2012) show that the proportion of young people (16-18 years) in Bradford who are not in education, training or employment (NEET) is at its lowest ever level (6.1%). Average data for the last three months (November 2011 to January 2012) reveals that Bradford NEET rates (6.4%) are below the England average (6.7%)\(^7\). However, there is still room for improvement; Bradford District’s Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP) 2011-2014 reported that unauthorised absences from primary and secondary schools are twice the national average and that NEET rates vary in line with the levels of deprivation throughout the district\(^8\).

Unadjusted NEET rates are available for Keighley itself (this data excludes young people whose destinations are unknown). These show that the East and Central wards have far higher NEET rates than the Bradford average (6.2% and 8.2% respectively, compared to the Bradford average of 5.8%)\(^9\).

Substance misuse

The vast majority (90%) of young people who access specialist drug and alcohol services in the Bradford District have problems with alcohol and/or cannabis\(^10\). The latest available data shows that under 18 year old hospital admissions for alcohol specific conditions in Bradford are significantly below the regional and national rates, but that Bradford hospital admissions have increased in the 2007/08 to 2009/10 period, whilst those at national and regional levels have gone down\(^11\). Bradford District’s CYPP 2011-2014 identified ‘concerning’ proportions of school age children drinking alcohol or taking drugs, and states that early intervention and prevention of drugs and alcohol misuse are key priorities. On the whole, Barnardo’s practitioners report that it is a challenge to know the true numbers of young people at risk of substance misuse as the ‘normalisation’ of under age drinking and the hidden nature of drug use ensures that much of it goes unreported.

In Bradford, Barnardo’s Young Carers project used Children’s Fund money to employ ‘Hidden Harm’ practitioners to support and protect young people impacted by parental substance misuse. In 2010-11 there were 72 referrals of children and young people whose parents were problematically misusing substances and the service reports that these numbers continue to rise\(^12\).
Youth offending

A mixed picture emerges in Bradford when considering offending by young people. A 2010 inspection of the youth offending service (YOT) noted that the number of first time entrants (FTEs) to the youth justice system has continued a downward trend over the last few years and is below the national and regional averages\(^\text{13}\). However, Bradford’s Youth Offending Plan notes that despite falling levels of NEET in the District, the numbers of young people known to the YOT who are NEET have increased in the last year (from 31% to 33%) and there is a concern that the YOT population is likely to be the most resistant to increasing learning opportunities\(^\text{14}\). Bradford’s CYPP also states that children and young people living in the most deprived wards of Bradford are those more likely to enter the youth justice system.

The Youth Service in Keighley recently undertook work with peer group leaders closely involved in gang culture and those on the fringes of involvement. Through the work they identified a need for sustained interventions with young people in relation to gang involvement, focusing on the conflict between the differing wards within Keighley. Incidents between inter-ethnic young people in particular were said to have increased\(^\text{15}\).

There have also been increased anecdotal reports of child sexual exploitation (CSE) in and around Keighley, including some high profile cases linked to gangs. The prevalence of CSE remains unquantifiable but is known to be widespread (a UK-wide survey by the National Working Group for Sexually Exploited Children and Young People found that there were over 3,000 young people accessing support services in the UK) and many young people still remain ‘hidden’. Barnardo’s research has shown that those involved come from all ethnic backgrounds and range from loose networks of abusers to more organised groups to criminal gangs. Barnardo’s services nationwide also report that peer based CSE is becoming more common\(^\text{16}\).

2.3. Community Budget and partnership working

Bradford was selected in October 2010 as one of 16 First Phase Community Budget pilot areas. The subsequent prototype for this piece of work was developed by Bradford District Partnership (the district’s local strategic partnership) and received Ministerial sign-off at the end of March 2011.
Bradford’s Community Budget (now known as Families First) builds on existing good practice, such as the Bradford Family Intervention Project (FIP), which uses partnership working to engage individuals and families to develop and own solutions that will work for them. The objectives include: addressing alcohol, drug and mental health problems and reducing levels of crime and reoffending. Work is taking place on developing and testing the Families First prototype until March 2013, when there is an expectation that Families First will be rolled out across the Bradford District.

A large-scale consultation (with children and young people, professionals who deliver services and elected members of the Bradford Council) highlighted the importance of the inter-relationships between the delivery partners making up the Bradford District Partnership, and specifically that, ‘complex problems can not be solved through agencies, services or partnerships working alone’\(^\text{17}\). Attendees at a Families First workshop highlighted ‘passported assessments’ and ‘case panels’ as important drivers in partnership working\(^\text{18}\).

### 2.4. The Common Assessment Process

A key tool in the development of an integrated approach to working with children, young people and families is the Common Assessment Framework (CAF). The CAF process is a key component in the Every Child Matters: Change for Children Programme and is supported by the Children Act 2004 and accompanying statutory guidance\(^\text{19}\). The aim of the CAF process is to promote early identification of ‘additional needs’ for vulnerable children and young people and the provision of appropriate multi-agency help and support; it’s use was therefore very relevant to the design and implementation of Choices in Keighley.

The CAF is not statutory nor subject to routine performance monitoring, however its use is subject to periodic inspection by Ofsted. Bradford Children’s Trust Board acknowledges that CAF is an ‘invest to save’ opportunity, without which children’s needs may go unmet\(^\text{20}\). In CAF practice guidance the Bradford District Partnership are clear that agencies working with children, young people and their families in Bradford should make ‘every effort’ to use the CAF process\(^\text{21}\).

Despite this commitment, Bradford continues to have relatively low levels of reported CAF use. At its high point in the latter half of 2010 (5 years after it was first implemented), CAF activity (4.7 assessments per 1000 head of population) was still
below the average across 9 of the 10 statistically comparable local authorities\textsuperscript{22}. Since then the trend has been downward, despite the introduction of CAF enabler posts (now deleted due to budget cuts).

2.5. Local practice

There are a range of projects operating in Keighley targeting vulnerable young people and their families. There exists a mix of vital statutory services (including Bradford Youth Service, Keighley Connexions, Keighley Extended Schools and Bradford and District Youth Offending Team) and projects run by the community and voluntary sector. Partnership working is anecdotally described as very good\textsuperscript{23}. Many of the very successful, established services for young people at risk of offending or substance misuse are run by small or medium sized voluntary organisations that are well embedded within the Keighley community and surrounds. They include: Barnardo’s (local authority funded) Junior Youth Inclusion Project (JYIP) for 8-13 year olds which offers constructive social activities and education to tackle the causes and consequences of offending\textsuperscript{ii}; Project 6 - an award winning voluntary sector drug and alcohol charity based in the centre of Keighley which helps individuals reduce the risks associated with substance misuse; Domestic Violence Services (Keighley) - a registered charity providing long term support services for women and children who have or are currently suffering from domestic abuse; and Hand in Hand - a Children’s Society project in Keighley, which provides a safe and accessible service for children and young people who are involved in or vulnerable to sexual exploitation.

2.6. National policy

Between 2000 and 2012 the number of young people entering the youth justice system, and the rate of reoffending have both been falling, but the numbers still remain high (latest figures show that the number of first time entrants to the youth justice system stood at 48,606 in 2010). Longitudinal research suggests that by the time they are 28 young people with continuing high levels of antisocial behaviour have cost society up to ten times more than those with no problems\textsuperscript{24}. Central Government and local authorities spent £800 million in 2009-10 dealing with youth crime, but on average, just 10% is spent on trying to prevent young people becoming offenders\textsuperscript{25}.

\textsuperscript{ii} The funding for this project ended in March 2012 but some of the money has since been diverted into a mentoring project for 8-13 year olds in Keighley Schools (provided by YMCA, JAMES and Barnardo's)
There is a considerable body of research on the ‘risk factors’ associated with antisocial behaviour and offending by young people (emotional and mental health problems; poverty; a lack of extra-curricular activities; having a parent who is an offender; peers who engage in risky behaviours; poor relations with parents and/or not spending much time with parents\textsuperscript{26}; educational difficulties and exclusion\textsuperscript{27}) which contributes to policy and practice, but increasingly relevant in policy making is the emerging evidence of characteristics that can counteract risk factors, including: enhanced self-esteem; greater enjoyment of school activities; reduced levels of family adversity; self efficacy; hopefulness; and self worth\textsuperscript{28}.

Antisocial behaviour and offending is also frequently linked to problematic drug and alcohol use\textsuperscript{29}. Nationally, the proportion of young people who drank alcohol has fallen from a peak of 26\% in 2001 to 13\% in 2010; and those admitting to using drugs also dropped from 29\% in 2001 to 13\% in 2010\textsuperscript{30}. However, amongst vulnerable groups the picture is less positive; almost half of young people excluded from school are regular drinkers\textsuperscript{31}. There are also links with parental substance misuse; Turning Point estimate that up to 1.3 million children are living with parents who are dependent on alcohol\textsuperscript{32} and the results of a major survey of early teen drinking published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation revealed that children who watch parents drink are more than twice as likely to binge on alcohol\textsuperscript{33}. There is a recognition in government policy that young people using alcohol or drugs are likely to be vulnerable and experiencing a range of additional problems\textsuperscript{34} which means that the commissioning and delivery of specialist drug and alcohol interventions for young people tends to take place within wider children and young people’s planning rather than in a drug and alcohol specific silo.

Early intervention is now recognised as being vital in tackling individual and family factors associated with offending and substance misuse. A well documented review of early intervention commissioned by the Government and undertaken by Graham Allen MP confirmed that, “intervening later is more costly, and often cannot achieve the results that early intervention is able to deliver”\textsuperscript{35}. However, there is very little expenditure on early intervention; national estimates have put prevention spending at four percent of total health spending, and within this, primary prevention accounted for just 1.4 per cent of total health spending\textsuperscript{36}. Cuts to local authority budgets have put increased pressure on provision of early intervention. The Department for Education’s Early Intervention Grant (EIG) intended to enable local authorities to invest in programmes for families who are at risk, however the amount to be allocated through EIG is 11 per cent lower than
the aggregated 2010/11 funding through the predecessor grants and is not ring-fenced to early intervention services, or to services for families.

The need to involve family members in reducing risk for young people has long been advocated for by policy makers and practitioners alike, and there have been some positive developments in the policy and commissioning of whole family support (particularly if the family falls into the Government’s ‘troubled families’ bracket). In 2011 the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) announced £200m of European Social Fund money over the next three years to help families with multiple problems to overcome barriers to employment; The BIG Lottery Improving Futures Fund (£20 million) is supporting voluntary sector projects working with families with multiple problems; and Community Budget localities are developing local arrangements to pool funding to support families with multiple needs. The Troubled Families Unit, within the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), launched the ‘Troubled Families Programme’ in April 2012, which aims to estimate numbers of families with multiple needs locally and implement a payment by results programme to incentivize local authorities and other partners to reduce these numbers by 2015.
3. The Keighley Choices model

3.1. Designing the model

Barnardo’s has invested heavily in support services for children and families in Bradford for many years and has had a presence in Keighley since 1999 and has delivered crime prevention work in Keighley since 2010 through its Junior Youth Inclusion Project (JYIP). The organisation is a vocal proponent of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) in Bradford and a stakeholder of Families First (the Community Budget pilot).

The Choices funding represented an ideal opportunity to integrate:

- Barnardo’s work and expertise in the area;
- The vital work being carried out by existing statutory and voluntary organisations operating in Keighley;
- The emerging ideas developed through Families First; and
- Bradford District Partnership (BDP) ambitions to embed the CAF across the district.

A number of factors were integral to how Barnardo’s designed the Choices model:

- A desire to fill a gap in local service provision for those ‘at risk’ of offending and/or substance misuse.
- A recognition of the value of early intervention and prevention work.
- An understanding of the evidence-base: risk factors and the characteristics that counteract risk.
- A recognition of the importance of a whole family approach.
- A desire to build on some good partnership working in Bradford by introducing a ‘case panel’.
- A commitment to the CAF process.

3.2. The target group

It was envisaged that the project would target young people at Level 2 (yellow) and Level 3 (orange) of the CAF continuum of needs (see overleaf). Specifically, the target group were young people ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention (either unknown to
services or known, but failing to engage), with complex whole family needs, but below the threshold for the local family intervention project (FIP).

3.3. Aims and Objectives of Choices in Keighley

Aim 1: to reduce the occurrence or reoccurrence of substance misuse and/or offending of young people ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention, in Keighley.

Objectives:
- To **identify** and **engage** at least 10 young people and their families where there is risk of or involvement in substance misuse and/or offending.
- To **divert** these young people away from substance misuse and/or offending through a tailored package of positive activities.

Aim 2: To increase the capacity of local organisations to identify and respond appropriately to children and young people at risk of substance misuse and/or offending.

Objectives:
- To promote and **increase the use of the Common Assessment Framework** (CAF) or other shared assessments with vulnerable young people in Keighley.
• To **increase partnership working** and cross-fertilisation of ideas and learning in Keighley.

Home Office funding was provided from 1\textsuperscript{st} October 2011 to 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2012 and work commenced immediately. Service level agreements were drawn up and agreed with partner agencies in early October and a Strategic Steering Group (SSG) and Multi-Agency Panel (MAP) were also set up. First meetings for both groups took place on 31\textsuperscript{st} October. Referrals were taken for young people until 28\textsuperscript{th} February 2012 and interventions were in place between 1\textsuperscript{st} December 2011 and 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2012. All young people had final exit interviews at the end of March 2012.

Barnardo’s approached 17 existing organisations and services from the voluntary, community and statutory sector across the Keighley local area partnership in order to build the Choices package of support. Service level agreements were eventually signed with eight organisations and services (detailed in the table overleaf).

In addition to the core offer, young people and families were referred to other relevant services in the community where appropriate, for example, several young people attended Keighley Young Fire-fighters Course (run by the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service), Barnardo’s Junior Youth Inclusion Project (JYIP) and A Tuesday Boys Group (a partnership between JYIP and Keighley Youth Service). A Participation worker was also employed to work with a group of young people during the Brathay Residential. The aim was to provide training in conflict resolution so that young people could act as young ambassadors in the Keighley area.
The Choices Package of support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details of service or organisation</th>
<th>Choices Offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnardo’s Yorkshire</td>
<td>Barnardo’s Yorkshire operates several hundred contracts, mainly with public bodies, providing services to more than 21,000 children and young people.</td>
<td>Barnardo’s key workers were funded by Choices and were responsible for assessing an individual and their family members (if relevant) and then devising and co-ordinating a plan. Key workers also provided one-to-one support work, focusing particularly on self esteem, anger management and resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford and District Youth Offending Team</td>
<td>Bradford and District Youth Offending Team (YOT), covers Bradford, Keighley and Shipley. The YOT is made up of representatives from agencies including the Police, Probation Service, Children’s Social Care, Health and Education.</td>
<td>Restorative Justice - A joint project delivered by the YOT and Barnardo’s key workers. The process gives victims the chance to tell offenders the real impact of their crime, to get answers to their questions, and an apology. The offender is held to account for what they have done and the process helps them understand the real impact, to take responsibility and to make amends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project 6                                 | Project 6 is an award winning voluntary sector drug and alcohol charity based in Keighley. It is a harm reduction service working to help people reduce the risks associated with substance misuse. Support is offered to users of drugs and alcohol and their relatives and carers.                                         | One to one work - Project workers worked with young people who had parents who were misusing substances or were themselves using drugs or alcohol. Project workers worked with young people to identify the goals that they wanted to work towards. Motivational interviewing techniques were then used to meet outcomes including:  
  · Improving school attendance  
  · Improving behaviour in school  
  · Coping with parental substance misuse  
  · Understanding risks of substance misuse  
  Parenting programme (specific for substance misusing families) - provision of training and support for families                                                                                         |
| **Brathay** | Brathay operates nation-wide and has a regional office in Bradford. The charity aims to inspire children and young people to engage positively in their communities. Young people experience residential programmes to help them reengage with education, have a voice in the community, become peer mentors or young leaders. | **A two day residential for families** - designed specifically for Choices families who were identified as having one or more of: a lack of quality family time’ living in vulnerable communities and home environments, breakdown in communication and listening skills, and a lack in belief in self and others. Aims of the weekend included: raising self-esteem and confidence, developing communication, listening and social skills, supporting positive ways to resolve conflict, developing understanding of roles within the family unit, and encouraging families to work together as a team. |
| **Dance United Yorkshire (DUY)** | A community interest company which aims to see young people, who suffer economic, social and educational disadvantage, transform their lives and realise their full potential through experiencing outstanding contemporary dance training and performance projects. | **A 4-week intensive contemporary dance and performance project**; 22 young people aged between 13 and 16 were referred from schools within the Keighley area, specifically those who had been identified as vulnerable or ‘at risk’ of/directly affected by: Offending, Drug/Substance misuse, Child Sex Exploitation (CSE), Disengagement/Exclusion from mainstream education.

The project took place at the Keighley Young People’s Centre and the young people attended Monday to Friday from 10am – 4pm. The project resulted in a performance event at the Alhambra Studio Theatre on 22nd March 2012 in Bradford and the completion of a Bronze Arts Award. Aims for the young people were to:
- gain higher levels of self-esteem, confidence and self-respect
- improve communication and team-work skills
- understand the importance of commitment, attendance and punctuality
- build respectful and trusting relationships with both peers and staff
- improve concentration and focus
- improve levels of resilience and perseverance
- work within a structured and disciplined framework
- understand the consequences of their actions and behaviours
- take more responsibility when making decisions in their lives
- become more motivated to learn, gain skills and develop ambitions
- recognise their potential and strive towards more positive futures |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnardo’s Voices</th>
<th>Based in Barnsley, but providing Family Group Conferencing (FGC) services across Yorkshire.</th>
<th><strong>Specially commissioned Family Group Conferences (FCG)</strong> for Choices families who are struggling with: a lack of quality family time, breakdown in communication and listening skills, and a lack in belief in self and others. FGC is a family-led decision making and planning process where family members meet with professionals to make plans and decisions for children and young people. Aims and objectives for each family were different but centred on improving family relationships and cohesion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connexions</td>
<td>Connexions provides free impartial and confidential advice, guidance, support and personal development services to all 13-19 year olds.</td>
<td><strong>A Connexions Personal Advisor (PA)</strong> was seconded to Choices to help identify and recruit NEET young people to the programme and to provide <strong>one to one support</strong> to young people on the programme - offering advice and guidance to resolve issues and barriers, to make informed choices and to seek further support from other services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Recycle</td>
<td>A social enterprise project which recycles bikes donated by the West Yorkshire Police.</td>
<td><strong>Work with Choices young people (aged 13-19) to design and set up a workshop in Bradford’s Alternative Technology Centre.</strong> Qualified bike mechanics helped young people to repair and recycle old bikes in a workshop-based environment for which, on completion, they then had responsibility. Young people were then given the opportunity to market, sell and make a profit in order to support a sustainable model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bradford Youth Service | The Youth Service provides services for all 13–19 year olds across the District, including vulnerable young people who need additional support. | **Rapid Response** – A 12 week partnership programme with Barnardo’s which aimed to:  
  • Engage with a minimum of 15 young people at risk (of alcohol, drugs, sexual exploitation, antisocial behaviour, offending) per evening and provide advice and signposting to positive activities, advice and support.  
  • Identify ‘hot spot areas’ in Keighley and increase intelligence of issues faced by the young people in these areas.  
Practitioners travelled in a mobile unit and responded to soft intelligence about target ‘hot spots’ within the Keighley area, where young people were involved in risky behaviours at night. |
3.4. The Strategic Steering Group (SSG)

A Strategic Steering Group was established to oversee the development of the programme and project progress and resolve any procedural issues. Full terms of reference are provided in Appendix 2. Core objectives of the group included: oversight of project activity; establishing and maintaining effective communication across the partnership; validating the chosen outcomes based measures; oversight and review of actions against any safeguarding incidents; and reporting back relevant issues from other networks and groups.

Membership consisted of senior representatives from: Barnardo’s; Department of Services to Children and Young People; Bradford and District YOT; West Yorkshire Police; Choices delivery partners; Bradford District Extended Schools; Keighley Safer Schools Partnership; and Children’s Social Care.

3.5. The Multi-Agency Panel (MAP)

A Multi-Agency Panel was established: to identify and approve referrals of young people to Choices; discuss ongoing progress of individual cases; oversee any safeguarding issues and report back relevant information to other internal networks and groups. Full terms of reference are provided in Appendix 3. The group met weekly during the initial referral period and then every four weeks thereafter. The panel consisted of case workers or supervisors from Choices delivery partners and referring agencies (Keighley Neighbourhood Policing Team and Bradford Extended Schools Partnership).

3.6. Staffing

The Choices Programme Manager was the budget holder and had responsibility for overseeing delivery of the programme and line managing the key workers. The Programme Manager has over 25 years experience working with vulnerable young people and managing projects across the North of England and the Midlands, including services addressing young people missing, child sexual exploitation, domestic violence, youth offending and NEET. The two key workers were youth practitioners, experienced
in multi-disciplinary team working and in initiating and leading Common Assessment Framework processes.\textsuperscript{3}

\subsection*{3.7. Referrals}

Referring agencies included all Choices delivery partners, plus Keighley Neighbourhood Policing Team and Bradford Extended Schools Partnership. Referral criteria were defined as, ‘young people aged 10-19 at risk of substance misuse and/or offending and who are not currently receiving a service or who are in need of additional support’.

\subsection*{3.8. Choices in Practice}

Choices operated a key worker model, whereby a named Barnardos’s individual was responsible for assessing a young person or family and then devising and co-ordinating their plan (see diagram overleaf).

Referrals to Choices were usually made through the MAP (particularly where they came through statutory agencies - West Yorkshire Police, the YOT or Bradford Extended Schools Partnership) and in a minority of cases, directly to the key worker.

The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) was embedded in the Choices model. Referring agencies were asked to complete a Pre-CAF as the referral document to help achieve a specialist assessment. From this first assessment, a decision could then be made about whether to action a holistic assessment (for example, “a CAF”).

All young people assessed for the Choices programme were offered a CAF if there was not already one in place. Where young people already had CAFs, care was taken to ensure that information from Choices was fed into this process where relevant.

The model is presented in diagrammatic form overleaf. A few key points should be noted:

- Barnardos’s services for 8-13 year olds were not initially outlined in the core offer but were included at a later date when it was clear that a large proportion of referrals were from this age group. These services consisted of Barnardo’s Junior

\textsuperscript{3} Information provided by the Choices Programme Manager
Youth Inclusion Project (JYIP), Tuesday Boys Group (a partnership between Barnardo’s and The Youth Service) and a Young Fire-fighters Course run by the West Yorkshire Fire Service and Barnardo’s JYIP. (These services are therefore represented in grey on the diagram).

- Dance United Yorkshire approached schools to identify young people who were not in education, training or employment so that they could be offered the opportunity. On the diagram, the DUY referral pathway is shown differently for this reason.

- Though not a member of the MAP, Turnaround (a Barnardo’s service supporting young people at risk of child sexual exploitation) did refer some young people onto the Choices programme. More detail about this partnership is provided in section 8. (Turnaround is therefore shown on the diagram).

- An aim of Choices was to train some young people in conflict resolution so that they could become ‘young ambassadors’ for Keighley. This participation work took place at Brathay (the same weekend as the family residential) and is therefore included on the diagram. However, within the timescales of the project, the young people did not get the opportunity to practice as young ambassadors.
Keighley Choices Model

Bradford YOT → Pre-CAF → MAP → Barnardo's Lead Worker → Engage young person/family → CAF

Bradford Extended Schools
Bradford Youth Service
Connexions
Police
Barnardo's Turnaround Project

Pre-CAF

A tailor-made support package (developed and overseen by the Barnardo's Lead Worker)

MAP

Barnardo's Lead Worker

CAF

Project 0
Rapid Response
Brathay Family Residential
Barnardo's FGC
Connexions Support
Cyoło Recycle

Young Ambassadors
Restorative Justice
Barnardo's Services for 8-13 year olds*
Dance United
Lead Worker 1-1 support

Participation
Tackling offending behaviour
Positive activities

* Not initially included in the model but Choices did start to link with Barnardo's wider services for 8-13 year olds (Junior Inclusion Project, Young Firefighters – run by West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and Tuesday Boys' Club).
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4. The evaluation

The evaluation was conducted between October 2011 and March 2012 and combined an outcomes evaluation and a process evaluation. In line with the aims of the programme, the key lines of enquiry were:

1. Did Keighley Choices reduce the occurrence or reoccurrence of substance misuse and/or offending of young people ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention, in Keighley (outcomes evaluation)?

2. Did Keighley Choices increase the capacity of local organisations to identify and respond appropriately to children and young people at risk of substance misuse and/or offending (process evaluation)?

An evaluation framework was developed presenting the aims, measureable outcomes, activities, outcome indicators and milestones (see Appendix 4). These related directly to the aims and objectives of the Keighley Choices programme.

4.1. Parameters of the research

Choices was a large scale programme involving eight voluntary and statutory delivery partners offering a wide range of interventions, it was therefore important to set parameters around the evaluation.

The eight delivery partners were chosen because they had good reputations locally for evidence-based practice, evidence of having achieved positive outcomes for young people and, in the case of Brathay and Dance United, having been externally evaluated and shown to be effective.

It was therefore agreed that the process evaluation should be focused on examining Choices as the facilitator (tailor-made packages of support, multi-agency working and use of CAF) rather than the individual interventions. Likewise, the outcomes evaluation monitored the impact of the whole Choices package on young people (rather than the impact of each individual intervention).
The aim of the Home Office Choices Programme was to prevent and reduce substance misuse and related offending by vulnerable young people aged 10-19 years. This evaluation therefore focused only on the outcomes of the young people involved, even though the activities to develop these positive outcomes often involved the whole family.

4.2. The outcomes evaluation

Purpose
The outcomes evaluation aimed to address the following key line of enquiry:

Did Keighley Choices reduce the risk of occurrence or reoccurrence of substance misuse and/or offending of young people ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention, in Keighley?

It was agreed that this should be broken down into two key research questions:

- Did young people show a shift towards safer thinking and behaviour (factors known to correlate with offending and substance misuse) with regards to: using alcohol and drugs, emotional wellbeing, risk taking, education and training, getting in trouble and family relationships?
- Did young people show a shift towards developing characteristics known to counteract risk of offending and substance misuse: enhanced self-esteem, improved family relationships and engagement with education or training?

These two research questions were an important way of measuring the ‘distance travelled’ by the young people on the Choices Programme. The target group were those ‘at risk’ of offending/substance misuse and ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention, therefore some were not engaging in these behaviours at all. It was therefore crucial to assign measurable outcomes that would indicate that risk - as well as any actual harmful behaviour - had been averted. As discussed in previous sections, there is a significant body of evidence identifying the factors linked to increased substance misuse and offending, and some emerging evidence of characteristics that counteract it. The SSG agreed that it was essential to monitor shifts in the young people’s thinking and behaviour on these risk (and counter risk) factors as well as on offending and substance
misuse itself. It was assumed that positive shifts in thinking and behaviour on factors such as ‘engagement with education’, ‘self efficacy’ and ‘emotional wellbeing’ would indicate that the risk of occurrence or reoccurrence of substance misuse and/or offending had been reduced.

**Method**

The outcomes evaluation used a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods (outlined below). The Evaluator ran an initial training workshop for key workers and those from partner organisations. This allowed staff to be consulted on the evaluation framework and the proposed tools and led to some adaptations to the method. Key workers were then trained in using the tools.

Informed consent was obtained from all young people and family members involved in Choices. This included consent for anonymous outcomes data and case stories to be used in this evaluation report. All research data and confidential information was saved on Barnardo’s secure server, which was password protected.

It should be noted that although the timescales of the Choices project did not allow for collection of longitudinal outcomes data, the semi-structured interviews with stakeholders (as part of the process evaluation) did ask interviewees to comment on the legacy of the programme.

*The Teen Star™ Third Edition*  

The Teen Star was one tool used to measure outcomes for the young people. The Outcomes Star is a suite of tools for supporting and measuring change when working with vulnerable people. It is widely used and endorsed (versions have been funded by the Department of Health, the Big Lottery, Camden Council, NESTA, and over 30 other organizations including several NHS Trusts). There are 14 versions of the Outcomes Star, adapted for different client groups.

Every Outcomes Star is based on an explicit model of the process by which people make changes in areas of their life that are not working for them. The Star measures the relationship the client has with any difficulties they are experiencing by identifying where they are on their journey with each of those issues.
This evaluation used the Teen Star, which was initially developed for young people involved in substance misuse, but has since been used with young people experiencing a wide range of issues. The Star asks young people about:

- Drugs and alcohol
- Health and wellbeing
- Safety and security
- Structure and education
- Behaviour and citizenship
- Family and other key adults

This tool was chosen as it allowed capture of the personal ‘journey’ of each young person in relation to six indicators that have been linked to offending and substance misuse. The accompanying ‘journey of change’ underpinning the Teen Star meant that we were monitoring the changing thinking and behaviour of the young people; from feeling ‘unsafe’ to ‘wanting change’, ‘making change’, ‘doing alright’ to ‘feeling safe and well’.

The Choices Programme Manager also welcomed the use of the Teen Star because the issues covered link well to the different issues covered by the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) process.

Teen Stars were completed at the initial assessment (or as soon as the young person was willing) and at the exit meeting. Where possible, Teen Stars were completed by key workers in discussion with the young person. Key workers reported that the young people were most likely to give accurate responses when a client-practitioner relationship had started to develop. In a minority of cases, young people were reluctant in these early stages to divulge any difficulties. In these cases, Stars were done retrospectively.

To assist young people in deciding where to place themselves on the points of the Star, key workers used the Teen Star Quiz (also supplied by Triangle Consulting).
**Substance Misuse and Offending Questionnaire**

A *Substance Misuse and Offending Quiz* was developed to provide a more detailed overview of a young person’s actual substance use and offending behaviour. It was adapted from a more detailed version that was developed by Project 6 (a dedicated drugs and alcohol support service) and was intended to be used at assessment and exit. However, in practice, very few young people were using substances (or prepared to discuss their substance use) so the questionnaire was not used.

**Case studies**

To capture more detail – particularly with regard to ‘softer outcomes’ and characteristics known to counteract risk of offending and substance misuse - structured case studies were produced for every young person who completed the Choices programme. A standard template was used which outlined:

- **Details** about the young person (or family, where they were involved).
- The **young person’s needs**, problems or issues (headings were used to ensure that the case study covered risk factors associated with offending and substance misuse and characteristics known to counteract risk).
- **Details of the Choices package of interventions offered.**
- **Outcomes achieved** (headings used to ensure that the case study covered risk factors associated with offending and substance misuse and characteristics known to counteract risk).
- **Views of the young person** about their own progress.
- **Views of a project worker** about the young person’s progress.
- **Key learning.**

**Consultation with five families at the Brathay Residential**

A participation worker was employed to do some qualitative consultation work with the five families who took part in the family residential run by the Brathay Trust. Families took part in a session of creative poster making which produced visual representations of families’ experiences of the Choices Programme. Each family worked around their own table with a large piece of paper, some creative materials and a list of headings and questions to consider. Families were encouraged to ensure that each family member was involved.
4.3. The process evaluation

Purpose
The process evaluation aimed to address the following key line of enquiry:

*Did Keighley Choices increase the capacity of local organisations to identify and respond appropriately to children and young people at risk of substance misuse and/or offending?*

It was agreed that this could be broken down into three key research questions, which were the focus of the process evaluation:

- Did the model (set-up and delivery) enable identification, engagement and provision of appropriate support to the relevant young people?
- Did the model increase the use of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) or other shared assessments with vulnerable young people in Keighley?
- Did the model increase partnership working and cross-fertilisation of ideas and learning in Keighley?

Method
The process evaluation used two methods outlined below. Data was analysed by the evaluator using standard qualitative analysis techniques.

*Semi-structured Interviews*
Thirty minute telephone or face to face interviews were carried out with 11 stakeholders. The interview schedule focused on the research questions outlined above. It covered: thoughts on the Choices Programme in general (set-up and delivery); thoughts on specific groups worked with; thoughts on the success of the Choices Programme; improvements that could have been made; and some additional questions for MAP members and Key workers. The interviews were semi structured to allow the evaluator to

---

4 The Barnardo’s Programme Manager; Barnardo’s MAP Chair; two Barnardo’s Key workers; Senior Strategic Commissioning Manager at Bradford Council; Crime Prevention Team Leader at Bradford YOT; Senior Youth Worker at Targeted Youth Support Services; The Parental Information Coordinator, Extended Schools; a YOT worker; a PCSO from Bradford District Safer Schools Partnership; and the Programme Manager at Dance United.
follow any lines of enquiry that seemed relevant to evaluating the ‘process’ of the Choices Programme.

Observation
The evaluator spent time at the Choices office base, at three MAP meetings and at one SSG meeting. This enabled the collection of additional (observed) information that could have been missed through formal structured interviews. For example, key workers’ reported use of creative methods to engage families, reported set-up of joint visits between key workers and individuals from statutory agencies and some comments about the challenge of engaging with families following ‘cold’ referrals.
5. Who did Choices work with?

5.1. Referrals and engagement data

Analysis of the standard monitoring data revealed the following:

- **41 young people were referred** to the programme through the multi-agency panel (MAP).

- **Choices engaged successfully with 25** of the 41 referrals (60%). The reasons for non-engagement were systematically recorded with key workers reporting that some failed to answer when phone calls or home visits were made and a minority had gained employment or an education placement and felt that they didn’t need additional support.

- **21 young people completed the programme** (of those who did not; two were referred onto other provision and two failed to answer phone calls or attend sessions).

- 17 young men and four young women completed the programme. Ages ranged from nine to 19\(^5\).

- The **average age of young people referred to Choices was 13** (although 12 was the most common age) and the **average age of those who engaged was also 13**.

- All young people involved in the programme were White British.

- **Seven families were engaged** in the programme (participating in Project 6 support, Family Group Conferencing and the Brathay Family Residential).

In addition to the young people described above, 22 young people aged 14-19 were recruited through Keighley Schools by Dance United Yorkshire (DUY) staff to take part in contemporary dance training. They were identified as being ‘at risk of substance misuse or offending’. Seventeen ultimately completed the DUY four week programme.

---

\(^5\) The programme targeted young people aged 10-19 but one 9-year old was referred through the MAP. The referring agency stated that there was no other support available in the area. This young man attended Barnardo’s 8-13 year old services and his family (17 year old sibling and mother) attended the Brathay Family Residential.
Table 1: Summary of referrals made to Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of referral</th>
<th>Number of referrals made</th>
<th>Number of those young people who completed the programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Schools Services</td>
<td>10 (26%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnardo’s Turnaround</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connexions</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnardo’s Services for 8-13 yr olds</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 shows, the number of young people who completed the programme (21) was over and above the target (10). A large proportion of referrals (11) came through Extended Schools Services. A high number of initial referrals (7) were also received from Keighley Neighbourhood Policing Team, but only three of these young people were successfully engaged.

Barnardo’s key workers made efforts to engage with every young person who was referred to the programme and achieved an engagement rate of 60%. Bearing in the mind the challenges of engagement (outlined in section 8) and the high levels of need (outlined below), this seems extremely positive.

5.2. Targeting vulnerable young people

The Choices Grant Agreement stated that Choices aimed to work with “vulnerable groups of young people who are most likely to be at risk of or already starting to become involved in substance misuse or related offending, including those who show early behavioural problems/disengagement from school, poor family functioning, early substance use and family members/peers involved in problem behaviours”. Analysis of the structured case studies and the Teen Star assessments provided detailed information about the young people who engaged in the Choices Programme.

The data in Table 2 was compiled following analysis of the case studies. The data suggests that Choices was engaging with the target group. It was apparent that most
young people were struggling with multiple needs (all were affected by a number of the challenges listed in the table), a majority were disruptive at school and in their communities. There were a range of family issues at play (including, parental depression, bereavement in the family and witnessing domestic violence) and parental substance misuse was common. Most of the young people had low self esteem and were frequently finding themselves in ‘risky’ situations.

Table 2: Case study analysis: risk factors (in white) and counter-risk factors (in grey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factors / Counter-risk factors</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of high substance misuse</td>
<td>All reported that there were drug users and/or groups of young people drinking or causing trouble near to their home. (“We need to get out of this estate. I’d like somewhere me and [son] can have a fresh start with new mates for both of us”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental substance misuse</td>
<td>Most young people on the programme were affected. In a majority of cases it was predominantly alcohol misuse but a minority of parents (in these cases absent fathers) had been or were using class A drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low self esteem</td>
<td>Most young people were described by their key worker as lacking confidence or self esteem. In some, this manifest in ‘bravado’ behaviour but other young people were said to be withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>A majority of the young people were experiencing challenges in controlling their anger. This had manifest in punching walls, verbally abusing neighbours or school staff and being involved in fights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending school</td>
<td>A majority were attending school, some were achieving well (one was studying for GCSEs) and others were attending sporadically but said they wanted to improve their attendance and attainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive in school</td>
<td>Although attending school, most were supervised by a Behaviour Support Unit and several were attending Pupil Referral Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>A majority of the young people were known to the Police for low level offending or anti-social behaviour (always as part of a group) including smashing windows and arson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling stressed/unhappy</td>
<td>Young people frequently described themselves to their key worker as ‘stressed’. Most seemed to be carrying significant worries including concerns about a parent with depression, feeling unsafe in their community, being bullied or living in a chaotic home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaotic family life</td>
<td>All young people had experienced disruption at home to varying degrees, from overcrowding (sharing a room with several siblings) to frequent relocation to adults moving in and out of their life. This had resulted in a lack of quality time spent with family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to change</td>
<td>Almost all young people recognised that there were problems in their lives and things that they wanted to change. Several reported that being known as the ‘bad’ young person in the community upset them and was a perception that they really wanted to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associating with older peers</td>
<td>Both young males and young females were frequently associating with older peers, which professionals suggested was contributing to some of their antisocial behaviour, offending or substance misuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis-using alcohol</td>
<td>Young people tended not to acknowledge that they were using drugs or alcohol, but ‘soft intelligence’ provided by partner agencies (Police, Extended Schools) suggested that use of alcohol (particularly in group situations) was relatively high for some.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of the 21 young people were described as coming from very loving families, where parents wanted the best for their child. This did, however, frequently manifest itself in conflict – between young people and parents or between siblings.

- **Parental depression**
  Four mothers involved in the programme reported that they suffered from anxiety, depression or post-natal depression and that this impacted upon their ability to parent positively.

- **Parenting issues**
  Most parents acknowledged that they needed some advice and support, particularly around boundary setting. Two mothers said that they had spoiled their child and were struggling to set rules.

- **Domestic Violence**
  Four young people had witnessed domestic violence in the past and many others witnessed or were involved in arguments on a very regular basis.

- **Bereavement**
  Three young people had been bereaved relatively recently (in two cases it was a father and in one case a grandparent who had passed away). Two other young people had close family members who were seriously ill.

- **Happy, likeable**
  Many of the young people were described as likeable by the professionals who knew them. A minority were also described as happy and positive.

- **Parental offending**
  Several young people had a sibling or carer (usually a father) who been convicted of an offence. One young person had a parent in prison.

The programme manager stated that although she was satisfied that Choices engaged with young people on the edge of statutory intervention as was intended, the level of disadvantage was quite significant: “We were expecting chaotic families because the aim was to work with those ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention and this was achieved. But thresholds [seem to be] high in Bradford for FIPs (Family Intervention Projects) so those on the edge of care actually have very complex needs.”

However, it is also notable that all of the young people displayed some significant strengths or counter-risk factors, including (most) engaging with school to an extent, wanting to achieve at school, a desire to improve their life and having a loving family.

“We were very shocked at the poverty in Keighley… it’s the worst I’ve seen in six years [working in Yorkshire]…usually they turn up with McDonald’s food or expensive trainers… but these young people didn’t… there’s not the money there for it.” (Dance United General Manager)
Table 3: Average assessment scores on the Teen Star (out of 6)
(Low scores indicate more difficulties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average assessment score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure &amp; Education</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour &amp; Citizenship</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; other key adults</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample = 19 young people (although 21 completed the programme, 2 did not complete an exit Teen Star and were therefore excluded from the analysis).

Table 3 shows that the young people who completed the programme initially scored themselves (on average) at 3.3 on the Teen Star. This places them halfway through the Teen Star’s ‘Journey of Change’. It suggests that these young people were at a stage where they were able to recognise challenges in their lives and were trying to make changes, but were struggling to do this.

On average the young people were most concerned about their Wellbeing (3.1), Safety and Security (2.9) and Structure & Education (2.7) rather than the (perhaps) anticipated domains of Drugs & Alcohol (4.2) or Behaviour & Citizenship (3.2).

The ‘Wellbeing’ domain focuses on physical and emotional health, and particularly stress and anger. Young people scored themselves 3.1 on average for this domain. These scores are backed up by the case study analysis which showed that most young people on the programme struggled with anger and many were worried and stressed about issues including parental substance misuse and bullying. The case studies also revealed that many of the young people were described as ‘unhappy’, ‘withdrawn’ or ‘lacking in self esteem and confidence’.

‘Safety & Security’ centres on ‘having friends who look out for you and avoiding violent situations’. An average score of 2.9 suggests that the young people were trying to stay safe but were finding it hard. This is supported by case study analysis which identified
that many of the young people were frequently associating with older peers and were known to the Police. Most acknowledged that they stayed out late and sometimes found themselves in ‘risky’ situations such as in groups that were smashing windows or causing trouble.

The ‘Structure & Education’ domain addresses how young people spend their day-time during the week. Young people on this programme scored themselves at 2.7 on average. A score of ‘2’ indicates that ‘I am in school or college but I usually don’t go or I get into trouble when I’m there, but I want things to be different’. A score of ‘3’ indicates that ‘I mostly go to school or college but it’s hard to keep going’. Case study analysis confirms that young people probably did range between these two points – with many showing sporadic attendance and disruptive behaviour in mainstream school and several attending Pupil Referrals Units.

Drugs & Alcohol was the area of least concern to the young people (average score 4.3). The wording on the Teen Star for a ‘4’ is that ‘I’m doing alright, but sometimes there are problems’. Stakeholders reported that most of the young people involved in the Choices programme were using drugs or alcohol unsafely but that they either failed to acknowledge their usage to key workers or failed to recognise that their level of use was a concern. According to ‘soft intelligence’ (from the Police and Extended Schools), young people, in most cases, were using alcohol alongside other young people and certainly in communities where alcohol and substance misuse is relatively visible (see table 2). It is therefore possible that substance misuse has become ‘normalised’ to these young people. Young people were, however, willing to report that substance misuse by their parents was of significant concern to them.

‘Behaviour & Citizenship’ focuses on antisocial behaviour and offending and was scored 3.2 on average, which suggests that it is not the most significant concern for these young people but that they recognise that it is a challenge. A ‘3’ on the scale means that ‘I’m trying to stay out of trouble but its hard – things happen’. Again, this is backed up by case study analysis which shows that many of the young people were seen as ‘trouble causers’ by the local community but did feel very compelled to try to change this perception.
‘Family & Adults’ was not one of the primary concerns for the young people (average score 3.4 – which is described on the Teen Star as ‘There are lots of rows but my home is mostly safe’) Again, this fits with findings from case study analysis which suggested that the home lives of most of the young people was chaotic but, in most cases, involved some loving relationships and strong family bonds. The biggest concern for young people was one or both carers’ substance misuse and/or depression.
6. Outcomes evaluation findings

The outcomes evaluation aimed to address the following key line of enquiry:

*Did Keighley Choices reduce the risk of occurrence or reoccurrence of substance misuse and/or offending of young people ‘on the edge’ of statutory intervention, in Keighley?*

This was broken down into two research questions:

- **Did young people show a shift towards safer thinking and behaviour** with regards (factors known to correlate with offending and substance misuse): using alcohol and drugs, emotional wellbeing, risk taking, education and training, getting in trouble and family relationships?

- **Did young people show a shift towards developing characteristics** known to counteract risk of offending and substance misuse: enhanced self-esteem, improved family relationships and engaging with education or training?

6.1. Results from the Teen Stars

Table 4: Number of young people showing change on the Teen Star overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Change</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Negative Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of young people (out of 19) who showed overall change</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Proportion of young people showing change on the Teen Star

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Change</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Negative Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure &amp; Education</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour &amp; Citizenship</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; other key adults</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample = 19 young people (although 21 completed the programme, 2 did not complete and exit Teen Star and were therefore excluded from the analysis).*
Table 4 shows that an impressive 15 out of 19 young people had achieved positive change overall by the end of the Choices Programme.

Table 5 shows the proportion of young people who made positive progress, stabilised or whose scores went downwards in each of the six star domains. On the whole these results are also very positive, with a large majority reporting positive changes in the areas of Wellbeing (63%), Structure & Education (63%) and Safety & Security (74%). The proportion of young people showing a positive change on Safety & Security – almost three quarters of the sample – is particularly impressive and reflects a real shift in a majority of young people’s attitudes to staying safe. Indeed, as the case study analysis (overleaf) explains, many of the young people did report that they were starting to recognise when they were in risky situations and were beginning to walk away from arguments, stressful situations or antisocial behaviour.

On the Behaviour & Citizenship domain, the proportion of young people showing a positive shift was less dramatic (58%). This domain focuses on changes in offending behaviour, which we know from research literature can be very entrenched and can be influenced by shifts on the other domains (engaging in education, having some structure to the day, improved self esteem etc.) It may be, therefore, that we would see shifts for more young people if the programme was running for a longer period. It is also worth noting that over a quarter of young people (26%) on this domain reported a negative change. Case study analysis suggests that this may reflect growing trust and willingness to acknowledge concerns rather than actual negative shifts in behaviour. Key workers reported that some young people tended to understate their offending at the initial assessment stage but were more likely to divulge their actual behaviour as the relationship between young person and key worker developed.

It is striking that 42% of young people reported no change on the Drugs & Alcohol domain. This could reflect a delay that occurred in implementing the Project 6 (preventing substance misuse) intervention; a staff member became ill and referrals were not taken on as quickly as was hoped. If Teen Star assessments were carried out in six months time, we might expect to see more positive shifts on this domain.
Table 6: Average Teen Star scores (out of 6) and the change
(Low scores indicate more difficulties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure &amp; Education</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour &amp; Citizenship</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; other key adults</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample = 19 young people (although 21 completed the programme, 2 did not complete an exit Teen Star and were therefore excluded from the analysis).
(Scores rounded to the nearest 0.1)

Table 6 illustrates the degree of change that young people achieved through Choices. Although the shifts were not particularly high (on average just 0.6) these results still seem positive, given the short period of time that Choices was in place (just six months). The ‘standard deviation’ was low, which means that the scores of each of the individual young people did not tend to deviate much from the average (i.e. this was not a situation where some young people had dramatic positive shifts and others had dramatic negative shifts) with the exception of Education & Structure, which is discussed below. The low shifts probably represent the limited time that young people were engaged with the programme. Key workers reported that they felt families were starting to change by the end of the six month programme but that more dramatic change might have followed if the programme had continued. Nonetheless, these small changes are encouraging.

The greatest shifts were in the domains of Wellbeing, Safety & Security and Structure & Education (changes of 0.7, 0.8 and 0.8 respectively). This is not surprising as the interventions seemed to focus most strongly on these elements. For example the Brathay Family Residential worked to instil confidence and self esteem through supporting families to work together and enjoy new challenges (Wellbeing); much of the work carried out in the 8-13 year old services centred on understanding risky behaviours...
and consequences (Safety & Security); and Cycle Recycle engaged young people back into education and training (Structure & Education).

More detailed analysis showed that not all (of the 19) young people experienced positive change in their Education & Structure, but for those (12 young people) that did, the changes were quite dramatic; six of the 12 young people had improved by at least two points on the Teen Star – greater changes than in any other domain. This is probably testimony to the Cycle Recycle project, which five of these six young people had attended. More details are provided about this project in Chapter 7, and Tristan’s case study in section 6.4 provides a real life example.

It is perhaps surprising that greater change was not seen on the domain of Family & other key adults (a change of 0.5), given that the Brathay Family Residential was described very positively by families and workers alike. (Data was even examined for just those families in involved in the family residential and the change still remained relatively low at 0.7). However, this does not suggest that the residential was not effective (indeed we know from reports from families that there were some very positive outcomes), rather, that the Teen Star focuses on safety at home and parental substance misuse rather than the more subtle outcome (reported by families) of improved family bonding. The case study analysis in the next section provides more detail about positive outcomes for families.

6.2. Case study analysis

Twelve structured case studies were completed and analysed. They provide detailed insight into the outcomes of the young people and families involved in the programme. Three case studies are presented in this section as they provide some powerful examples of some of the ‘softer’ outcomes that young people and their families achieved.

The case studies particularly highlighted some shifts in behaviours known to counteract offending and substance misuse. Most young people to some extent achieved:

- Increased understanding and respect for others

---

6 The names of the young people and families are changes throughout this report to protect identities
Increased self esteem, confidence or wellbeing (e.g. see Tristan’s story)

Improved ability to control anger and walk away from ‘risky situations (e.g. see Chris and Thomas’ story)

Improved family bonding (e.g. see Noah’s story)

6.3. Examples of individual outcomes achieved

Every young person and family made some steps towards safer thinking and behaviour that would reduce risk of offending or substance misuse. Every young person’s personal journey was different, with each achieving positive outcomes and that were pertinent to themselves. A selection of these ‘softer’ outcomes are presented here:

• One 12 year old boy achieved success (a certificate) and praise (for attendance) and was described as being “proud of himself for the first time”. He had learned that commitment to his course (Young Fire-fighters) was an important part of being accepted by others and stated that he would like to try to apply this commitment in school.

• A 19 year old young man took part in the Cycle Recycle project after being NEET for several years. His commitment and level of skill prompted his project worker to describe him as now being “very sellable to employers”. He also stated that the new found structure to his day had led him to reduce his cannabis consumption dramatically.

• One mother was described as having ‘a breakthrough moment’ on the Brathay Family Residential when she realised that she didn’t need to use cannabis every day. She said, “I did realise at Brathay that I don’t need my weed. I can cope without it and [project worker] said that I was totally different and much calmer. And I think I was, so I really want to cut down and one day I’ll stop.” This realisation led to her accepting support from Project 6 (around parenting and substance misuse) on her return from the residential, which it is hoped will contribute to positive outcomes for her son.

• An 18 year old who had been NEET and who took part in Cycle Recycle stated that he now feels like getting out of bed in the morning because he has something to do that he enjoys, he has realised that he can complete tasks and ‘stick with it’ and he now feels that he has a future.
• One 13 year old young man had assaulted his mother during an argument. He and his mother undertook a restorative justice conference and some family group conferencing which resulted in his mother committing to attend a parenting class. The family’s key worker feels that this could lead to some significant changes for the young person as it is the first time that his mother has been willing to accept support.

• A 10 year old girl (Elisha) had witnessed the effects of her older sister being sexually exploited and this had led to concerns around her own self esteem and feelings of safety. Her mother was drinking heavily and was consequently spending significant amounts of the day-time in bed. The family took part in a family group conference (FGC) in an attempt to improve openness and trust and to find ways to help Elisha feel safer and more confident. During the FGC it was agreed that Mum and Elisha would try to spend quality time together and that the whole family would have sit-down meals twice every week. Since the FGC, Mum has stuck to both agreements; she and Elisha have sit-down meals and the older sibling does join them on occasion. Every Saturday Mum and Elisha do some baking together. Mum and Elisha have both recognised an increase in Elisha’s self esteem and confidence and put this down to the introduction of quality time together and the increased stability and family routine.

6.4. Three case studies

Chris and Thomas’s story

Chris and Thomas are brothers aged 10 and 11. They live on a Keighley estate with their mother Lisa and younger sister. The boys’ father left the family home several years ago but Chris and Thomas both witnessed domestic violence fuelled by alcohol and substance misuse when their parents lived together. Lisa was suffering with anxiety and postnatal depression and was struggling to cope with her boys’ challenging behaviour and anger. The family were referred to Choices by Extended Schools.
Chris was very streetwise for his age but found it difficult to discuss drugs and alcohol without getting upset. He struggled with his anger and was well known within his community for getting into trouble – swearing and arguing with neighbours, antisocial behaviour and frequently being placed in isolation at school. He was spending a lot of time outside with older peers, which was exacerbating his challenging behaviour.

Thomas was being bullied at school and often felt unsafe playing in the street at home. Both boys had a good relationship with Lisa but felt that she spent very little quality time with them. Neither of the boys felt able to talk to their mum about things that worried them and it was clear that both needed support to boost their self esteem.

“Things were pretty grim really. I just couldn’t cope with their behaviour. I suffered with post natal depression and everything just got on top of me. No matter what I did for my family, it never seemed to be enough.” (Lisa)

The family undertook the following Choices package:

- Both boys were referred to Barnardo’s Junior Youth Inclusion Project where they learned about anger management and behaviours and consequences.
- Both boys received one-to-one support from Project 6 to develop strategies for keeping safe and for coping with challenging situations (parental substance misuse and conflict) more positively.
- Thomas received some one-to-one support on his confidence and self esteem from his key worker.
- Chris, Thomas and Lisa attended the Brathay Family Residential, which gave them some quality time together as a family.

**Outcomes**

Chris feels that he has improved on five out of six domains of his Teen Star (see overleaf). Most striking was his increase in wellbeing (improved from a ‘2’ to a ‘5’). His key worker agrees that Chris’s confidence and self esteem have risen dramatically, along with his ability to cope better with stressful situations. Chris says that he can deal with his stress now because he knows “what to do to make it right”. He is also proud that he has learned to walk away from ‘risky’ situations; for example, he was recently playing
in his street with friends when a neighbour came outside and shouted at the boys. While some boys shouted back and were disrespectful, Chris walked away and went home.

Chris’s relationship with Lisa has also improved since the Family Residential; he listens and acts upon what she says most of the time and he says that his mum spends more time with him than she used too. He says that when arguments start at home now, his mum always tries to sort them out. Lisa has also started to attend a Parenting Course at Project 6 which she hopes will give her the skills to continue to make improvements.

“Mum has learned new ways of dealing with the boys. She now praises them when they do things well.” (Key worker)

Thomas reported fewer concerns than Chris at his initial assessment, but has shown a significant increase in his wellbeing. He acknowledges that he used to get angry with staff at school, but has now realised that “there is no point” and has stopped this. Some of the children that Thomas was frightened of have now left the estate which has undoubtedly helped him to feel safer. Thomas enjoys spending more time with his mum and says that he is now able to share small problems with her and that she listens and tries to help. He also enjoys sitting down to watch DVDs with his whole family at weekends – something that had never happened in the past.

The Brathay Family Residential Worker said, “The three made a significant amount of progress. The weekend gave them the opportunity to reconnect with the good quality relationship they once had and take a step back from daily negative patterns of behaviour. Follow-on support would be helpful if the changes are going to be sustainable.”
Blue (inner) lines shows scores at initial assessment in December 2011 and red (outer) lines show scores at final assessment in March 2012.

“I have learned that spending ‘quality time’ and not just ‘time’ is important to me and the boys. I am able to praise them when they do well, which I found quite difficult before. We spend time on Friday nights just being together with pizza and DVD. It’s great.” (Lisa)

Tristan’s Story

Tristan was 19 and not in education, employment or training when he was referred to Choices through Project 6. Tristan volunteered at Keighley Young People’s Centre once every week but was anxious to find a job and was fed-up with having no real structure to his days. His father died due to heroin use in 2004 and Tristan had a history of binge drinking and smoking cannabis, which Project 6 had already been working with him to reduce.

Tristan’s main challenge was the lack of education and structure in his life and he scored himself a ‘1’ on this domain. He also said that he felt ‘useless’, which affected his
emotional wellbeing and he reported that he still had difficulties with binge drinking, which sometimes lead to arguments with his mum and stepfather at home.

Tristan was referred to **Cycle Recycle** in January 2012 and continues to be involved in the project. He was also referred to **Connexions**, where a personal advisor supported him around training and employment and confidence building.

Blue (inner) lines shows scores at initial assessment in December 2011 and red (outer) lines show scores at final assessment in March 2012.

Tristan had 100% attendance at Cycle Recycle and has helped and supported other young people on the project. He is continuing to work hard (assisting the cycle mechanic in the workshop and coming in on additional days to set up the workshop) and is working towards gaining Basic Skills qualifications through the project. He feels that his confidence has improved but he still lacks a bit of self belief about his capabilities.

“Tristan has been a positive influence and a good role model to others on the project. He has been very enthusiastic and engaged with all tasks and he has wanted to learn above and beyond what the mechanic has taught him.” (Cycle Recycle project worker)

Tristan’s drinking has also reduced which he says has helped him to cope better with any problems he has – he has been through a tough couple of months with family health
issues and has not lapsed back into heavy drinking or smoking. He feels that he now has some structure and motivation in his life and he hopes to organise a charity bike ride to raise money for Cycle Recycle.

“Tristan’s story is one of success; he needed support into a work environment and the Cycle Recycle project was exactly suitable. He has excelled and shined in this environment, which will lead to excellent references as well as, potentially, a sustainable working business model.” (Key worker)

Noah’s story

The Stacey’s – Michael, Noah (13) Luke and Jadyn live on a Keighley estate with their single mum, Adele. The family is warm and caring but known to the Police for anti-social behaviour. Their home is crowded (the boys share a room) and can be chaotic at times, with lots of young people coming in and out, and frequent arguments. The whole family benefitted from Choices, but this case study focuses specifically on Noah, who was referred by the Police.

Noah is a happy young man who loves his family and has plenty of friends on his estate. When he came to Choices, he was spending a lot of time with young people who were getting into trouble (usually involving alcohol) and often taking risks. He was well known to the local Police for anti-social behaviour on the estate and was often getting into trouble at school; he swore frequently and often addressed very abusive language at staff. He tended to get stressed and angry easily and had punched a wall on several occasions. He liked to show-off at school and had walked out on several occasions - particularly when he struggled in class. The Police and school were concerned that he was at risk of a criminal record if things didn’t change (his older brothers already have criminal records).

Noah was referred to Cycle Recycle as it was hoped it would encourage him to use his leisure time more positively. He was also referred to Barnardo’s Junior Youth Inclusion Project (JYIP) and a Young Fire-fighter’s course to help him to understand
more about the risks and consequences of his behaviours. The Stacey family also attended the **Brathay Family Residential**.

Blue (inner) lines shows scores at initial assessment in December 2011 and red (outer) lines show scores at final assessment in March 2012.

Noah feels that he has improved his wellbeing and his structure and education as a result of Choices. He has shown a very positive attitude to learning (100% attendance at Cycle Recycle) and now spends more time playing on the bike he built and less time getting into trouble on the streets. He says that he has started to think more about keeping himself safe and is trying to make better choices that keep him out of trouble. Noah says that Cycle Recycle has helped him to realise that he can learn and be positive and he hopes that he can keep this attitude up in school. He has also recognised that he can work well in a group and has started to enjoy teamwork – controlling his temper and being safe and careful around the workshop equipment.

“**Noah needed to work on building up tolerance and learning to control his temper, especially when working with others. He has improved his listening skills, he is working better with others and he is now making better choices. He has really enjoyed the practical aspects of the project.**” (Cycle Recycle project worker)

The family also benefitted from the residential. Adele was excited about what her boys were able to achieve and was proud of the support that they all gave her and each other. One of her sons commented on how surprised and pleased he was that his mum had joined in. He said, “I learned a lot that it’s important to help each other and I learned that
respect is a two-way thing. If you show respect to others, hopefully they will show it back.” The older son didn’t attend the residential but has commented that his mum seems to enjoy spending more time with the family now – even playing rounders on the local recreation area.

Adele herself is now trying a different approach to discipline – ensuring that the whole family understand what is acceptable in the home – and commented that, “the lads have calmed down, particularly Noah. It’s kept them on the straight and narrow. God only knows what would have happened if they hadn’t got involved.”

“Noah has started to develop some maturity in certain situations and his behaviour is calming down…. Offending behaviour may not have improved quite yet because we ran out of time….but we were making some headway to change behaviour and the boys are far more aware of the consequences of their actions.” (Key worker)
7. Process Evaluation Findings

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten stakeholders (see method section). The research questions addressed were:

- Did the model (set-up and delivery) enable identification, engagement and provision of appropriate support to the relevant young people?
- Did the model increase the use of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) or other shared assessments with vulnerable young people in Keighley?
- Did the model increase partnership working and cross-fertilisation of ideas and learning in Keighley?

The findings are presented under headings below which cover all the different elements of the process; from set-up, referral and engagement through to partnership working, delivery and exit. The headings for each section provide an indication of what was concluded. The three research questions seemed to cut across all of the sections and therefore are interwoven.

It should be noted that the purpose of a process evaluation is to inform future practice; and consequently, ‘areas for improvement’ tend to be teased out and highlighted. These should not be read as criticisms (indeed the Choices outcomes evaluation revealed extremely positive results) but should simply be drawn upon to discuss and develop local practice in the future.

7.1. In summary

Overall, the stakeholders were positive about Keighley Choices and felt that the young people and families benefitted, despite what were considered to be “extremely limited” time scales. All external stakeholders highlighted as positives, the “broad range” of interventions that Choices offered and the hard work and effort of the programme’s key workers in engaging families. Some interventions were also singled out for significant praise, including; Cycle Recycle, Dance United Yorkshire, the Family Group Conferencing (FGC), and the Brathay Residential. The core offer also seemed to
address local strategic priorities; the Senior Strategic Commissioning Manager at Bradford Council stated, “Community reparation, NEET, raising educational achievement and tackling substance misuse is all spot on. There is a good fit with strategic priorities in the Children and Young People’s Plan.”

All stakeholders felt that the programme had succeeded in building the capacity of some small, local agencies and had brought different agencies together to work in partnership and share learning. Most noted that the programme had benefitted from existing strong networks in the area. Perhaps one of the greatest challenges was in leaving a legacy in Keighley when the funding ended and overall, it was felt that some very positive outcomes had been achieved.

7.2. Hitting the ground running

Overall, stakeholders felt that the size and breadth of the programme was ambitious in the available timescales but that on the whole, it was delivered well. Stakeholders were particularly impressed at how quickly partners were brought on board despite the need to reconfigure services specifically for the Choices Programme. One stakeholder said, “It [Choices] did bring people together. It did quite well in getting people around the table in that short time.” The Programme Manager echoed these sentiments and explained, “The challenge was in taking other people on the journey with us. Our partners didn’t have the same level of accountability as we did and we were expecting them to change their delivery plans mid-year to suit the needs of Choices.”

The need for a rapid set-up and delivery did inevitably mean that not all relevant agencies could be brought on board within the timescales. It was pointed out by three stakeholders that more involvement with Keighley schools could have been increased the value of the programme; one said, “They see the young people the majority of the time and know them best” and another said, “Schools know other services and could have offered suggestions. They might have been able to offer workshop space or other venues. The Programme Manager agreed that more targeted work would have been done to engage clusters of schools at the outset if more time had been available, but pointed out that Extended Schools Services were engaged from the start and an invitation was provided to Behaviour and Attendance Collaboratives (BACs).
The timescales probably also limited the outcomes that young people and families were able to achieve. As one key worker explained: “Families very often wouldn’t even discuss offending or substance misuse early on... we do have very good relationships with the families now, but we’re five months on and the project is due to end.” Another stated, “It’s about now [three weeks before the end of the programme] that the exceptional work could have started if the programme wasn’t closing.”

The tight timescales also meant that some interesting aspects of the model could not be brought to fruition. It was originally intended that the most appropriate project worker (from any partner agency) should become a young person’s key worker, however, when it became apparent that Choices was working with families with a relatively high level of need within rapid ‘turnaround’ times, the model was adapted. It was agreed, in the interests of safeguarding, that Barnardo’s workers should retain key worker responsibility as they were closely line-managed and supported by Barnardo’s senior managers who had good oversight of the project and the families involved. Barnardo’s staff stated that if the model was to be replicated within longer timescales, that it would be beneficial to implement a multi-agency worker model as intended.

However, overall, the programme was successful in spite of its limited timescales, which is probably testimony to the hard work of all those involved. As one external stakeholder put it, “[The key workers] were very committed and once the project got going they really got on with things.”

**7.3. An innovative way of attracting referrals**

Referrals to the programme were increased through linking with Barnardo’s Turnaround Service, which is based in Bradford and supports children and young people at risk of child sexual exploitation. Where Turnaround had failed to engage young people, if appropriate, they were approached by a Choices worker who was able to engage in a slightly different way (no reference made to missing from home/child sexual exploitation) which perhaps was less stigmatising (“we just said that we were there to help with any difficulties that they were having at home or school”). This was an interesting and
innovative way of applying a ‘safety net’ for young people who had not been successfully engaged by another service.

“They were apprehensive about what our motives were and what they were going to get out of it. Being able to be honest about yourself and the lifestyle you lead can be extremely difficult. It was right [for us to] tread carefully with the family, gaining their trust, but we felt that we ran out of time just as the family were making some headway to change behaviours.” (Barnardo’s key worker)

7.4. Skilful engagement of young people and families

Engagement of what were described as ‘hard to reach’ service users was “a constant challenge”, yet it did seem to be achieved with great success (analysis of the monitoring data showed that 60% of those referred were successfully engaged with the programme. NB taking into account actual referrals that would have been accepted this figure rises to 75%). As the Barnardo’s Chair of the MAP put it, “How do you sell a voluntary intervention to people around something that is stigmatizing? It is important not to be deceitful, but being upfront can alienate people. It requires some very sensitive handling, which I think the project workers did very well.” The Programme Manager also acknowledged the challenges: “We were engaging with families who had not previously engaged with services and asking them to undertake some very intensive pieces of work.”

Several explanations were given for the key workers’ success in engaging the families. These included: taking time (“sometimes three visits or more to build that relationship before they would engage”); being sensitive to the stigma of drugs and alcohol use (“reminding them that we were here to help their family and no-one would be making a judgement”); being persistent; and using informal approaches (“It was a relaxed
Above all, families seemed to respond well because they were approached by a voluntary sector organisation. As one key worker explained, “We were the just the right people. We came in with fresh eyes. Many of the families had received a statutory intervention and we came in with more of a ‘softly, softly’ approach and it was voluntary. So for the first time, families had a choice.”

A significant challenge was in encouraging family members to acknowledge some of the issues that they were facing so that an appropriate support package could be put in place. This is unsurprising when delivering a project based on voluntary engagement as there is no obvious incentive for young people or their parents to divulge very sensitive, personal circumstances. When asked how they encouraged these families to open up, key workers explained, “With great difficulty and patience. I would now be able to talk quite comfortably with some of the parents about their drug use but this has taken time [to build trust].”

7.5. Using CAF

Choices aimed to increase the use of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) or other shared assessments with vulnerable young people in Keighley. As part of the Choices referral and assessment process, eight children and young people had a Pre-CAF completed and seven had a CAF completed. The remaining children and young people already had a CAF when they came to the programme (five young people) or already had Social Care involvement (five young people). The majority of CAFs were completed by the Extended Schools Parental Information Coordinator and four were completed by Barnardo’s key workers. It was reported by Barnardo’s staff that all CAFs were logged with the local CAF Coordinator. All external stakeholders reported that they, themselves had actively contributed to the CAFs (either contributing information or supporting young people through the process) and the Programme Manager reported; “We put it [CAF] on the agenda and people were seeing that…we made a start.”
7.6. Some strong partnership working

Choices seemed to offer a good opportunity for a range of statutory and voluntary organisations to come together for a common purpose. Although none were unknown to each other, they had never been brought ‘around the table’ together. The Barnardo’s Chair of the MAP stated: “It’s an innovative, eclectic mix of different services. But mostly it was the ‘bringing them together as a package’ that was the innovative bit.”

On the whole, partnership working was described as very positive and Choices was thought to have aided the existing strong networks. Stakeholders variously reported: “There was a good breadth of services involved which were quite holistic given the timescales involved” and; “In the main, agencies are working well together in Keighley, but Choices did bring some new players around the table for the first time.”

There were also some good examples of shared training opportunities offered by Project 6, the YOT (Restorative Justice) and Barnardo’s Voices (FGC training). The YOT Crime Prevention Team Leader said, “The staff learned a lot from the FGC training. They gave brilliant feedback for that.” A Barnardo’s key worker said of the training, “The joint training created inter-agency relationships…. really useful…I learned tools and strategies for working with families more generally, not just for FGC.”

Although Choices seems to have brought the right services together, there was a consensus that there was not enough time for the different services to begin interfacing with each other to provide one single, integrated Choices service. As the Barnardo’s Chair of the MAP put it, “There was a breadth of services but the services didn’t knit together to provide a holistic provision. There wasn’t enough time to get up and running in their own right and then start to link up with each other.”

7.7. A high quality core offer

Numerous examples were provided of positive interventions, partnership working, joint training opportunities and shared learning. These and other successes are described in this section.
Table 7: The interventions received by the young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Number of young people receiving intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 6 support</td>
<td>5 young people (and 2 parents)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Residential (Brathay)</td>
<td>9 young people (from 5 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Group Conferencing (FGC)</td>
<td>5 young people (from 3 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice (RJ)</td>
<td>2 young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People’s Participation Work</td>
<td>3 young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Recycle</td>
<td>3 young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connexions support</td>
<td>5 young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnardo’s Key worker 1-1 support</td>
<td>2 young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance United Yorkshire (DUY)</td>
<td>17 young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnardo’s Services for 8-13 yr olds</td>
<td>9 young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 12 young people were referred but at the time of writing, only 5 had received a service

Note: 13/21 young people participated in more than one intervention

**Restorative justice (RJ)** work was carried out in partnership between the YOT and Barnardo’s with two young people. Individual’s from both organisations attended meetings with the perpetrator and with the victim and then worked to identify and implement a solution in line with the victim’s wishes and feelings. The dual arrangement was described by both Barnardo’s and YOT representatives as offering several important benefits:

- A YOT worker is able to address the offending behaviour with the perpetrator up to the point where the victim is satisfied, but it was reported that Barnardo’s was able to offer additional interventions that might support the young person in the future. For example, the YOT worker noted, “Poor parenting can be more easily pointed out by Barnardo’s and then solutions immediately offered to a family.”
- YOT workers were perceived to be linked to the Police and hold a statutory status. Barnardo’s, in contrast, were described by the YOT worker as offering, ‘a more acceptable face’ to a young person or family.
- The RJ process was reportedly speeded-up; traditionally a YOT worker would need to go away and contact a family support worker or other social care colleague if

I think this programme has been ace and I think we have been lucky. I just wish it had been longer.” (Mother of two boys aged 10 and 11)
additional issues are identified but in this case Barnardo’s was able to put some support or a referral in place immediately.

RJ was a new concept for Barnardo’s key workers who had not previously been involved with youth offending teams, “Having come from a social care background I was not aware of restorative justice and I think it’s brilliant.” A YOT worker reported that the partnership with Barnardo’s worked very well. “I think it’s been fantastic. We’ve learned from each other.”

*Family Group Conferencing (FGC)* was an important part of the core package - offering families an opportunity to discuss issues and come to some shared solutions. Two families experienced FGC and the anecdotal feedback from both was very positive. It was reported that the YOT may now continue to run some FGCs in the future.

Other interventions were highly praised: *Cycle Recycle* was seen as new and innovative by a number of stakeholders, particularly because it added a social enterprise element. “It got young people involved and gave a possibility of taking things forward beyond the length of Choices through developing a business.” Another said, “It’s an innovative way of engaging young people in something they might be interested in and they get something tangible out of it - a bike.”

Seventeen young people completed the *Dance United Yorkshire (DUY)* four-week programme. The project (culminating in a large show event at Bradford’s Alhambra Theatre) was reported by all those involved or associated as being a success. Attendance rates were high; 17 out of 22 young people completed the programme and 13 of those had an attendance of over 90%. A Senior Youth Worker stated, “Dance United was really good. I’ve seen a change in the young people as they were rehearsing at the Young People’s Centre and I witnessed it.” A Barnardo’s project worker who helped to support young people through the rehearsal stages stated, “To see those

---

7 Due to the nature of the programme, Teen Stars were not completed for this group.
young people...they realise that they can achieve. They know the feeling of success and pride now. I heard some of their mums say that they were proud of them and they were just elated by that.”

The Assistant Head at Oak Bank School, who referred seven young people to Dance United Yorkshire said of it:

“Dance United has had a greater impact on the majority of students who attended than I could possibly have imagined. Students who were lacking in any kind of confidence or self-esteem signed up, persisted, responded to the significant challenge and achieved a really impressive level of skill by the time the performance came around. It was quite moving to see some of them responding so positively and the change in them has been incredible. At the time, they were excited and proud of their achievements, amazed at their own levels of resilience and tenacity.

Since the end of the project, those who completed it are back in school and working well. For all, their levels of self-confidence have increased, in some cases, dramatically. For one student in particular, this also means she feels strong enough to do the right thing when faced with a difficult decision and influence from peers. This is a MASSIVE step forward and I’m so pleased that she intends to remain on the project to continue her new love of dance. Hopefully, she won’t lose her enthusiasm.

Many thanks to everyone involved with these young people on this project. I have no doubt that it was incredibly hard work at times but I know that it was all worth it and that the students have had a phenomenal experience, life changing in some cases.”

The Brathay Family Residential was seen by all stakeholders as a very important element of the package. Five families took part in the weekend away and experienced some very positive outcomes (discussed in the outcomes section of this report). A Senior Youth Worker stated, “It was a fantastic experience for them to be able to go to Brathay and have quality time together… it was quite unique and positive.” A key worker who
attended the residential said, “They all saw qualities in each other that they don’t get a chance to see on the estate.” Another stated that, “The families learnt things about themselves and about supporting and encouraging each other...they got so much out of it. It was beautiful to see the pride in the mums about their kids and vice versa. It was priceless. I felt really privileged to be a part of it.”

“I have seen what my boys are capable of doing when they put their minds to it.” (Mum speaking at the Brathay Residential)

Many of the stakeholders interviewed said that they wished that some type of (less intensive) whole family work could continue in the area which allows families to have fun and enjoy working as a team together.

“The family had a positive time together, laughing and celebrating success in activities. Like the group skipping where it all went wrong but was celebrated by simply laughing and joking together. The pair [mother and son] valued this because it was in contrast to the usual shouting and [arguing].” (Brathay project worker)

**Project 6** offered one-to-one support to help young people to cope with parental substance misuse and other challenges (such as anger or low self esteem). This was considered, by Barnardo’s key workers and some of the external stakeholders, to be a good offering, but in the event, a staff member fell ill and Project 6 was not able to start the work as early as planned. As one stakeholder lamented, “…referrals need to be accepted and worked with very quickly because things change very quickly for these families.” This unexpected difficulty at Project 6 meant that young people and stakeholders were unable to comment on the value of this intervention, but at the time of writing more young people were starting to receive a service and a key worker pointed out that, “Some young people will continue to work with Project 6 beyond the life of the Choices programme because they aware of the service now and what it offers, which is good.”

**Rapid Response Outreach** was carried out by the Youth Service in partnership with Barnardo’s. Both agencies felt that it had merits as a pilot project but that adaptations
were needed. A mini-bus was driven around the Keighley area at night, responding to local intelligence about where young people were gathering. Youth workers and Barnardo’s workers then provided advice and signposting, particularly in relation to staying safe and alcohol and drugs. Several young people were reported to have subsequently attended Targeted Youth Services sessions at Keighley Young People’s Centre. Despite operating in the winter months (through several bouts of heavy snow) when fewer young people were spending time outside, a Senior Youth Worker explained that the pilot was successful enough to be continued if funding can be identified.

7.8. Some gaps in the Choices package

All stakeholders were very positive about the breadth and quality of interventions offered as part of the Choices Programme, but like any large programme of this nature there were understandably other interventions that they felt could have been included in the core offer. The Programme Manager also gave a very honest appraisal of the programme and explained that time constraints had prevented agreement of delivery terms with some partners that might have improved the package (for example, one-to-one provision for young people at risk of sexual exploitation). Some of the partners approached had not been willing to offer interventions that met the programme aims but were rather more about replacing their core funding. She also explained that funding cuts had played a disruptive role, “All our partners and potential partners are fighting for funding at the moment and their focus seems to be on that…most of our partners were in limbo. They don’t know if they’ll be here in six months or nine months.”

Each of the following suggestions for improvement was made by two or more stakeholders:

**A wider breadth of choice**
One stakeholder who knew several of the young people and families well stated that they would have liked to have seen more activities to suit the individual interests of young people, for example sports and music. Another said, “Some of the carrots that we were dangling didn’t fit the young people’s needs. But the ones that did engage with the interventions we had got a great deal out of it.”
Opportunities for young people who attend school
The two main interventions specifically for young people took place during school hours (Cycle Recycle and Dance United Yorkshire) - targeting (as planned) those who were NEET or had very sporadic school attendance. There was no targeted support within this Choices programme for those at risk of offending or substance misuse who were still attending school, and several of the young people referred to the programme did fall into this bracket. One key worker pointed out, “It would have been nice if there was something like Dance United Yorkshire delivered in schools so that the ones that were attending school were rewarded.”

“I feel awesome. I feel like a superstar,” and “I was amazed because I actually did it and also hyper because I had never done anything like that before.” (Young people speaking after Dance United Yorkshire performance at Bradford’s Alhambra theatre)

Early intervention for the younger end of the spectrum
Nine out of ten stakeholders reported that there is a lack of ‘early intervention’ provision for younger children who are involved in antisocial behaviour in Keighley. One said, “There is very little provision for younger children. There are local community youth clubs but these are very ad hoc….no set protocol and they’re not available in every neighbourhood.” The consensus seemed to be that the widest gap was for those aged between five and 12 years old; as one stakeholder put it, “They’re too old for the Children’s Centre and too young for the Youth Service.” Another said, “They’ve been getting in trouble since they were about 8 and by the time they get to 12 when they’re at secondary school and there is support available, it’s too late because the behaviour is entrenched.” The Crime Prevention Team Leader at Bradford YOT said, “There is a need for early intervention before they even get to the offending stage as this will support the families before it gets complex and expensive.”

Several stakeholders therefore felt that as Choices was (rightly) aiming to offer early intervention, it might have been effective to offer some one-to-one provision to children in school years five and six (10-12 years old) who are at risk of offending. This potential gap in service provision has since been acknowledged by the local commissioner and three voluntary sector agencies have been commissioned to provide mentoring support in schools (see 7.11).
Tier 2 mental health support

Four stakeholders mentioned that lack of emotional resilience and/or self esteem were prominent issues for young people in the Choices Programme, along with anger management difficulties. They were concerned that there was no obvious support service to refer them onto, “There was nothing but Project 6, and then their parents had to have a drug or alcohol problem if they were referred to that, and of course that brought with it a stigma.” The Extended Schools Parental Information Coordinator said, “Self esteem, particularly in 11 and 12 year old girls is a growing concern. Their teachers are usually able to identify the girls who will be at risk [of CSE] when they move up to secondary school but as far as I know there is really no preventative support available.”

7.9. A promising exit strategy

The consensus was that the families had a very positive experience of support services through Choices and would be more willing to engage with services in the future as a result. Families themselves (consulted at the Brathay Residential) overwhelmingly said that they would recommend other families to be involved in something like Choices if it was offered. The Barnardo’s MAP Chair said, “I’d like to think that those families who’ve engaged have had a positive experience that someone genuinely wanted to help them. They might therefore establish a trusting relationship with other services in the future.”

Collaboration between the Strategic Steering Group (SSG), the Choices Programme Manager and partner agencies resulted in an exit strategy that consisted of:

- Local authority investment (initially 12 months) in an intensive support / mentoring project in schools through a partnership between YMCA, JAMES (Joint Activities Motor Education Service) and Barnardo’s for 8-13 year olds.
- Re-launch of the Cycle Recycle project.
- Continuation of the Project 6 work which had started late (providing one to one support for young people to help improve school attendance, improve behaviour in school, cope with parental substance and understand risks of substance misuse; and parenting support classes for parents with substance misuse issues).
• Development of a partnership between Barnardo’s, Project 6 and the YOT to deliver family group conferencing over the next 12 months.
• Ongoing links to local schools and the Three Valley BACS.
• Dance United Yorkshire (DUY) were successful in an application for funding from the Bradford Youth Opportunities Fund. This has been used to establish a Youth Company offering weekly dance provision in the north of the Bradford district (including Keighley) - offering a clear progression route for all the young people involved in the DUY project, irrespective of ability. For those demonstrating exceptional talent and commitment, the Performance Company in Bradford has also been offered as a progression route. The Youth Company will also eventually be opened up to other young dancers from the north of the district interested in contemporary dance and performance but who are not yet at the standard of the Bradford Performance Company.

Stakeholders were also asked about the medium to long term legacy of the Choices Programme in Keighley. Most felt that some very positive outcomes had been realised and it was hoped that the achievements, confidence, self esteem and memories would stay with the young people and their families. On a more practical note, some stakeholders reported that their relationships with other agencies had been reaffirmed through working together on the MAP. Four stakeholders said that it “might” or “could” be useful for a MAP-type meeting to continue locally, but there was a caveat that there would need to be a clear aim or purpose with the relevant people around the table (“not just a talking shop”).

“What am I going to do now? It’s been great for me and the boys, it’s helped so much. I don’t know what will happen now the programme’s finished. At least I’ve got the parenting course which might help.” (Mother of two boys, 10 and 11)
8. Conclusions and recommendations

8.1. Conclusions

The Barnardo’s Choices Programme can be seen as a very promising pilot project – offering an interesting multi-agency, key worker model that could be adapted and developed and used with a range of client groups, including families with multiple needs.

The programme was undoubtedly targeted in the right area – Keighley has higher levels of deprivation and young people NEET than the regional and national averages, concerning levels of substance misuse amongst school age children, and (like many towns) some complex challenges to face around social isolation, antisocial behaviour, child sexual exploitation and engagement of young people in gangs. The local strategic commissioner also felt that the programme fitted well with local priorities.

Choices aimed to target young people at risk of substance misuse and/or offending and who were not currently receiving a service, and these criteria were well met. Twenty-one young people were involved in the programme from start to finish, including seven families. It was apparent that most young people were struggling with multiple needs linked to offending and substance misuse - including disengagement from education, family difficulties (parental depression, bereavement and domestic violence), parental substance misuse, low self esteem, and risk taking. The majority had recognised that they were experiencing significant challenges in their life, wanted to make changes but didn’t know how to, and most had significant levels of need, which possibly reflected high thresholds for other support services, such as Family Intervention projects in the area.

The Choices model (set up and delivery) was very positive; key workers, a multi agency panel and multiple voluntary and statutory sector delivery partners enabled appropriate identification, engagement and delivery of services within the timescales. Families overwhelmingly gave positive feedback about the support they had received. The most
significant challenge to delivery was the timescale (six months for set-up, delivery and exit) which probably impacted upon the degree and sustainability of outcomes that the families achieved.

Positive outcomes were achieved by 15 out of 19 young people on the factors known to correlate with offending and substance misuse. In particular, impressive changes were seen in young people’s ‘Safety & Security’ (almost three-quarters of young people reported positive improvements) and ‘Structure & Education’ (63% reported improvement and for the majority of these, the improvement was dramatic). The changes in attitudes and behaviour towards substance misuse and offending were less impressive, but this was not unexpected; offending behaviour in particular can be very entrenched and often influenced by changes in other aspects of life, it is therefore quite possible that more impressive changes would occur for these young people if the programme had continued longer.

Young people also showed shifts towards developing characteristics known to counteract the risk of offending and substance misuse; particularly improved family relationships and enhanced self-esteem, pride or confidence (for example, the young man who realised he ‘had a future’ after becoming involved in Cycle Recycle and the young people taking part in Dance United Yorkshire and experiencing commitment and success for the first time). There was also evidence of increased understanding and respect for others and some improved ability to control anger - for example, the young man who had learned that it was safer to go home when his friends started verbally abusing a neighbour.

The mix of interventions offered to families was impressive, both in terms of breadth and quality, though there was not enough time for the different services to start to interface as ‘one programme’. Although not individually evaluated, the different interventions received some very positive feedback from families and stakeholder alike. Of particular note were the Dance United Yorkshire, Cycle Recycle and Brathay residential activities, which were reported to have had some very significant impacts on young people’s lives – engaging them in meaningful activities, instilling praise and self esteem and building family relationships. This is not to say that other interventions (for example, Project 6,
family group conferencing and restorative justice) were not promising, but that fewer young people experienced these options and feedback was less forthcoming.

The programme also allowed for identification of some gaps in provision, particularly for the younger (8-12 year olds) age bracket and around tier 2 mental health provision (self esteem, wellbeing and anger management). Many stakeholders also advocated for more opportunities for families to experience, structured, quality time together.

The model built on existing strong partnership working and seemed to further enhance some inter-agency relationships. There was evidence of mutual learning – particularly between the YOT and Barnardo’s through delivery of restorative justice – some shared training opportunities and some promising developments for the future. A partnership between the YOT, Project 6 and Barnardo’s is looking to develop the use of family group conferencing.

The model increased the use of the Pre-CAF and CAF with vulnerable young people in Keighley - eight children and young people had a Pre-CAF completed and seven had a CAF completed – and all partners had some involvement in the process. This was seen as pushing the CAF agenda forward, in line with the aims of the Bradford District Partnership.

An exit strategy was put in place by Barnardo’s, in collaboration with the Strategic Steering Group and partner agencies. The strategy included continuation of Project 6 support for those already referred, re-launch of the Cycle Recycle project, set-up of a Dance United Yorkshire (DUY) Youth Company - offering a clear progression route for all the young people involved in the DUY project - and continued support from Connexions where relevant. A new service was also commissioned by Bradford Council following closure of Choices – a partnership between three organisations to deliver mentoring to young people in schools in Keighley. It is hoped that this continued work with the target group will provide some lasting legacy for Choices and ultimately reduce risk of offending/substance misuse in young people.
8.2. Recommendations

Choices was a pilot project - aiming to test a model of support for a specific group of young people – which achieved some very promising results. For the learning from this pilot to be useful, seven broad recommendations are made:

1. Barnardo’s and partners, including members of the Strategic Steering Group may wish to consider working with the Government’s very newly appointed local authority coordinators for the Troubled Families Programme to investigate whether, and how, the Choices model could be developed to meet emerging priorities; including prevention of inter-generational offending, reducing risk of care proceedings or reducing NEET.

2. The Government and practitioners agree that whole family interventions are critical for addressing needs faced by young people at risk, and Choices has highlighted the significant value that enjoyable, structured family time can provide. Commissioners may wish to consider how cost efficient support of this type could be provided to more families – perhaps by looking at options within the community.

3. Local authorities have increasing levels of autonomy to develop local solutions to issues such as offending and substance misuse (in particular through community budgets and Police and Crime Commissioners). This evaluation could serve to open up some discussions locally about how some of the Choices good practice could be developed and shared with budget holders.

4. This research evaluated Choices ‘as a whole’, rather than each of the individual interventions that made up the programme. Feedback from families and stakeholders was very positive about the different interventions, and those providers may wish to consider having their project evaluated in its own right (if they have not done so already). In particular, there may be specific outcomes that young people achieve and which were not identified through the broader Choices evaluation. It is worth noting that some providers have already been evaluated and readers can find out more information by contacting the services themselves (contact details provided in Appendix 1).
5. Restorative justice and family group conferencing seemed to show some promising results, but numbers who accessed these interventions through Choices were limited. More work is needed to explore these options in Keighley.

6. A significant number of referrals to Choices were for children under 13 who were known to Police for anti-social behaviour and were at risk of offending. It was frequently highlighted that prevention support is needed for these young people before the behaviour becomes entrenched. Local commissioners and providers may wish to discuss the available provision for 8-12 year olds and consider whether there is a need for additional services or for changes in the configuration or coordination of existing services to ensure there is no gap at this critical juncture.
Appendices
## Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Barnardo’s Allergrange (Choices Programme Lead) | T: 0127 454 5816  
E: Jill.greenfield@barnardos.org.uk |                                           |                          |
| Dance United Yorkshire              | T: 01274 649404  
E: duncan@dance-united.com  
W: www.dance-united.com |                                           |                          |
| Brathay Trust                       | T: 0844 225 3100  
E: brathay@brathay.org.uk  
W: www.brathay.org.uk |                                           |                          |
| Project 6                           | T: 01535 610180  
E: admin@project6.org.uk  
W: www.project6.org.uk |                                           |                          |
| Barnardo’s Voices                   | T: 01226 246 904  
E: fgcsyorkshire@barnardos.org.uk |                                           |                          |
| Bradford Youth Service              | T: 01535 618091  
E: youthserviceinfo@bradford.gov.uk |                                           |                          |
Appendix 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE

CHOICES STRATEGIC STEERING GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee/Group</th>
<th>CHOICES STRATEGIC STEERING GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability &amp; Reporting Mechanisms</td>
<td>Accountable to Home Office via Barnardo’s as per grant agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other Groups/ Committees</td>
<td>YOT, Keighley Locality Partnership, Family Ambassadors, Young People Ambassadors, Choices Multi Agency Panel, Junior YIP, Neighbourhood Policing Team, Substance Misuse lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Committee/ Group</td>
<td>This is a strategic steering group who will oversee project progress, resolve any procedural issues. The panel will provide direction and focus to the Multi-Agency Panel (MAP), inform the MAP to ensure implementation, co-ordinate activity to ensure all partners participate in order to improve the outcomes for young people and their families within the target cohort. This will be achieved by: • Enhanced working relationships between services and prevent duplication of services and resources. • Looking at any strategic and legislative changes which impact on the services provided. • Ensure the experiences, views and opinions of young people/families are incorporated into the development of the service. • Direct a comprehensive evaluation of the project. • Inform strategies and work with the project team to assist in ensuring a legacy of the work remains in the community. • Develop solutions to identified problems and barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td>The core objectives of the group are to: • Oversee project activity through information fed into the steering group from Multi-Agency Panel. • Establish and maintain effective communication across the partnership. • Oversee/support the development of the community ambassadors by the MAP. • Validate the chosen outcomes based measures. • Oversee and review actions against any safeguarding referrals/incidents. • Review and disseminate best practice across services. • Report back relevant issues from other internal networks and groups. • Barnardo’s will provide updates to the group on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NB: The strategic steering group will not have any responsibility for the financial monitoring of the project. This function rests with Barnardo’s and the Home office via the grant agreement.

| Membership | Chair – James Purdie Children’s Services  
Barnardo’s – Jill Greenfield  
YOT – Phil Briggs  
Keighley Project 6 – Aimee Gould  
Connexions – Jenny Cryer  
Bradford District Youth & Schools – Sgt Paul Robinson  
West Yorkshire Police – Sgt Claire Stothers  
Youth Service – Sue Duffy  
Children’s Social Care – Farah Hussain/Caroline Wood  
Family Ambassador  
Young Person Ambassador |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>James Purdie – Children’s Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of meetings</td>
<td>4 weekly to last 1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum/Attendance</td>
<td>A minimum of 3 members of the group is required for any meeting to be quorate. From time to time the Project Group may wish to invite individuals to attend the meeting to aid in the understanding of particular items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputising arrangements</td>
<td>Members of the Project group unable to attend a meeting should request an informed deputy to attend on their behalf to feed in related information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda &amp; Papers</td>
<td>An agenda for each meeting, together with relevant papers, will be forwarded to group members prior to the meeting. The Administrative function for the Project will be via Barnardo’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Group members will approve minutes of the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Terms of Reference

**Appendix 3**

**Terms of Reference**

**CHOICES Multi-Agency Panel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee/Group</th>
<th>CHOICES – Multi-Agency Panel (MAP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability &amp; Reporting Mechanisms</td>
<td>Accountable to Choices – Strategic Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other Groups/Committees</td>
<td>Barnardo’s, YOT, Young Peoples Participation Group, Keighley Locality Partnership, Keighley Neighbourhood Policing Team, Family Ambassadors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Purpose of the Committee/Group | The Multi-Agency Panel is made up of supervisors/practitioners that will be accepting referrals, discussing ongoing progress of individual cases, overseeing any safeguarding issues, identifying any initial risks or challenges to the project to refer to strategy group for advice/action. The CHOICES MAP will ensure through implementation plans fed through from Strategic Steering Group that all partners participate in their key delivery roles to deliver the CHOICES programme to improve the outcomes of the target cohort. This will be achieved by:  
- Balanced, fair and consistent approach to referrals.  
- Enhanced working relationships between all partners working within the CHOICES Programme and prevent duplication of services and resources.  
- Regular review of progress of families and children and young people enrolled within the Programme.  
- Provide a conduit for information on new initiatives.  
- Ensure the experiences, views and opinions of young people and their families are incorporated into service developments. |
| Terms of Reference | The core objectives of the group are to:  
- Identify and approve referrals for the target cohort which services will deliver the CHOICES Programme to.  
- Identify & develop community ambassadors to support and advocate for families and individual young people.  
- Establish and maintain effective communication between all partners.  
- Ensure appropriate actions take place following any safeguarding referrals/incidents.  
- Establish, in co-operation of service users and agreed spectrum of progress measures.  
- Share, review and disseminate best practice across the partnership.  
- Identify and problems or barriers and refer to Strategic Steering Group for resolve.  
- Report back relevant issues to other internal networks |
and groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chair - Helen Dalton  
Barnardo’s - Sonia Evers  
YOT  
Keighley Project 6 – Bev Watts  
KIVCA  
Barnardo’s Voices (FGC Delivery Vehicle)  
Connexions  
Keighley Neighbourhood Policing Team  
Youth Service – Carole Bywater  
Extended Schools Partnership – Helen Mawer |

| Chair |
| Helen Dalton – CSM Work Programme |

| Frequency of meetings |
| During initial referral period to meet weekly, then defer to 4 weekly. |

| Quorum/Attendance |
| A minimum of 4 members of the group is required for any meeting to be quorate.  
From time to time the CHOICES group may wish to invite individuals to attend the meeting to aid in the understanding of particular items. |

| Deputising arrangements |
| Due to the short nature of the project it is essential for representation at each MAP meeting for each partner involved. Should the allocated member of the service not be available an informed deputy should be attend on their behalf. Where possible this information of the attendee to be forwarded to the Chair of the group. |

| Agenda & Papers |
| An agenda for each meeting, together with relevant papers, will be forwarded to group members to arrive five working days before the meeting. |

| Minutes |
| Group members will approve minutes of the meeting. |
**Appendix 4**

**Choices Evaluation Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Measurable outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Aim 1**     | **Young people** show a shift towards **safer thinking and behaviour** with regards (factors shown to correlate with offending and substance misuse):  
- Using alcohol and drugs;  
- Emotional wellbeing;  
- Risk taking;  
- Education & training;  
- Getting in trouble;  
- Family relationships. | **Deliver a tailor-made package of support to young person and family, including: positive activities, NEET prevention, family support, participation activities and education in substance misuse.** | **Reduction in self reported offending and/or substance misuse.**  
**Movement along the 'journey of change' on the Teen Star.** | **Teen Star used at initial assessment and at exit interview.**  
**Case studies follow young person’s journey from initial assessment to exit interview.** |
| **Young people** show a shift towards **developing characteristics** known to counteract risk of offending and substance misuse:  
- Enhanced self-esteem and self efficacy;  
- Improved family relationships;  
- Engaging with education or training. | | | | |
## Aim 2

To increase the capacity of local organisations to identify and respond appropriately to children and young people at risk of substance misuse and/or offending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The model (set-up and delivery) enabled identification, engagement and provision of appropriate support to the relevant young people.</th>
<th>Developing the model in line with relevant intelligence and delivering according to expectations of stakeholders.</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders from partner agencies, the Strategic Steering Group and the Multiagency Panel.</th>
<th>At end of March 2012.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased <strong>use of the Common Assessment Framework</strong> (CAF) or other shared assessments with vulnerable young people in Keighley.</td>
<td>Requesting use of pre-CAF for all referrals and using CAF for assessments when not already in place.</td>
<td>Numbers of Pre-CAF and CAF assessments completed.</td>
<td>At end of March 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased partnership working</strong> and cross-fertilisation of ideas/learning in Keighley.</td>
<td>As above, plus share learning and ideas between voluntary sector organisations.</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders from partner agencies, the Strategic Steering Group and the Multiagency Panel.</td>
<td>At end of March 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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