**Appendix 2: Advocacy strategy for achieving change**

This section of the report sets out the advocacy which will be needed in order to start to bring about the changes we have identified. It starts with the key principles which underpin the strategy, moves on to provide more detail on how each of the 15 key recommendations could be delivered, and finishes with the section ‘Potential ways forward’ which sets out suggestions for an overarching approach to continuing the work.

*[note: recommendations in strategy will be cross-referenced with relevant page numbers from main report once that has been laid out by the designer]*

Key principles

The recommendations and the strategy for delivering them are based on four overarching principles. These emerged very early on during the research. They clearly reflect the voices and concerns of all the young people who took part. They are:

*1) Policy-makers should listen to and act on what young people say.*

Employers, landlords, service providers and politicians all need to listen more closely to what young people themselves are saying, and act on what they hear. This will lead to policies and services which are better aligned to the needs of young people. A key principle behind all the recommendations is that young people need to be involved in leading and shaping them.

*2) Supply and quality need to be increased, in both housing and in ETE. Achieving this will give more young people the opportunity to live and work independently.*

Previous generations could generally assume that there would come a point in their lives when they could live independently. This is no longer true. Changes are needed which will increase the availability of affordable housing, and which will deliver better education, training and employment opportunities. These changes could have a huge impact on young people’s life chances. Even in a climate of continued economic constraints, there are ways in which some of these changes could be delivered now.

*3) Services which are intended to help young people need to be more appropriate to their needs. In addition, ‘signposting’ to these services needs to be improved.*

Services which are available for young people need to be more directly focused on their actual needs. The quality of services across the region needs to be more consistent. Both young people and the agencies with which they interact need to be more aware of the different services which are available.

*4) National change should also be sought.*

In some instances local change can be effected, often by acting to interpret existing rules more flexibly. In other instances, national change is required. There needs to be a focus on both – the final recommendations set out areas where key national policies which disadvantage young people need to be changed.

Key headings

Each recommendation within the advocacy strategy is set out under specific headings. These are:

- The practical changes which are required

- The key people who need to agree to make the changes

- The people and organisations who can influence these change-makers, and the ways in which the influencers can be reached.

In total there are 15 recommendations. In some cases, we have been able to very clear with regards to who should own and drive the recommendation. In others, more work is needed in order to get to this level of clarity. We have attempted to set out what this work is. Above all, the advocacy strategy should be considered as a ‘live’ document which will need to be changed and adapted as work on it progresses.

***1. Policy-makers should listen to and act on what young people say***

**Recommendation 1(a):**

Council providers of services should adopt the standards for listening to and working with young people which are set out in the National Youth Agency Commissioning Guidelines. Adopting these standards will lead to more effective consultation with young people and will result in better and more cost-effective services.

*Practical changes required*

* Housing, social care and ETE council lead officers across the region should adopt the National Youth Agency (NYA) commissioning guidelines, due to be to be updated in late spring 2019, which require them to listen closely to young people who use their services when determining:

- What outcomes successful services should be trying to achieve

- How well current service providers are achieving those outcomes

- Which providers to commission

* Housing, social care and ETE council lead officers and service managers should undertake training in the broader National Youth Agency ‘Hear By Right’ participation toolkit. This would be a concrete start to a process of ensuring Hampshire becomes a region that genuinely listens to and works with its young people. It is important that it should be the officers in these functional areas who undertake the training, rather than ‘youth’ or ‘participation’ officers. The functional lead officers wield more power, set policy directly, and are more empowered to deliver real change.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Council leaders and chief executives
* Council lead members and functional lead officers in both Housing and ETE

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Council leaders and chief executives can be influenced both directly and by their lead members and senior officers. Where a change of this nature is being sought it is often an engaged lead member who can be the single biggest catalyst for achieving it.
* A short, clear and simple document, setting out the evidence base of the benefits of both the NYA commissioning guidelines and the ‘Hear By Right’ toolkit, needs to be produced. This can then be used as a springboard to meet with and persuade the decision-makers to support adopting the guidelines and ensuring key officers undertake the necessary training. This role could be the work of a single individual for a period of c. 2-3 months. Additional support from the NYA itself should be sought (also see 1(b), below).
* Councils should be lobbied directly, through the use of deputations at council meetings and by asking individual elected members to ‘sign up’ to adopting the guidelines. Cross-party commitment should be obtained. Lead members and their shadow counterparts should be requested to make commitment to adoption of the guidelines one of their political party’s manifesto pledges to young people in the region.

**Recommendation 1(b):**

Council and voluntary sector providers in the region should subsequently work together towards adopting a broader, region-wide standard of ‘listening to and working with young people’ when making policy and commissioning services. This should be branded as the ‘Hampshire Region’s Young People’s Charter’ (or similar) and established as a desirable badge of ‘best practice’ in the region. This is a longer-term change than recommendation 1(a) above and will require a higher level of buy-in.

*Practical changes required*

* A project will need to be established in which housing, social care and ETE council lead officers consult with voluntary sector organisations and other parts of their council organisations to determine which specific elements of the ‘Hear By Right’ Toolkit should be adopted on which to base the Charter. A project of this type is probably best delivered by appointing a lead council to drive it. A similar approach has recently been successful in establishing the regional adoption agency ‘Adopt South’: the project was spearheaded by Hampshire County Council, but also includes Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils along with Isle of Wight Council.
* Objective and consistently-measurable assessment criteria will need to be developed in order to determine which organisations adhere to the Charter.
* Council lead members, lead officers and chief executives will then need to commit to embedding the Charter standard throughout the region. One way in which this can be achieved is by setting a deadline, whereby voluntary organisations which do not meet the Charter criteria will no longer be commissioned to provide services beyond a specific date.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* As with recommendation 1(a) above, political and organisational will is required from senior members and officers. In addition, heads of voluntary sector organisations will need to support the establishment of the Charter. Commissioning rules will play a key role in delivering this buy-in.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Change will in part be influenced by successes delivered from 1(a) whereby adopting the NYA commissioning guidelines starts to deliver more cost-effective and better-tailored young people’s services. This should engender ‘organic’ support from within local authorities which helps make the establishment of a more formal Charter a natural evolutionary development.
* The National Youth Agency already has evidence from councils who have benefited from adopting its ‘Hear By Right’ toolkit. One option for consideration is to formally engage with the National Youth Agency in supporting the delivery of both recommendations 1(a) and 1(b).

***2) Supply and quality need to be increased, in both housing and in ETE. Achieving this will give more young people the opportunity to live and work independently.***

**Recommendation 2(a)**

Local councils in the region should explore whether they can increase the supply of housing to homeless, single, childless 21-25 year-olds (including those in supported accommodation) through ‘Housing First’.

*Practical changes required*

* In the first instance work is required to develop a business case which will help determine whether adopting a Housing First approach to homeless young people in our region will deliver better outcomes for this group than current approaches. The business case should ideally deliver two main objectives: evidence that such an initiative is likely to be economically viable (through cost prevention) and also in terms of measurably beneficial social outcomes. The organisation Homeless Link provide support for doing this, and should be asked to do so.
* Existing Housing First schemes in the UK are generally commissioned by a local authority, with funding additionally supplied in some cases from Public Health England, local Clinical Commissioning Groups, and from Police and Crime Commissioners. Assuming that the business case is positive, then funding should be sought from some or all of these bodies for a local trial of Housing First.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Senior housing officers and lead members for housing. The business case would need to be disseminated among all of these in order to persuade them that a trial scheme would be worth pursuing.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* The key influencer is the business case itself. The nature and availability of local housing stock suitable for single people is one of the key determinants as to whether a scheme is likely to be successful. Once the business case is established then it can be targeted towards the relevant decision-makers in a local authority most suitable for a trial.

Options for different ways in which this work (and many of the other recommendations) could be taken forward are set out under the heading ‘Potential ways forward’, below.

**Recommendation 2(b)**

Research should be funded to develop a model for a sharing agency, initially in Southampton where engagement has been highest, to increase the supply of low-cost, decent-quality shared housing to single non-students. If successful then this model should be rolled out to other areas with similar student/non-student demographics.

*Practical changes required*

* Private landlords in Southampton have traditionally preferred renting out their housing to students who share. However, with increasing amounts of purpose-built student accommodation in the city, landlords are becoming more amenable to the non-student shared market.
* Two potential approaches need to be explored: the first is a ‘minimal’ sharing agency which gives advice and acts as property manager for private landlords, and the second a more ‘maximal’ one which offers more support in order to help sustain tenancies, but is more expensive.
* In the first instance, research should be commissioned in collaboration with a local landlord association such as iHowz to develop a model for a sharing agency. The efficacy of Winchester’s ‘City Lets’ model should also be evaluated. The cost and scope of this research is the next thing which needs to be determined.
* iHowz and others should then establish a trial of a model in Southampton with direct support from Southampton City Council.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* iHowz and the Southampton City council housing lead already support the proposal in principle.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* The influence and progress thus far have emanated directly from the research project. The resource necessary to drive it forward from here needs to be identified – see ‘Potential ways forward’, below.

**Recommendation 2(c)**

Local employers should improve employment conditions, reduce numbers on non-permanent and zero-hours contracts, pay National Living Wage rates for young people, and sign up to a Kitemark ‘to make Hampshire a great place for young people to work’.

*Practical changes required*

* The region’s councils and employers’ organisations should develop a Kitemark for employers who offer the National Living Wage, along with a high percentage of permanent contracts and traineeships and apprenticeships (see below). Further research will be required to understand the full detail of ‘what good looks like’ in this area.
* They should use their communications channels to make the public aware of the Kitemark.
* The percentage of 16-25 year olds earning an hourly rate above the minimum should increase and the percentage employed on non-permanent contracts decrease.
* This change needs to be the start of a process which raises awareness among employers, unions and the wider public of the importance of effecting meaningful change in improving young people’s pay and employment terms.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Employers’ and employees’ organisations - Business South People’s Forum, the Chamber of Commerce, Wessex Federation of Small Businesses, and others
* Trade unions
* ETE lead officers of local authorities
* ETE lead members of local authorities

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* A number of Business South members, along with some unions, are already in agreement on this and should be encouraged to influence the wider employers’ organisations and ETE lead officers (several ETE lead members are also already open to the proposal).
* Participants in this research can also reach influencers by being facilitated to attend employers’ organisation meetings.
* See ‘Potential ways forward’, below.

**Recommendation 2(d)**

As part of making Hampshire a great place for young people to work, local councils and public employers like the NHS should publish the number of their apprentices and trainees who are aged 16/17 and 18-25. Second, as they strive to meet the government target of 2.3% of public sector employees being apprentices by 2021, they should ensure an increasing proportion are from across the 16 to 25 age groups. We suggest that the proportion of 16 and 17-year-olds in apprenticeships and traineeships across Hampshire should be targeted to increase to 15% by 2021 from its current (estimated) level of c.7%

*Practical changes required*

* Local authorities publish the number of apprenticeships they offer, but it is low (0.6% in Hampshire County Council, 0.8% in Southampton City Council and 1.3% at Portsmouth City Council.) No local authorities currently publish details of how many of the apprentices they take on are aged 16-25. The regions’ council leads and senior NHS managers should agree to publish apprenticeship and traineeship numbers by age.
* Council ETE leads and officers should encourage employers to do the same (see below).
* Council ETE leads and officers should ensure that increasing the number of young trainees and apprentices is seen as an integral part of making Hampshire a ‘great place to for young people to work’.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Council leaders and chief executives; senior NHS managers.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Council lead members and lead officers in both ETE and health.
* Participants in this research can reach influencers by being facilitated to attend one of the Solent apprenticeship hub meetings.
* See ‘Potential ways forward’, below.

**Recommendation 2(e)**

As part of making Hampshire a great place for young people to work, local employers should publish the number of their apprentices and trainees who are aged 16/17 and 18-25. They should also work to ensure that the number of traineeships and apprenticeships to 16/17 year olds and 18-25 year olds increases year-on-year.

*Practical changes required*

* Local employers should start to publish their apprenticeship statistics, including the age range of their apprentice cohorts. Publishing this information should also be a key criterion for being awarded the Kitemark.
* Employers should seek local authority advice, such as from the Solent Apprenticeship Hub, about how to use Apprenticeship Levy funds to pay for ‘floating’ support to help recruit and keep young apprentices engaged.
* Solent Apprenticeship Hub and those making decisions about Levy funds should explore linking support from those funds to employers meeting the criteria of ‘making Hampshire a great place for young people to work’.
* Local employers’ organisations participating in ‘Making Hampshire a great place for young people to work’ should publish the figures for how many young apprentices they employ and increase the number each year.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Employers, and employers’ and employees’ organisations – e.g. Business South People’s Forum, the Chamber of Commerce, Wessex Federation of Small Businesses and trade unions.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Council ETE officers can influence some employers through Solent Apprenticeship Hub meetings and by controlling access to Levy funds.
* There is also a need to reach employers directly and through employers’ organisations. Participants in this research can potentially influence employers’ organisations by being facilitated to attend some of their meetings.
* A business case needs to be made which makes a case for specifically targeting NEET young people as part of workforce development (for example, in the way Barclays Bank has done[[1]](#endnote-1)). One route forward from here would be to work with the National Apprenticeship Service to develop this business case.
* ‘Early adopter champions’ for this, and for other aspects of the Kitemark, need to be sought. Enlisting one or more ‘champions’ will make it more likely that the Kitemark will gain the traction necessary to succeed.

**Recommendation 2(f)**

Voluntary sector organisations do not currently monitor how many people they employ from backgrounds similar to those they are trying to help. Young people told us they would like more of the people who help them to come from such backgrounds because they understand them better and act as role models.Voluntary sector organisations helping young people should provide more employment to people from backgrounds similar to those they are trying to help.

*Practical changes required*

* Initial research should be commissioned into current practices in monitoring employee backgrounds in the youth voluntary sector, how an appropriate measure for ‘similar backgrounds’ could be developed, and what recruitment practices could be practically implemented to increase employment of these young people.
* These statistics should be monitored and publicised to act as a spur within the voluntary sector as well as (potentially over time) within other sectors.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* The chief executives of voluntary sector organisations.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* They can be influenced directly and via their HR heads and through trades unions.
* The Blagrave Trust could potentially take a lead role in implementing this recommendation, by engaging with other funding organisations in order to develop a concerted approach on this issue

***3) Services which are intended to help young people need to be more appropriate to their needs. In addition, ‘signposting’ to these services needs to be improved.***

**Recommendation 3(a)**

Some local authorities in Hampshire currently do not offer 16 and 17-year-olds genuine care options and are not implementing the ‘Southwark judgement’. Local councils should fulfil their statutory duty by offering to take homeless 16 and 17-year-olds into care.

*Practical changes required*

* Lead officers in the councils concerned need to change their practices. When local advice centres report accounts of the Southwark judgement not being implemented, council homelessness prevention and social care officers need to investigate them.
* Council leads, children’s services lead members and chief executives in the councils concerned need to agree funding for sufficient numbers of staff to conduct the necessary care assessments.
* Councils need to focus on developing social care solutions for 16 and 17-year-olds which are not simply placements in homeless hostels.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Council officers, particularly homelessness and social care leads, need to acknowledge there is a problem.
* Council leaders, children’s services lead members and chief executives in the councils concerned need to drive change from the top down.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Local advice centres hold evidence of many cases of 16 and 17-year-olds who failed to have the Southwark judgement applied to them, and how their available options were presented to them. This evidence needs to be marshalled and presented to the relevant local authority staff and to elected members. There is a culture of denial of the problem which needs to be addressed.
* ‘Best practice’ in the region should be identified and shared among non-compliant local authorities in order to make it more widespread.
* This is a complex and particularly sensitive policy area and will require a high degree of diplomacy to address. While not desirable, the option of seeking a judicial review on behalf of a client should not be ruled out.

**Recommendation 3(b)**

Some employed young people who become homeless and go into supported accommodation such as hostels do not feel that working full-time makes them better off and find it hard to save for a deposit so that they can move out into rented accommodation. Funders and providers of supported accommodation should remove the ‘benefits trap’ which currently discourages hostel residents from working.

*Practical changes required*

* This is a complex issue that requires more research. Research should be commissioned via Centrepoint and Homeless Link gathering evidence about any schemes which have been introduced elsewhere, including where savings have been achieved as a result of successfully moving young people out of supported accommodation.
* This recommendation should also be directly linked both to a trial of Housing First (recommendation 2(a) and to recommendation 2(b)), the establishment of a shared housing agency for non-students. The cohort of young people currently ‘trapped’ in supported accommodation are most likely to be those who can benefit from one or other of these new approaches.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change/Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* This will need to be established during the research. Locally, both Step by Step and YMCA Southampton have said they are interested in progressing this. The resource needed to coordinate the research efforts is yet to be determined.

**Recommendation 3(c)**

Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) officers need to be encouraged to be more flexible in their interpretation of national rules on Alternative Payment Arrangements (APAs) in order to make it less likely that young tenants will get in to arrears.

*Practical changes required*

* The national rules say all recipients of housing benefit or the housing element of Universal Credit (UC) should be given it directly as the default position, with responsibility to pass it onto the landlord. Young people can apply for APAs so the money goes direct to landlords, but the DWP grant more of these in some parts of the region than others. We would like them all to grant more.
* Hampshire County Council homelessness officers, who have the best record in achieving DWP acceptance of APA requests, should share best practice in encouraging all councils’ homelessness officers to establish relationships with local DWP officers to ensure the acceptance rate for alternative payment arrangements requests on behalf of young claimant tenants increases.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* The Secretary of State for Work and Pensions has already made it clear (in January 2019) there should be more flexibility.
* In the first instance local council homelessness officers need to agree to approach the DWP
* Local DWP officers need to agree to interpret the national rules more consistently across the region.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Hampshire’s homelessness officers, in conjunction with the group set up to take this work forward (see ‘Potential ways forward’, below) should take the lead on this.

**Recommendation 3(d)**

Many young people told us they felt unprepared for post-16 choices and that what was on offer was confusing. Part of the reason for this is that funding for some projects is so short-term that advisers themselves are not sure what is available.

Local authorities and statutory and voluntary sector providers of post-16 education and training and schools should offer better-quality and more up-to-date information about what education training and employment options are available post-16.

*Practical changes required*

* Council ETE officers need to keep websites like ‘Hampshire Futures’ fully up to date
* Council ETE officers should work to strengthen existing region-wide networks of Further Education (FE) providers so that the providers themselves have a better knowledge of what is on offer across different institutions
* Strengthened networks and clearer information about what is available should drive up attendance FE rates and reduce the number of young people who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET).

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Council ETE officers and post-16 ETE providers.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* There is already a degree of buy-in to this recommendation from ETE officers and FE colleges who have taken part in our research.
* Further work is required to (1) set out what best practice in post-16 information websites looks like (Hampshire Futures currently leads the way) and to lobby individual council ETE officers to sign up to delivering this, and (2) to encourage FE providers to improve information-sharing among themselves. Resource will need to be identified to carry out these two pieces of work.

**Recommendation 3(e)**

Local councils and Further Education providers should collaborate to deliver an increase in the numbers of ‘informal’ education and training places, such as Enham College, including work-based traineeships available to 16 and 17-year-olds with few or no qualifications. Initial high-level analysis suggests that an appropriate target could be the doubling of the number of such places (to c. 950 across the Hampshire region) in order to meet demand. More young people should be encouraged to focus on achieving the revised ‘Functional Skills’ standards which come into force in September 2019.

*Practical changes required*

* Council ETE leads and chief executives should prioritise finding funding both for informal college provision and work-based traineeships, particularly after funding from the European Social Fund comes to an end (the exact date of this will depend on the terms under which the UK exits the EU). Planning for what happens after the UK ceases to be a member of the EU (which at time of writing is still the most likely scenario) is something that needs to be happening immediately.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Further Education colleges, other FE providers, and employers all need to focus on how this provision can be delivered.
* Council ETE lead officers and lead members for education should also prioritise this.

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Further analysis is required to understand the ‘true’ level of demand. In the first instance, working with colleges like Enham could help provide this insight and build a more detailed picture of how this type of provision can more effectively complement the existing FE offer in the region.
* As with other aspects of this strategy, a systematic approach is required, as set out in ‘Potential ways forward’, below.

***4. National change should also be sought***

**Recommendation 4(a)**

Local authorities, voluntary sector providers and private landlords should all lend weight to campaigns at the national level which aim to make it easier for young people up to the age of 25 claiming housing benefit to opt in to alternative payment arrangements.

*Practical changes required*

* Local support should be given to national campaigns by the National Landlords’ Association, Shelter, Homeless Link and Centrepoint to press the Department for Work and Pensions to change the national regulations.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* The Secretary of State at the DWP

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Local MPs can be asked to exert influence by writing to the Secretary of State at the DWP.
* Council housing leads, voluntary sector housing chief executives and local landlords’ associations can lobby their local Members of Parliament for support, as well as lobbying directly.
* Resolutions passed by individual councils, based on deputations where young people and landlords work together, could act as a powerful spur towards achieving this

**Recommendation 4(b)**

Local authorities, post-16 ETE providers and employers should support national campaigns for greater flexibility in the funding arrangements for provision of literacy and numeracy post-16, including greater recognition of the value of Functional Skills.

*Practical changes required*

* The Department for Education needs to relax its current regulations which attach FE funding to the requirement to enter all those with Grade 2 or above at GCSE Maths or English for repeated re-sits, so that a larger number of students can study Functional Skills, leading to greater engagement with education and training post 16.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* The Minister of State for Apprenticeships and Skills, and the Secretary of State for Education

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* Local MPs can be asked to exert influence by writing to the relevant ministers.
* Council ETE leads influence can ask council leaders to reach out to local MPs.

**Recommendation 4(c)**

Local authorities, post-16 ETE providers and employers should support national campaigns for a change in child benefit rules so that parents are as equally incentivised for their child to pursue a post-16 apprenticeship as they are for a college course.

*Key people who need to agree to make the change*

* Parliamentary legislation would be required to be passed before the DWP implements the change*.*

*Who influences these change-makers, and how they can be reached*

* The Secretary of State at DWP needs to agree.
* The 2018 Education Select Committee members and Conservative MPs who have previously advocated this change in Private Members’ Bills should influence the Secretary of State, including citing the Audit Commission evidence estimate that such a change would cost £100 million.
* Local MPs should be lobbied to influence relevant ministers in both this and future Parliaments

**Potential ways forward**

There is a number of clear and recurrent themes in most, if not all, of the policy recommendations set out above:

More research is required: this ranges from development of specific business cases to further documenting and collating the experiences of young people

There is a need to structure and organise the advocacy work itself (contacting key people, making the case etc.)

Continuing to listen to young people, regardless of levels of support for any specific policy point, is vital; equally vital is making sure there is a direct role for young people in the actual ‘nuts and bolts’ processes of achieving policy change

There are also very clearly some ‘key players’ whose support will be important to enlist in order to effect changes. These are (among others) council leaders, lead officers and members for ETE and housing, heads of FE institutions, leaders of large employers and of employers’ organisations, and trades unions.

In practice, it will be most effective to seek to engage with these key individuals and introduce a coherent ‘whole agenda’ for change, rather than adopt a piecemeal approach.

To deliver the strategy, therefore, there are two broad approaches which could be adopted:

The first would be to establish a group to take forward all the proposals in the report. This would mean seeking funding for a single coordinating/delivery organisation for all the work, and working with youth agencies, including (although not exclusively) current Blagrave partners.

The second would be to advance different proposals separately. In practice this would mean some or all of the housing-related proposals, and some or all of the ETE ones. This could be achieved by seeking funding for leads in each area. This could potentially be a new group, or taken forward by an existing organisation.

Either approach would see the implementing group(s) seeking to meet with the ‘key’ people to introduce the whole agenda for change, with perhaps with the hope of them nominating themselves or other colleagues to take a lead (or at least be a future point of contact).

There is also an additional case for forming a specific coalition of groups to push on with the ‘listening to young people’ aspects of the work, irrespective of which of the two options above is adopted.

The Southern Policy Centre and our peer researchers believe that this project has identified practical deliverable changes that would respond to many of the key problems identified and experienced by young people. We hope that those supporting young people can find ways to take forward the recommendations in this report, by continuing to work with young people themselves.

1. https://www.learningandwork.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/NEET\_Case-Studies-Final-Version.pdf [↑](#endnote-ref-1)