

## **Executive Summary**

### **Report on voluntary and community sector organisations and young people in Hull**

In April 2004 Volcom received funding for the All Our Futures project which aims to develop a study support market in Hull between schools and the voluntary and community sector. In order to scope out the ground and gain an understanding of the capacity that already existed in the city within the sector, a questionnaire was sent out to 600 groups in the city using existing contacts and networks as well as being posted on the web. This questionnaire sought to find out which groups were currently working with children and/or young people (aged 0-19), as well as which groups had done in the past or would like to in the future. Ninety-five questionnaires were returned and the following report is an analysis of what those groups had to say.

#### **Who organisations work with**

The majority of organisations (65%) targeted particular groups of young people. Of the organisations that targeted particular groups, the vast majority (84%) did so geographically. The areas targeted the most by groups were East (36%), Riverside (26%), North Carr (21%) and West (15%). Fewer groups targeted Northern (9.5%), Park (9.5%) or Wyke (7%) areas.

Whilst the areas targeted most by organisations contain some of the most deprived wards in the city, all of the areas score relatively highly on the levels of multiple deprivation, child poverty and low educational attainment when compared to the rest of the country. It could be argued therefore that young people in all areas of the city need the same level of support.

The majority of organisations worked with a wide range of age groups. Just under half (43%) of the groups worked with all ages including adults, meaning that there is great potential for family learning in the city. Other groups worked with a range of ages within the early years to 16+ spectrum; for example KS3 to 16+, or early years to KS2. Other target groups included disadvantaged or disengaged young people; those with learning disabilities; reading difficulties; physical disabilities or those linked to a specific school or organisation.

#### **Activities groups offer**

The activities offered by groups included: sport, support work, clubs, computers, art, trips, drama and dance, digital media, games and outward bounds. Some groups specialised in offering one activity, for example rugby, whereas others offered a variety of things to do, often in a youth club setting. Within each category of activity there was a great deal of diversity in the capacity of the organisations offering them and the structure and formality of the organisation;

for example under sport one group might offer a kick about with a football whilst another might provide professional training and the chance to compete and gain certificates.

Some types of activity were offered by several organisations, whereas other activities were either not offered at all or only rarely by the groups that responded to this research. Art, sport and drama were well represented. However the sports category was heavily focussed on football, rugby, athletics and boxing; there was no mention of sports like netball, hockey or gymnastics for example. Music was only mentioned by one group. It is of course possible that organisations offering these things did not respond to the survey but do exist in the city.

### **When groups work with young people**

Just over half (57%) of groups worked with young people in school hours, indicating that many groups are already working with schools in some way to deliver activities to children. The majority of groups (72%) offered activities in the evening. Over half (54%) offered activities at the weekend and just under half (43%) offered them straight after school.

Only 15% worked with young people before school. However there are 47 Primary school breakfast clubs in the city according to a Hull Daily Mail article (Young 11/02/ 05); it is likely that these are run by the schools themselves rather than by voluntary or community groups and therefore they did not reply to the questionnaire. The vast majority of groups (69%) worked with young people both during term time and school holidays ensuring continuity of provision.

### **Partnership working**

Only 10% of groups never worked in partnership with other organisations. The vast majority (90%) worked in partnership either all (60%) or some of the time (30%). Just over half of the groups already work in partnership with Primary (51%) and/or Secondary schools (52%). Groups also worked with the Youth Service (45%), Faith Groups (31%), the Police (29%) and charities (18%). Nearly 70% of groups also worked with other partners, some of which were registered charities as well such as Duke of Edinburgh Award or Girl Guides.

### **National Curriculum**

Whilst a minority of groups seemed to understand clearly how their activities linked to the National Curriculum, for a bigger proportion it was not clear whether they did or not. Some groups wanted help in understanding how they could relate what they did to the curriculum. Even with greater understanding of what this entails, it is likely that several groups will want to keep their activities independent of the National Curriculum.

## Qualifications

Just over half of all groups (55%) gave young people the opportunity to gain a qualification or award. These ranged from internal certificates of achievement awarded by the group to external awards such as Duke of Edinburgh, ASDAN or NVQ's.

## Barriers and enablers

The two key issues that came from groups were funding and staffing. The vast majority of groups (81%) said that lack of funds was a barrier to them working with young people. Half of the groups said that a lack of volunteers was a problem, but having committed volunteers was thought by groups to be the most important enabler of their work with young people with 73% saying this helped their group run activities. Some groups also said that finding paid staff with the appropriate skills and experience was difficult. Lack of funding and volunteers were the two main reasons given by groups for no longer running activities for young people when they had done previously.

## Funding

The biggest sources of funding for groups came from small local grants with 64% of groups receiving money this way. Many groups had various funding streams; however the majority of money came from more easily accessible pots of money such as grants from trusts and foundations (40%) or was raised by groups themselves; through fundraising events (44%) or charging young people to participate (36%). Funding streams that deliberately targeted community groups such as the Community Fund's Awards for All were more popular (22%) than more complex sources such as the main programme of the Community Fund (11%).

Just under a fifth (19%) of groups received occasional funding to deliver services to schools.

Only 7% of groups were contract holders delivering services straight to school. Overall groups said they wanted easier access to funding and more stability in their funding. A sustainable market with schools paying for the services offered by the voluntary and community sector has the potential to create these conditions.