



## ECPA/BPC 2009

**Please answer the following questions in English.**

1. Is this your county's ECPA entry or is it an additional project? (Only one ECPA entry per country plus up to two other projects.)

This is the United Kingdom's ECPA entry

2. What is the title of the project?

# **Charlton Athletic Social Inclusion Programme**

3. Please give a short general description of the project.

Kent is one of the largest counties within the UK and is situated south east of London. Due to Kent's geography and demographic profile, it has a high number of old housing estates and a very high level of young people. As a result of these and other factors, the project focused on re-engaging 'at risk' young people in areas highlighted by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) by using professional football coaching as a vehicle for engagement. At a macro level, high IMD areas within Kent were identified, but at micro level it was recognised that each community had its own particular problems of young people becoming bored, acting in an anti social manner and becoming involved in crime.

A Partnership was formed of key stakeholders within each community to form Problem Orientated Partnerships (POPs) as a steering group, to identify each of the problems using the SARA model (Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment).

**Scanning:** To support identification of the problem, Police and the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) used statistical data to create a comprehensive assessment. This also included:

- school retention and exclusion information
- school behavioural and record of achievement data
- the Home Office designed 'Substance Project Reporting System' measuring the Every Child Matters outcomes

Through consultation with local community groups, outreach workers, community wardens and most importantly the young people, it was apparent that were significant areas where there was risk to young people becoming involved in ASB and criminality. This process also afforded consultation in identifying the validity of any

potential responses to promote social responsibility, encourage consequential thinking and raising aspirations. There is clearly further criminal consequences resulting from high levels of 'at risk' young people, as they can often get drawn into other street based ASB, crime and disorder. This project was the catalyst to engaging 'at risk' young people, as it allowed the coaches to engage with the young people within schools.

**Analysis** - To design a countywide programme to address the objectives would have been misguided. To identify and measure the extent of the real problem presented, in 2006 each district in Kent & Medway, multi-agency steering groups were set up so that the relevant data to the particular area / problem could be identified. Steering group members included CDRPs, Housing Associations, Youth Service and other support groups. The steering groups were dual-purpose:

- to bring particular agency problems to the attention of other partners who were working towards similar goals
- to use the combined knowledge and skill-set of the group to provide solutions

Analysis identified that the real problems were created by a combination of underlying issues of boredom, at risk status and exclusion of young people. This often led to young people congregating in groups, at key locations, causing high levels of ASB, underage drinking violence, graffiti, criminal damage and general disregard for these areas. This increased the fear and perceptions of fear of crime amongst residents. Further analysis of this problem suggested that crime and the perceptions of crime could be impacted upon by:

- Providing suitable places for young people (victims/offenders) to meet (location) and socialise within a controlled environment (capable guardians).
- Introducing an educational support programme within and beyond schools for young people who had social issues.





Under achievement, truancy and exclusion from school were prevalent in the identified areas. Data taken from the Kent Police incident System for Tasking and Operational Resource Management (STORM) suggested the most appropriate time for diversionary sessions was between 3pm-8pm. The partners mentioned validated this, as they were also stakeholders in addressing crime and ASB, whilst also cross referencing with the Kent Crime & Victimisation Survey.

Having engaged with both the young people and partners, it was clear that previous tactics had not worked in engaging them away from their meeting places within the community. Young people did not want to engage with what was available due to the nature of the activities and time/locations. This is supported by Home Office research regarding the availability of local and accessible youth activities at key times of the week. Using Cohen and Felson (1993) Routine Activity Theory, the young people would act in an anti social way due to their choice of environmental locations and lack of capable guardians. Partners fully support environmental design and enforcement; however this has only impacted on the symptom temporarily or moved the problem elsewhere.

Having analysed the cause and symptoms of the problems above, knowing what these young people wanted, coupled with previous engagement tactics such as outreach and with hard to reach groups, the steering groups sought to set clear objectives and performance measurements.

#### 4. Please describe the objective(s) of the project.

As this was a true partnership, stakeholders set objectives using the SMART model (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely) to achieve during 2007-2008.

Targets were to:

- reduce exclusion rates in 2000 pupils identified at risk
- increase 'in school' attendance by 4%
- decrease the number of PE refusers by 25%
- reduce ASB reports, by 25% from those wards where the sessions were running
- create a sense of community responsibility

If partners could achieve these targets, they believed that the inclusion of positive activities that young people wanted would reduce the ASB, disorder and fear of crime mentioned previously for the longer term.

#### 5. How was the project implemented?

**Response** - Mindful of sustainability of this project that was initially founded to support young people; it became a community project, encompassing the areas by involving the local communities and councils. To remain flexible within the

communities, the project could be moved to other locations, days/time that were suffering similar issues.

After liaising with the young people and partners, appropriate areas were identified where Charlton football-training sessions could be set up on areas such as playing fields and open spaces. This ensured that young people were attracted to a central place away from usual gathering places, where they could meet in a supervised environment with trained football coaches. These areas attracted both young males and females. Partner agencies would also attend the sessions to support, engage and build relationships with young people.



The steering groups identified key target areas and groups of young people to deploy the schemes, which involved extensive coaching within estates and communities, as well as within schools across Kent. Identification for coaching also took place in alternative curriculum programmes and pupil referral units, targeting young people, who for various reasons, had become disengaged from mainstream education. Significantly, the delivery was not restricted to football but provided a large number of various forms of activities and programmes, designed to engage young people, including outreach to the homeless, asylum seekers, young offenders and groups/gangs. These included:

- life skills programmes
- teenage pregnancy awareness
- netball
- basketball
- fishing
- first aid
- boxing
- dance
- one to one mentoring



Partners had to be cognisant of the needs of all stakeholders and the young people when delivering new activities and outreach work. To address the educational issues, schools across Kent and South East London agreed to take part in a project involving Charlton coaches and coordinators, who brought a wide range of experiences to the scheme. Consultation was key to ensuring that tailored responses were flexible depending on the profile of the group, locations and funding. New ways of working between partners also included using these responses to other wards that were experiencing similar emerging issues.

Problem solving was critical when taking decisions in both operational and strategic settings. This was particularly the case in terms of coordinators ability to think laterally and develop new pragmatic ways of broadening the capacity of the scheme, thus forming partnerships with other agencies. There were some coordinators who exceeded the benchmark in terms of their ability to establish a rapport with the young people, running 3 hourly weekly workshops for them who were chosen for various reasons, including:

- History of truancy
- Under achievers
- Social, psychological or physical issues
- Low self esteem

These workshops ran on a 10-week basis, which included education on:

- Personal safety (including the internet)
- Social responsibility & respect
- Peer pressure & bullying
- Cannabis & Smoking
- Alcohol awareness
- Healthy Eating
- Fitness & group sport
- Numeracy & literacy
- Racism & stereotyping
- Guns & Knives

The decision to choose this response, that developed further to solve new problems as they arose, was the ability that Charlton have of engaging hard-to-reach young people. The decision appears to be justified as all of the main objectives have been met. In addition to many of the softer outcomes that, in many instances, are at the root of the causes of crime such as improved psychological and emotional wellbeing, raised aspirations, improved community cohesion, support for young offenders to gain employability skills and bespoke entry to employment programmes for young adults.

Steering groups have a range of monitoring tools in place coupled with the programme's ability to be responsive, ensuring that effective review and evaluation procedures are in place. Partners paid for the costs of the scheme, as it addressed their performance indicators. The cost per young person attending a 1.5 hour session, which was free to them, cost £2.81. As a result of the value for money and review, agency partners continued to finance the scheme in 2009.

Further detailed responses are also included in the '**Summary of Measurable Impact by Canterbury Christchurch University**', as this provides a good indicator of the impact of the responses used.



*Tessa Jowell M.P. expresses Government support at an estate session*

6. Were partners involved in planning and/or development and/or implementation of the project? If so, who were they, and what were their roles?

Steering groups took ownership of the problems and responses by implementing a range of local solutions. Partnerships flourished and included:

- The Home Office
- Police
- Kent County Council
- Kent Fire & Rescue Service
- Charlton Athletic Community Trust (CACT)
- Kent Football Association
- The Football Foundation
- Network Rail
- Local CDRPs and Steering Groups
- Housing providers
- Youth related partners
- Schools, colleges and alternative education providers

Agencies came together creating specific partnerships such as the Kent Partnership and the London Partnership, which were formed to monitor and support the project. This cumulated in the signing of the 'Partnership Agreement', with the objective of

'Building Safer, Stronger and Flourishing Communities, by supporting collaboration across Kent'. This added an extra element by assisting in developing and enhancing the project by raising awareness amongst communities and other agencies, thus assisting in supporting the young people further.



*The Launch – Working towards the same agenda.*

7. How did you build in plans to measure the performance of the project? Has the project been evaluated? How, and by whom?

Assessment and evaluation was always going to be problematic as it is very difficult to attribute cause and affect when so many variables are interacting. Recognising there were many ways to collect raw data, the decision was taken to commission **Canterbury Christ Church University** to undertake a two-year empirical evaluation to measure the effectiveness of the programme, measuring not only reductions in ASB and youth crime, but also how the attitudes and knowledge base of participants altered during their time on the programme.

In addition, the Strategic and local steering groups managed the performance of the project to ensure each agency's objectives could be addressed and milestones maintained.

Deployments of the schemes on the estates were managed locally and proved dynamic in catering for the changing needs of the young people and the wider community. The impact of the local schemes was monitored weekly to ensure the activity addressed local needs, the schemes objectives and any displacement.

In addition to the university evaluation, other awarding bodies have assessed the scheme. Some of the awards include:



- 2007 BITC Big Tick Award – Excellence in Community Work
- 2007 BITC Silver Jubilee Award – Community Engagement
- 2008 BITC Best Impact Project in Kent
- 2008 Football League Family Excellence Award
- 2008 Football League Best Community Club of the Year
- 2009 Football League Community Club of the Year
- 2009 Football League Family Excellence Award
- 2009 Tilley Award Winner

8. What were the results? How far were the objectives of the project achieved?

The university findings identified that the key objectives were achieved and exceeded:

The key objectives achieved were:

- Reduced exclusions rates in 2000 pupils identified at risk (**zero exclusions 2007/8**)
- Increased 'in school' attendance by 4% (**achieved 4%**)
- Decreased number of PE refusers by 25% (**112 PE refusers, 60 re-engaged = 67% target achieved**)
- Reduced ASB reports by 25% in those wards where the sessions were running (**achieved an aggregate of 27%**)
- The creation of a sense of community responsibility (**achieved and evidenced by the CCCU review**)

#### **Additional University Findings:**

##### **School educational projects:**

School staff selected which young people would take part. There was some variation in the process, with a limited number of schools still selecting 'naughty kids'. However, the majority of schools carefully selected young people they felt would benefit from the scheme, largely those with low self-esteem.

*"We've got some very needy students. Over 50% of our cohort are special needs students so we have got some very needy students, some [from] very poor backgrounds, 60% from broken homes, large numbers in care, so for me, academic isn't as important as social development.. . I would justify this [it] to governors, etc. in terms of engagement. Significant numbers of our kids... it is difficult to get them to access the curriculum. There are more children sitting out of lessons that you would hope".*

In relation to the school based sessions, discussions with a range of school staff and



young people revealed that there were a number of very rich perceived benefits to be gained by participating in the scheme. There was also evidence that the scheme had improved young people's behaviour and self esteem. A number of schools commented on this:

*"I would say that has been a major step forward, the group of more vulnerable students I think have developed themselves, self awareness, more confidence, I think that is across the board, but it's very difficult to evaluate it rather than be anecdotal'. 'This is part of the holistic experience we give the children. It would not be possible say a particular child has a particular outcome from this particular project."*

### **School workshops:**

These have been highly successful with schools reporting the benefits of the scheme. One primary school head teacher was asked by an Ofsted Inspector for evidence to prove the value of allowing children to participate in the scheme instead of working on the National Curriculum. The head teacher produced a detailed case study of a pupil detailing marked improvements not just in behaviour but also in academic performance.

It is possible to make comments on fixed term exclusions and overall absence rates. For example, Year 9 pupils participating in the summer term had no exclusions compared with 20% the previous year. Year 7 students who participated in the summer started the year with relatively high absence rates, which increased considerably in the Spring, but noticeably reduced in the term when they were in the scheme. There was also strong qualitative evidence that involvement in the scheme led to increased school attendance by young people.

### **Behaviour and Self-Esteem:**

Schools carefully selected young people who they felt would benefit from the scheme, largely those with low self-esteem. There is also evidence that the scheme has improved young people's behaviour and self esteem. Evidence emerged from school-based and estate-based case studies and from interviews with young people and other agencies. The emphasis placed on the importance of 'respect' on and off the pitch by the coordinators and coaches was extremely important, as this enhanced the behaviour of many young people and provided them with a positive role model.

There were also a number of individual case studies of young people who had benefited hugely from the mentoring and training provided by coordinators.

### **Anti-Social Behaviour:**

The CCCU evaluation has shown extremely strong qualitative evidence that the scheme led to a reduction in anti-social behaviour on the estates where the sessions took place. Whilst difficult to detail all the reasons for reductions or increases in ASB, the impact of the Charlton scheme on anti-social behaviour suggests that anti-social behaviour was reduced by 1% in 'Area a', 7% in 'Area b', 35% in 'Area c' and 59% in

'area d', with an aggregated reduction of 27%.

**Residents' perceptions:**

These included that crime in these areas improved, especially by the marked decline in young people hanging round in groups.

**Activities/Responses:**

The extensive coaching in estates and wards has been identified by local and county agencies, as well as within schools across the Kent. Coaching also took place in alternative curriculum programmes and pupil referral units, supporting young people, who for various reasons have become disengaged from mainstream education.



**Guns & Knives:**

The scheme highlighted other opportunities to support young people and work together, one being the development and production of a guns & knives education pack. This pack has been launched on a countywide level across schools and is delivered by Charlton coaches, Police Safer School Partnership Officers, Schools and partners. It includes a board game on consequences, information support for the workshop deliverer, a DVD that was made in partnership with young people from a school, Police and partners.

9. Are there reports or documents available on the project? In print or on the Web? Please, give references to the most relevant ones.

There are various reports and documents about the project, which include:

- Commissioned Canterbury Christ Church University Department of Educational Research, two-year empirical evaluation.
- Educational DVD material on Guns and Knives.

All copies are available from the author.



10. Please write a one-page description of the project.

Kent is one of the largest counties within the UK and is situated south east of London. Due to Kent's geography and demographic profile, it has a high number of old housing estates and a very high level of young people. As a result of these and other factors, the project focused on re-engaging 'at risk' young people in areas highlighted by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) by using professional football coaching as a vehicle for engagement. At a macro level, high IMD areas within Kent were identified, but at micro level it was recognised that each community had its own particular problems of young people becoming bored, acting in an anti social manner and becoming involved in crime. Analysis identified that the real problems were created by a combination of underlying issues of boredom, at risk status and exclusion of young people. This often led to young people congregating in groups, at key locations, causing high levels of ASB, underage drinking violence, graffiti, criminal damage and general disregard for these areas.

The Charlton Athletic Social Inclusion Programme offered young people a chance to get involved in something fun and positive, whilst spending time with young people from other communities and backgrounds. Agencies came together creating specific partnerships such as the Kent and London Partnerships that were formed to monitor and support the project, which culminated in the signing of the 'Partnership Agreement'. The key objectives that were set and achieved for 2007-2008 were:

- Reduced exclusions rates in 2000 pupils identified at risk (**zero exclusions 2007/8**)
- Increased 'in school' attendance by 4% (**achieved 4%**)
- Decreased number of PE refusers by 25% (**112 PE refusers, 60 re-engaged = 67% target achieved**)
- Reduced ASB reports by 25% in those wards where the sessions were running (**achieved an aggregate of 27%**)
- The creation of a sense of community responsibility (**achieved and evidenced by the Canterbury Christ Church University review**)

Through consultation with local community groups, outreach workers, community wardens and most importantly the young people, it was apparent that there was significant risk to young people becoming involved in ASB and criminality. Charlton football coaches and partners set up football coaching sessions in problematic estates as a vehicle to provide alternative activities and win the trust and confidence of the young people. Overtime, their trust was gained and other educational activities were introduced for both male and female participants. These included personal safety (including the internet), social responsibility & respect, peer pressure & bullying, cannabis & smoking, alcohol awareness, healthy eating, fitness & group sport, numeracy & literacy, racism & stereotyping and guns & knives. In addition, many other sporting activities were introduced.

Canterbury Christ Church University undertook a two-year empirical evaluation to measure the effectiveness of the programme, including the objectives achieved and how the attitudes and knowledge base of participants altered during their time on the programme. This programme has been replicated across Kent, South London and as far as South Africa. It is the biggest community football scheme in Europe reaching over 96,000 young people during 2008.