Communities In Transition

Participatory Design Process – Reporting Template

Please complete this report following each participatory design session (i.e. one per session) to record the key of the discussion. Please use the sections below to structure the report. If any area was not covered during the discussion, please note that in the relevant section.

Please return the completed report to cit@cooperationireland.org within one week of each participatory design session.1

Area: Ardoyne- New Lodge

Theme: Young People

Date: 24 January 2019

Number of attendees: 12

1. **Proposed interventions discussed to address the issues identified in Phase 1 fieldwork?**

A number of projects were suggested at the workshop. All of them were directed at supporting a culture of lawfulness through civic leadership and support for young people at-risk. Overall the theme was creating a supportive environment in which the key approach to young people at-risk was framed within a values based concept: "Somewhere to go, someone to talk to, something to do." However, there was an acceptance that B4 projects had to escape the usual suspects involving the same young people in multiple projects. Participants spoke about the 'power of positive disruption' as a key asset of youth work and the importance of education with a youth work approach as a mechanism to engage those falling out of the system with their own potential. There was a strong emphasis on the need to ensure that B4 interventions were aligned with youth work interventions being made under the A4 measure. More specifically, people noted:

   a. **Support for the training and development of local detached youth workers**: Detached youthwork has a strong track record of engaging young people who are alienated form official structures. Many will not or do not attend local clubs and require one on one engagement. However detached youthwork is a skill, which requires investment and development, especially for early youth workers. This was particularly important at weekends. There was a sense that this could build on work already pioneered with the DPCSP. However, this peer approach holds out hope of engaging many hard-to-reach young people. The participants felt that this was an area of specific

intervention for the Ardoyne and New Lodge areas where there was insufficient resources;

b. **Mentoring Programme for young leaders**: Mentoring is a critical way to enable young people to bridge into adulthood. Working on the 'One Good Adult' principle, the opportunity for young leadership to develop requires specific attention in B4 areas. This could be facilitated through youth organisations with a presence in the area;

c. **Development programme for 16-18 year olds**: Youth workers expressed concern that young people stop accessing youth services after 16. The priority was to create a future-orientated horizon for young people. This would require the development of 'outward and forward programmes', which raised horizons and aspiration. There was strong participant support for the idea that international educational, leadership and partnership opportunities were central to such a programme. Many examples of success in this area were offered at the workshop;

d. **Support for year-round provision of youth services**: Summer poses a particular time of risk for young people. Nine weeks outside school is a long time for low-income neighbourhoods to support young people. Support for summer provision of youth services in B4 areas would be a contribution to lawfulness and allow for the demonstration of value of this kind of service. This also requires a budget for event's and programmes that can be accessed relatively quickly;

e. **Training support for youth workers on key issues**: It is important that leaders are regularly updated with best practice. This includes support for youth leader in developing restorative practice. Young leaders should be offered OCN training in criminal justice-related issues. This should be a B4 priority which is connected to other measures and programmes;

f. **A programme of inter-generational work involving young people**: There is a lack of direct connection in the cultures of young people and older people, yet this is part of giving people a sense of pride in their identity and area. The participants spoke of this as providing a 'scaffolding for youth work.' This would be a contribution to building up the pro-social capital in the area, and could be extended on a cross-community basis, as are many other programmes;

g. **Support for youth workers working directly with the police service:** Much of the discussion in this element focussed on the threats posed to young people and youth workers working with the police. Many participants spoke of the need for police to calibrate their actions under the programme to ensure that there was a strong neighbourhood presence and a sustained community capacity to engage with the police.

2. **Comments on current community capacity to address issues identified?**

There was broad consensus that both Ardoyne and New Lodge had a well-resourced youth sector. Furthermore, there was an acknowledgement that some interventions relied on the participation of the same young people in many of the activities. At the same time, the participants acknowledged the importance of high-quality targeted youth work, and the focus of the workshop was strongly on interventions, which would extend and enhance youth service provision in the long term.

For this reason, the focus was on three main aspects:

- Increasing the attractiveness of youth work, especially for hard to reach young people and those over 16;
- Enhancing the quality of youth work especially in relation to restorative practices and targeted provision for detached youth work and summer provision. This also included investment in youth workers;
- A civic culture for youth work which included inter-generational work and an appropriate relationship with policing at neighbourhood level.

3. **Outcomes that participants suggested these interventions would achieve?**

a. Maximum engagement of youth work with young people, supporting a higher level of identity and engagement with community and pro-social attitudes – Outcome: more pro-social community life and active participation;
b. Building an alternative to a culture of violence - Outcome: lower level of alienation and violence;
c. An investment for all under-18s in a civic culture in an area where this has not always been consistent with sustainable effects. Outcome: Greater participation in community life;
d. Greater focus for young people on their potential and aspiration. Outcome: More young people in education, employment and training and then in work.

4. **How did participants suggest will we know if these projects/interventions have succeeded? (indicators/measures)**

a. More participation in youth programmes, especially among hard-to-reach groups and over 18;
b. Lower levels of reported violence in the community and greater positive contact with the police at local level. (Higher confidence in policing among young people);
c. Greater level of expertise in youth workers measured by their capacity to engage with key groups;

d. A high participation in summer programmes and reduced threat and violence;
e. Spread in restorative practices in response to anti-social behaviour.

5. **Target beneficiaries/participants of the suggested interventions?**

- Young people not in youth work;
- Young people aged 16-18;
- Young youth workers in early careers;
- Community cohesion at inter-generational level.

6. **How did participants suggest these projects/interventions will build the capacity/capability in the community?**

Investing in young people and youth work is an investment in the quality of life of the whole community, enhances leadership and education and makes a significant contribution to a better community future.

7. **How did participants suggest these projects/interventions will support the overall objectives of the Tackling Paramilitarism Executive Action Plan…?**
   a. **Paramilitarism has no place.**

Engaging with 'at risk' young people ensures that their potential involvement with armed groups can be minimised –either as future members or victims of their activities.

   b. **Citizens and communities feel safe and confident.**

Ultimately this is about reducing and eliminating the pathways, which young people travel in terms of recruitment into armed groups and paramilitary organisations. By reducing the potential pool of new members, you begin to reduce the presence of these groups and lessen their levels of coercive control.

   c. **The public support and have increased confidence in the justice system**

Through these interventions the numbers of young people will reduce in terms of being trapped in the criminal justice system (CJS). Furthermore, the key recipients of the interventions will develop positive and meaningful relationships with agencies in the CJS and increase their knowledge and understanding of the agencies.

d. Support is available for those who wish to move away from paramilitary activity and structures.

For those young people associated with armed groups/paramilitary groups this is an opportunity to access services that will move them away from them.

Finally, the primary focus of the participants was:

- Providing alternatives to violence which were supportive, restorative and pro-social at local level;
- Leading by example in relation to policing and restorative practices;
- Contributing to confidence in justice by making positive associations;
- Reducing the levels of anti-social behaviour and community conflict;
- Challenging the use of violence as a method of community control.

8. Any dependencies identified by participants?

Participants were very clear that the B4 programme must be properly calibrated with A4 and A5 within the programme. Without this the B4 programme will fail.

Other youth interventions under Department of Education budgets and priorities and T:BUC investments should be fully aligned.

9. Any risks identified by participants?

- **Risks to workers and young people:** All work with police is subject to contention from some elements in the community. Finding ways to overcome this is a community priority but it requires active support from other organisations and community leadership. Risks to young people are the primary commitment of youth workers and must always be prioritised even if this means changing programmes and contacts with police.
- **Risks in detached youth work:** Detached youth work is inherently risky. There is no guarantee in every case that it will 'succeed' in engaging every person. Part of the principle of the work is to allow young people to engage at their own pace. There is a further risk where those on the streets have no training and no real understanding of the risks of the work.
- **Risk of duplication of investment:** The participants accepted that simply duplicating current investments would not achieve the required change. There was a very mature conversation about the need to ensure that resources were targeted and not based on general arguments of need. It was accepted that the mainstream youth service was well resourced in these areas.

10. Any other comments made by participants?

N/A

11. Is a further follow-up workshop required? Please provide details.

- A full engagement with those responsible for measures A4 and A5 is required to ensure that the interventions are co-ordinated.

- Submissions from New Lodge CEP in the first consultation period should be revisited to ensure that those ideas developed in community consultation are included in tender possibilities.