

Proudly supporting
youth social action



Department for
Digital, Culture
Media & Sport



DARTINGTON
SERVICE
DESIGN LAB

#iwill Fund Learning Hub Evidence Workstream

Community Benefit and Youth Social Action
Dartington Service Design Lab
June 2019

About the #iwill Fund Learning Hub	2
Introduction	4
Who benefits from youth social action?	5
Value flows in youth social action	7
Evidence for community benefit	11
Measurement of community benefit	13
Conclusions and recommendations	16
Acknowledgments and references	17

About the #iwill Fund Learning Hub

This is a report by the #iwill Fund Learning Hub. The #iwill Fund Learning Hub was commissioned to support, and build on, the activities of the #iwill Fund. It has two strategic objectives:

1. To inform the strategic and investment direction of the #iwill Fund. This will ensure that the Leadership Board and #iwill Fund delivery partners are able to target funds into the right areas, ages and approaches, where it is really needed.
2. To strengthen and connect the youth social action sector by enabling and facilitating the sharing of learning, data and insights across delivery partners, including what does and doesn't work. Sharing key insights and learning more broadly within the wider youth social action sector.

The Learning Hub has developed three workstreams which will support its objectives. This will allow us to support funders in making decisions about how to support youth social action now, and to capitalise on the evidence generated through the #iwill Fund to create a legacy of evidence to support funding and delivery in the future.

1) Systems

This work will develop our understanding of barriers and enablers in building and strengthening sustained youth social action. It will support the identification of emerging practice and the testing of potential new solutions as well as help guide investment decisions.

(a) Systems Mapping

Co-production workshops, supported by research briefings, will build the understanding of barriers to, and opportunities for, embedding and sustaining youth social action in three priority themes: education, place, and the relationship between youth social action and 'all ages' social action. Workshops are attended by Match Funders, invited grantees, and other invited stakeholders (Sept 2018 – Mar 2019).

(b) Funder Collaboration

A series of 'Lab Storms' will be offered to Match Funders to enable a collaborative approach toward identifying common challenges, and to find and share actionable responses to them. The Lab Storms will support Match Funders to fund as effectively as possible (April 2019 – April 2021).

2) Sector Evidence Plan

This work will build on our understanding of what youth social action achieves; how to reach under-served groups and how to sustain youth social action (Aug 2018 – ongoing). It will draw on

these four information sources to develop and evolve answers to key questions:

- Intra-fund evaluation aggregation
- Extra-fund research aggregation
- Match Funder returns to the #iwill Fund and data from Information Management System
- Results from other workstreams.

3) Quality Practice

This work will deepen our understanding of what it takes to deliver quality youth social action. It will illustrate how delivery organisations define 'double benefit' and how they attempt to both achieve and measure it. This work will support delivery organisations to improve their offer (September 2018 – ongoing). 'The Impact Accelerator', delivered by Generation Change, is an intensive process of impact support, challenge and development – up to 30 organisations will take part in this. Learning from these organisations will be shared more widely to spread knowledge about improvement across the youth social action landscape.

Introduction

This paper is one of a series released as part of the #iwill Fund Learning Hub's Evidence Plan workstream. It takes as its focus the concept of 'community benefit'.

The #iwill Campaign has defined great youth social action as opportunities that satisfy the following six quality principles (also depicted below).ⁱ Youth social action should be:

1. Reflective
2. Challenging
3. Embedded
4. Youth-led
5. Progressive
6. Socially Impactful

This paper addresses the principle that quality youth social action should have social impact. Funders and delivery organisations in the youth social action space commonly refer to social impact as community benefit, so we take this term as the starting point for this paper.



Having a clear intended benefit to a community, cause or social problem distinguishes youth social action from other types of programmatic work with young people, which focus exclusively on potential benefits to the young person. However, given the importance of community benefit, the issue often receives surprisingly little attention in the design and evaluation of youth social action activities.^{ii,iii}

This paper will summarise some frameworks that have been developed to help conceptualise the different types of benefit from youth social action activities before we contribute a framework of our own. We will use our framework to show the types of benefit that have been studied so far and

where there are gaps in the evidence base. We will also address the issue of measuring the community benefit of youth social action, a challenge which has been raised consistently by Match Funders.^{iv} We hope this paper will aid those who fund and deliver youth social action opportunities to think about how their programmes can achieve community benefit and how that benefit could be measured.

Who benefits from youth social action?

In this section we summarise three ways in which the benefits of youth social action programmes have been broken down based on who benefits from the activity. Each perspective is not necessarily better than any of the others; they simply employ different levels of detail when dividing up potential beneficiaries and emphasise different stakeholder groups who might benefit.

Double benefit: young people and community

Double benefit is a key concept for all within the #iwill Fund. The first side of double benefit encompasses benefits to the young people who participate in youth social action. The literature on volunteering, a subsection of social action, has long acknowledged the potential for participation to have a positive effect on volunteers.^v Potential benefits include gaining or improving skills that can be transferred to education and employment opportunities as well as improved emotional and physical wellbeing. Most Match Funders and the organisations they support have focused their programme designs and evaluations on the young person side of double benefit.^{vi} The next paper in this series by the #iwill Fund Learning Hub will focus on the benefits of youth social action to young people.

The other side of double benefit, community benefit, is a flexible concept that can be applied to almost all forms of social impact. A one-grade improvement in a child's maths results following some tutoring by an older pupil, for example, can be considered the community benefit of a youth social action programme. So could the increased enjoyment residents get from a local park because it has been tidied up by young people. Community benefit can also refer to outcomes from increased community cohesion resulting from a youth social action programme promoting mixing between generations to policy changes influenced by young people's campaigns.

To provide some structure to the concept of community benefit, it is helpful to note the different ways in which communities can be defined. Categories of community can overlap: a youth social action programme may create benefits for a community that is defined by a combination of the dimensions listed below. It is also important to note that defining a community is a necessarily exclusive act; some people are included in the community and others are not. This is not something that can be avoided, but it is important to recognise this at the levels of funding and programme design.

Geography. Communities of geography are defined by more or less precisely drawn boundaries around a 'local area' such as a town, neighbourhood, city, county or postcode. A recent report from the #iwill Fund Learning Hub has considered in greater detail the importance of place in youth social action.^{vii}

Culture. Communities of culture are groups of people who may share (among other things) history, language and traditions. Examples of communities of culture include diaspora groups in the UK.

Interest. Communities of interest identify around a shared interest or set of interests. A sports club is an example of a community that aligns around an interest in a particular hobby. Other interests can include the use of a piece of land: a local group may share an interest in keeping a park well-maintained.

Experience. Communities of experience are made up of individuals who share a past or ongoing experience. These can include experiences of physical or mental health difficulties, challenging circumstances such as financial hardship or caring for a relative, or universal experiences such as ageing.

The way in which a youth social action programme may be beneficial to any of these communities can be more or less directly caused by the activities of the programme. Tidying up a park has a very direct impact on visitors' experiences of the park, for example, but a young people's political campaign on behalf of a particular community may only have an effect if other factors are in place. The #iwill Fund Learning Hub will explore this issue further in a forthcoming paper in this series that will develop a typology of youth social action.

Service users: a subset of the community

Social action is a broader concept than volunteering, but the long history of volunteering research is valuable for those trying to understand youth social action today. In 2004, the Institute for Volunteering Research (IVR) developed a framework to help understand the benefits of voluntary action. The *Volunteering Impact Assessment Toolkit* identified four stakeholder groups that could benefit from the work done by a volunteer. As well as the volunteer (or young person) themselves, a community and the organisation for whom the person is volunteering, the *Toolkit* identifies service users as a fourth potential group of beneficiaries.

While it is legitimate to consider benefit to service users simply as benefit to a community, distinguishing service users from the wider community may provide a better understanding of the social impact of a youth social action opportunity in cases where the opportunity is clearly involved in the provision of a service. Patient outcomes would be important to consider when designing and evaluating youth social action in hospitals, for example, as would the wellbeing of residents when

a young person is volunteering in a care home. In these cases, it may be helpful to think about service user benefits (to patients and residents) as separate from community benefits such as increased social cohesion. It is therefore important to recognise that these frameworks are not necessarily better than one another, but simply provide a different perspective on youth social action opportunities.

Triple benefit: the organisation

Some funders and delivery organisations are using the term 'triple benefit' to emphasise the value of youth social action opportunities to the organisations which create and facilitate the opportunities.^{viii} As well as bringing benefits to the young participant and to a community, a youth social action opportunity may also add value to the organisation providing the opportunity. An #iwill Fund Learning Hub paper on place-based youth social action developed a nested model in which organisations like schools and hospitals sit within a wider community structure.^{ix} In some cases, it may be helpful to distinguish organisational benefit from wider community impact. Use of the term 'triple benefit' is often motivated by a desire to demonstrate the value of youth social action to an organisation in the hope that the organisation will continue to provide opportunities from its regular budget.^x Pears Foundation, for example, is funding youth social action opportunities in NHS trusts that can be beneficial to the trusts themselves as well as patients (the community).^{xi} Similar work has happened in the adult volunteering space. Research for The King's Fund suggests that NHS trusts see an average return in the order of 10 times the investment they put into each adult volunteer they recruit and train.^{xii} The report argues that "[an] economic assessment can be used to support investment and commissioning of volunteer services". This reflects how the notion of triple benefit is used to articulate the value to an organisation of ongoing investment in youth social action provision.

Value flows in youth social action


The frameworks discussed above provide useful clarity around the concept of community benefit by identifying different stakeholders to whom benefits can accrue. They would be complemented by a framework that accommodates the relationships between the benefits going to different stakeholders. It is important to recognise these links between young people and communities in order to understand the mechanisms of change through which youth social action activities may bring benefits to different stakeholders.

A new framework for value flows

The diagram below is an attempt to create such a framework using value flows to represent the possible ways in which the benefits of youth social action can 'ripple' through individuals and communities. The arrows depict hypothesised value flows around youth social action. Three stakeholder groups to whom benefits may accrue are defined: young people; communities; and organisations that provide social action opportunities. Young people and organisational resources

are inputs to social action activities. Direct benefits may flow to the young participants (*young person benefit*), to communities (*community benefit*) and to the organisation providing the opportunity (*organisational benefit*). Between young people and their community there is *reflexive benefit*, when young people benefit indirectly from benefits to their communities, and *societal benefit*, when communities benefit indirectly from the value that accrues to young people directly.

Societal benefit. Young people belong to communities and continue to do so when they grow up. Some of the benefits from youth social action participation that accrue directly to young people are beneficial to the societies in which they live.



Community benefit. Benefits that accrue to a community directly from the social action that young people are engaged in.

Young person benefit. Young people benefit directly from participating in youth social action.

Organisational benefit. Organisations that provide youth social action opportunities can benefit directly from the activity.

Reflexive benefit. Young people belong to communities. Any benefits that accrue to their communities may also benefit the young person individually.

Societal benefit

In their seminal social profile of volunteers, Musick and Wilson divide the impact of volunteering in a similar way to the concept of double benefit. Instead of 'young person benefits' and 'community benefits', the authors refer to *private goods*, which are "any tangible outcome[s] of volunteer work enjoyed exclusively by the volunteer", and *public goods*, which accrue "not only to the volunteer but to those who did not volunteer at all".^{xiii}

The distinction between public and private benefits, however, is not perfectly clear cut. Some private goods are also "good for society".^{xiv} To use terms more familiar to the current practice of youth social action, it is believed that some changes that occur in young people as a result of social action participation are beneficial not only to the young person themselves, but also to society more widely.




We refer to these as *societal benefits*, because it is hypothesised that the wider community benefits from being made up of more active and socially engaged citizens. Musick and Wilson name two overarching types of such benefits.^{xv}

1. *Citizenship benefits*. Young people are caused by social action participation to become more active citizens now and in their adult life. This could take the form of increased knowledge of political, social and cultural institutions, greater awareness of structural causes of social problems and the need for collective solutions and a strong habit of service that sustains participation in social action throughout the life-course.
2. *Prosocial behaviour*. Youth social action participation encourages behaviour and attitudes that conform to society's expectations and discourages behaviour and attitudes that transgress them. The #iwill Fund Learning Hub will explore the mechanisms through which youth social action participation is hypothesised to impact on prosocial behaviour, and other young person outcomes, in the next paper in this series.

Reflexive benefit

In addition to societal benefits, where the community benefits from changes in young people, some youth social action programmes may also lead to *reflexive benefits*, when young people benefit from the changes they create in their own community. The reflexive benefits are most obvious when young people complete youth social action projects that aim to benefit communities to which they themselves belong. However, a youth social action project that involves young people in helping out at a care home may bring reflexive benefits to young people by helping improve the reputation young people have with other adult members of their community.

This hypothetical example illustrates a case where the IVR framework with four stakeholders can be useful, because it can identify young person benefits (perhaps increased confidence), service user benefits (the care home resident receives a service) and wider community benefits (changing attitudes to young people, reduced loneliness, increased intergenerational cohesion) that in turn has a reflexive benefit for the young people (young people are more accepted in their community). This opportunity may have longer-term societal benefits if the programme encourages the young people who participate to adopt more prosocial and civic attitudes and behaviours.



Evidence for community benefit

One advantage of the value flow diagram depicted above is that we can use it to map the evidence base on the impact of youth social action. The most well-developed bodies of evidence study the potential *young person benefits* of youth social action including those which are of wider *societal* benefit. Some larger-scale youth social action programmes have estimated their *triple benefit* to the organisations in which the opportunities are located. The greatest gap in the evidence base around the impact of youth social action is on its potential *community benefit* and any *reflexive* benefit that young people might derive from this. In the next section, we explore why this gap may have emerged and consider some recommendations that may help funders, researchers and delivery organisations to fill it.

Societal benefit

We will address the potential individual benefits of participation in youth social action in the following paper in this series. However, as noted above, two broad categories of individual benefits of youth social action may also be good for communities: prosocial behaviour and citizenship benefits.

1. Prosocial behaviour

First, youth social action is hypothesised to promote prosocial behaviour in young people which may sustain into adulthood. Based on the available evidence, we cannot conclude with confidence that this hypothesis is true.

A review of American studies into the relationship between volunteering and individual prosocial behaviour in young people concludes that it is unlikely there is a causal relationship from the former to the latter.^{xvi} While young people who volunteer are more likely to conform to social behavioural norms, volunteering does not cause prosocial behaviour in adolescents. Compared to youth work that is focused exclusively on the young person's benefit, the authors advise "caution in concluding that volunteer work offers anything distinctive to the adolescent as far as human development is concerned."^{xvii} In the UK, two waves of randomised control trials that evaluated five youth social action programmes found positive relationships between programme participation and self-reported "character attributes" such as empathy, self-confidence and teamwork.^{xviii,xix} These attitudinal changes are not, however, enough to predict behavioural changes in young people.

2. Citizenship benefits

Second, participation in youth social action is hypothesised to promote elements of active citizenship in young people which may sustain into adulthood. The evidence for this hypothesis is promising; many of the initial effects on young people's knowledge and attitudes that are believed

to be required for more active citizenship later in life are observed in the short term. However, only longer-term studies would confirm the hypothesis with confidence. We found one such study. A longitudinal study of the *City Year* programme in the US found that alumni of the programme were more likely to volunteer and vote as adults.^{xx} Cross-sectional studies conducted in the UK and US have confirmed the hypothesis that participation in voluntary action causes an increase in young people's political knowledge and understanding.^{xxi,xxii}

Randomised control trials carried out on programmes supported by the Cabinet Office's Centre for Social Action and the Education Endowment Foundation identified the potential for youth social action to promote elements of active citizenship. One programme, *Envision*, demonstrated an impact on young people's intention to volunteer in the future.^{xxiii} Repeated evaluations of the National Citizen Service programme, which has a youth social action component, have found that participation in the programme is associated with a self-reported increase in young people's positive feelings towards people from different backgrounds.^{xxiv}

International comparative studies have found that the relationship between volunteering and political and civic participation in young people is culturally specific, typically varying depending on how politics and voluntary action interact in each nation.^{xxv,xxvi} This suggests that caution should be advised when concluding that youth social action promotes civic participation. The relationship is likely to be contingent on factors that can vary across time and social groups. Indeed, there is an open question whether social phenomena like the formation of the #iwill Fund and the emerging significance of the *School Strikes for Climate* may change how young people experience social action, volunteering and civil society.

Triple benefit

Most studies that attempt to measure the organisational benefit of youth social action do so as part of an economic analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of a given opportunity. A typical method involves adding the young person benefits from the youth social action opportunity (e.g. from an increase in emotional wellbeing) to the value of the tasks the young people complete during the opportunity.^{xxvii} The value of these two things are estimated in terms of financial benefits, i.e. as an amount of money. These analyses do not include the value of the community outcomes of the youth social action opportunity. They capture the organisational benefit of the activity (young people's contribution to the activities of the organisation) but not the community benefit (the outcomes of the organisation's work).

Evaluations of National Citizen Service in the UK and AmeriCorps in the US are examples of these analyses. In summer 2016, through National Citizen Service, young people completed hours of volunteering equivalent to approximately £49.7 million of paid work.^{xxviii} In 2012/2013, *City Year* members in the US provided 155,000 hours of school-based service and supported 600 pupils one to one.^{xxix}

While these outputs from young people are important to capture, appreciate and understand, they do not predict outcomes for service users and communities. The gap in the evidence base around *outcomes* for communities is the issue to which we turn next.

Measurement of Community Benefit

Match Funder evaluation plans within the #iwill Fund tend to focus more on the individual benefit of participation in youth social action to the young person. They aim to answer questions like, “Are we increasing wellbeing for girls?” or “Does youth social action contribute to assets and strengths that lead to long-term outcomes?”. Another common focus is on what young people contribute in terms of inputs to organisations seeking social impact, and whether or not this is sustainable from the organisation’s point of view. There is less focus on the *outcomes* for communities and other stakeholders from youth social action programmes, although some Match Funders have made efforts to measure these.

This is partly because it is difficult to measure community outcomes. How to evaluate community benefit is an issue has been consistently described by #iwill Fund Match Funders as a serious challenge.^{xxx} To begin to address this, we first have to consider the reasons *why* we might want to measure the community benefit of youth social action programmes.

How are Match Funders measuring community benefit?

The #iwill Fund Learning Hub has been able to analyse Match Funder evaluation plans in order to understand how Match Funders intend to appraise the community benefit of the youth social action projects they support. Some of these are presented below.

Societal benefit

Match Funders such as Sport England, Team London and UKCF are planning to survey participants in their youth social action programmes to measure self-reported changes in prosocial and citizenship behaviours which are hypothesised to have societal benefits for society both now and in the future.^{xxx} These prosocial and citizenship behaviours targeted by Match Funders include levels of social trust, confidence to set meaningful personal goals and an increased likelihood of participating in volunteering in the future. The majority of Match Funder evaluation plans contained more developed strategies for capturing the young person benefit of their programmes, so it is not surprising that community benefits that follow from young person outcomes are the most commonly measured by Match Funders.^{xxxii}

Organisational benefit

Pears Foundation, Sport England and Spirit of 2012 are recording the outputs produced by young volunteers.^{xxxiii} Both Pears and Sport England will collect data on the number of hours young

people who participate in their programmes volunteer to the organisation they are working in. Spirit of 2012, as well as Pears Foundation, will also attempt, in some projects, to estimate the number of people in the community reached by the youth social action project they support.

Community benefit

Many Match Funders have collected information about the community impact of a sample of young person-led social action projects within their funded programme in order to write case studies on young people's social impact. Systematic attempts to measure community benefit are less common.

Where Match Funders report in their evaluation plans that they will attempt to measure community benefit, the most common approach is to ask young people who participate in their programmes to reflect on the community impact of their social action. Spirit of 2012, and their evaluation partner UK Youth, intend to enhance this method by conducting qualitative research with local community.^{xxxiv} Their proposed methods include qualitative interviews with community members to understand change to limiting perceptions, improvements to social cohesion and other outcomes specifically relevant to the Young Women & Girls project. Where relevant, UK Youth have also proposed using community postcard surveys.

Reasons for measuring community benefit

Measuring community benefit is challenging (see below) but there are valid and compelling reasons to do so – some of these are summarised below:

Understanding impact. What difference, if any, does the social action programme make to the community it is trying to help? A funder or delivery organisation might be interested in this question for reasons of *accountability*, *improvement*, or *generalisable learning* about what works. At the very least, funders and delivery organisations should seek to understand the impact their work is having.

Understanding mechanisms of change. How does the youth social action programme achieve benefits for young people and communities? The value flow diagram presented on page 8 shows how direct benefits to one stakeholder group can have knock on benefits to others. Programmes that may be creating reflexive benefit (according to their theory of change) will not understand how they are changing young people's outcomes without appreciating their effects for the communities in which those young people live.

Showing young people they can make an impact. Youth social action is hypothesised to increase young people's sense of self-efficacy and likelihood of participating in social action in the future because participants come to understand that they can make change happen.^{xxxv} One way

of engendering this understanding is to measure the impact young people have on the communities they are trying to help and showing it to them. Here, measurement of community benefit becomes part of the youth social action opportunity, since it is a mechanism of change for the young people.

Challenges to measuring community benefit

The reasons why #iwill Fund Match Funders and their learning partners might find it challenging to measure community benefit are both general and particular.

Rigorous measurement of community outcomes would require long-term study ideally comparing the youth social action intervention against a control scenario where the youth social action opportunity does not happen. This would be highly impractical as well as high-cost in terms of financial and human resources. The duration of study required to track community outcomes is often outside the scope of the time-limited #iwill Fund.

In addition to these general difficulties, the community benefit of youth social action can be difficult to measure because one of its key principles is that it is youth-led. That means the community the young people will try to help through their youth social action, and the activities they will undertake to achieve that, are sometimes not pre-defined, but chosen by the young participants.

It is challenging to design a community outcomes framework for highly youth-led social action where the outcomes are not defined in advance, and we have not yet seen a good example of this being done. While this is a difficulty, there are different kinds of evaluation framework that can be appropriate to monitor programmes which are going through ongoing development (see Conclusion 4). Moreover, the youth-led principle of great youth social action also suggests an opportunity to allow young people to take the lead on designing an outcomes framework once they have defined their own activity and objectives (see Conclusion 3).

Even where the programme defines activities and outcomes in advance (i.e. they are not determined by young participants during the programme), **it is not possible to make general recommendations about how to measure the community benefit of youth social action because the practice covers a wide range of activities.** We will examine the different types of youth social action in a forthcoming paper in this series.

Finally, many of the youth social action opportunities supported by the #iwill Fund are supported and/or delivered by organisations which have a historic focus on young people.^{xxxvi} This means that they carry with them greater knowledge of outcomes for young people, as do their network of learning partners. This may mean that traditionally youth-focused organisations may find it more difficult to think about how to evaluate community impact. Alternatively, it may mean that these organisations are more critical of claims about impact with

young people because of their more nuanced understanding of youth development compared to community impact.

The challenges involved in measuring the community benefit of youth social action opportunities are significant. Below we offer some conclusions based on the content of this report, but also some recommendations that may help to address the gap in the evidence base and assist organisations trying to understand more about their community impact.

Conclusions and recommendations

- 1. The frameworks described above should be used to think rigorously about the theories of change underpinning youth social action programme designs.** Those designing youth social action programmes should use the categories of beneficiaries from social action (young people, organisations, services users and communities) and the categories of communities (e.g. of geography, culture, interest and experience) to refine their theories of change, being explicit about where their programme is anticipated to have an impact. The concepts of societal and reflexive benefit should enable those designing youth social action opportunities to broaden their understanding of the potential impact of their programmes, the mechanisms by which this may be achieved, and appropriate and proportionate ways to understand their impact.
- 2. If a social action programme is youth-led, then consider empowering young people to plan and measure their community impact.** Projects hoping to achieve social impact should be designed on the basis of a logical theory of change and should use monitoring and evaluation for accountability and improvement. These principles also apply to the projects young people undertake as part of highly youth-led social action opportunities. Those designing, providing and funding youth social action opportunities should consider how young people can be empowered to apply these principles to their projects. They should support young people to develop theories of change and evaluate the impact of their work – in engaging and proportionate ways.
- 3. The evidence base for the community benefit of youth social action is underdeveloped relative to other potential benefits.** Community benefit has been, and continues to be, an under-researched area of youth social action. This paper contributes a set of frameworks that provide greater precision to the concept. A forthcoming paper in this series will explore the different types of youth social action. Research is needed to understand how different kinds of youth social action can best achieve different kinds of community benefit.
- 4. Organisations in the youth social action space should learn from community sector organisations who focus on community benefit.** It may be that organisations delivering youth social action opportunities are focused on the benefit to young people because adolescents have historically been the focus of their work. However, many of the issues that

youth social action opportunities seek to address are also being tackled by community sector organisations which focus on community benefit. Funders and delivery organisations in the youth social action space can look to these organisations in order to learn how to achieve community impact, and how to measure it. In a previous #iwill Fund Learning Hub paper, we recommend that 'partnering' between youth social action and other community sector organisations with overlapping aims could be supported. There could be many benefits to these partnerships but one might be to help youth sector organisations develop more sophisticated ways of delivering and measuring community benefit. For example, a youth social action programme in which young people decide to improve the health of a local nature reserve could look to conservation groups for this kind of guidance. A 2018 report by Renaisi also provides an overview of the challenges and methods that are ongoing in the all-ages social action sector and would serve as a helpful starting point for funders and delivery organisations in the youth space.^{xxxvii}

Acknowledgements

Dartington Service Design Lab is grateful to the following people who gave their time and insights to help frame this paper: Dave Yates, Bridget McGing, Alice Thornton, Dr Eddy Hogg and Dr Stuart Fox.

ⁱ Online, accessed 11/06/19: <http://www.stepuptoserve.org.uk/about-us/principles/>

ⁱⁱ #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019b), *Exploring Integration of Youth Social Action and 'All-Ages' Social Action*.

ⁱⁱⁱ Rochester et al. (2010), *Volunteering and Society in the 21st Century*.

^{iv} #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019a), *Sector Evidence Plan Introduction*.

^v Musick & Wilson (2007), *Volunteers: A Social Profile*, Ch.6.

^{vi} #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019a)

^{vii} #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019c), *Increasing Social Action in Place*

^{viii} #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019d), *Increasing Youth Social Action in Education*

^{ix} #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019b)

^x #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019d)

^{xi} Pears Foundation (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*

^{xii} Galea et al. (2013), *Volunteering in acute trusts in England: Understanding the scale and impact*

^{xiii} Musick and Wilson (2007), p.455

^{xiv} Ibid.

^{xv} Ibid.

^{xvi} Ibid.

^{xvii} Ibid., p.485

^{xviii} Gorard et al. (2016), *Youth Social Action Trials: Youth United | Evaluation report and executive summary*

^{xix} Kirkman et al. (2015), *Evaluating Youth Social Action*

^{xx} Anderson et al. (2007), *The Effect of the City Year Experience Over Time: Findings from the Longitudinal Study of Alumni*

^{xxi} Niemi and Chapman (1998) *The Civic Development of 9th-through-12th Grade Students in the United States*

-
- xxii Roker et al. (1999), "Young People's Voluntary and Campaigning Activities as Sources of Political Education." *Oxford Review of Education* 25:185-198
- xxiii Kirkman et al. (2015)
- xxiv e.g Panayiotou et al. (2017), *National Citizen Service 2016 Evaluation*
- xxv Flanagan et al. (1998), "Ties That Bind: Correlates of Adolescent Civic Commitments in Seven Countries." *Journal of Social Issues* 54:457-475
- xxvi Torney-Purta and Amadeo (2003), "A Cross-National Analysis of Political and Civic Involvement among Adolescents." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36:269-274
- xxvii Rochester et al. (2010)
- xxviii Panayiotou et al. (2017)
- xxix Belfield (2013), *The Economic Value of National Service*. Monograph, Voices for National Service and Civic Enterprises for the Franklin Project at The Aspen Institute.
- xxx #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019a)
- xxxi Sport England (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*; Team London (2019), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*; UKCF (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*
- xxxii #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019a)
- xxxiii Sport England (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*; Pears Foundation (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*; Spirit of 2012 (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*
- xxxiv Spirit of 2012 (2018), *Return to National Lottery Community Fund (internal document)*
- xxxv Partridge et al. (2018), *Teenagency: How young people can create a better world*.
- xxxvi #iwill Fund Learning Hub (2019b)
- xxxvii Renaisi (2018), *Place Based Social Action: Learning Review* | https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/755473/PBSA_Learning_Review_-_Full-FINAL_1_.PDF