Project Rejuvenate – Final Report

Reference

A.   20200930_229090 HE Project Rejuvenate Tender Response Document Ref.: 239940.01 September 2020.

Contents

1. Introduction

This report has been prepared by Wessex Archaeology, in partnership with Canterbury Archaeological Trust, for Historic England in accordance with Reference A with the aim to:

> *Research the most effective ways to improve the lives of vulnerable young people with a particular view to enhancing life opportunities including to prevent involvement with the criminal justice system and to respond to the challenges of being in the criminal justice system, and reduce re-offending.*

through the implementation of a heritage-themed participatory intervention. There are six principle sections of the report: a summary of the policy context related to young offending; a summary of the operation of the Youth Justice System and its stakeholders; a review of the existing evidence for heritage interventions involving young people and/or offenders; the development of a conceptual model for a heritage-themed intervention with this community, a supporting evaluation framework, and two costed pilot programme designs.

In meeting the first objective:

> *To review the current evidence base for working with young people in the areas of enhancing wellbeing, achieving potential and reducing re-offending rates within the cultural sector and beyond as appropriate.*

the commissioned research included a summary of the policy context and operation of the youth justice system and a review of the evidence for what works from published literature and engagement with stakeholders connected with supporting vulnerable young people at risk of entering, or have already encountered, the youth justice system. Additional evidence of wider engagement with young people, or adults, in a heritage context has been included where it has been deemed valuable in generating insights to support the development of the project.

In meeting the second objective:

> *To propose methods and costs for two pilot projects (using site-based, blended or on-line delivery) to commence in 2021 looking at feasibility of carrying out two collaborative projects using heritage interpretation, archaeological survey, archaeological investigation or heritage with a view to creating a scale-able and sustainable model for national application.*

The participants agreed a common framework of programme components based on the insights of the research, consultations and experience of the team members considering the risk and protective factors that determine a propensity to offend in young people. In addition, the costing for the two pilots has been developed based on a common understanding of essential delivery resources and requirements to enable young people participation and to prepare and support facilitating staff. The selection of referral and facilitating partners also considers the aspiration of this project to enable scaling for national delivery coverage.

The third objective to review the project name in line with consultation with key stakeholders and young people, to create shared ownership and something fit for purpose has not been achieved in this Stage 1 of the project, owing to challenges in accessing stakeholders and young people during the coronavirus

restrictions in place during the timeframe of the commissioned work. With a deferred date for the pilot programmes there is time for this objective to be resolved as part of the engagement strategy with the participating and referral organisations and young person potential participants.

In addressing the fourth objective:

> *To propose an evaluation framework for stage 2 of the project. This should cover the kinds of benefits to be expected by interventions and advice on how and when to follow up to assess impact and how to control for understanding the impact.*

The team has considered a theoretical underpinning to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot programmes and its components in terms of the addressing some of the causal factors behind young offending and in promoting wellbeing. Using Self-Determination Theory as the theoretical framework a mixed methods approach has been proposed for the evaluation of the pilot programmes. In addition, the project proposes addressing the measurement of longitudinal effects and establishing a control group through partnership with the young person referral organisations.

2. Policy Context

2.1 Young offending and impact on society?

The most recent Youth Justice Board (Ministry of Justice (MoJ))[1] statistics published in January 2020 for the year ending March 2019 cited that c. 60,000 children (aged 10-17) were arrested by the police in England and Wales with Black children over four times more likely than White Children to be arrested, 21,700 children were cautioned or sentenced, that there were 11,900 first time entrants to the Youth Justice System (YJS). Although these figures chart a significant positive downward trend over the last decade, the average custodial length and the number of children held in custody on remand has increased. Young people from non-White ethnic backgrounds are over-represented in the figures, and boys make up the majority (82% while comprising 51% of the general 10-17 population).

Other sources indicate that re-conviction rates are very high with two thirds of under 18s reconvicted within 12 months of release, and c. 25% of male young prisoners were homeless or in temporary accommodation pre-return to prison. Over 50% of these young people have a history of being in care or involved with social services. A disproportionate number of young people in custody are from black and ethnic minority groups. Other apparent traits are that a large proportion of those young people in prison were excluded from school and there is a linkage between offending and a detachment from education, training, and employment. It is also common for young people in the youth justice system, especially in prison, have mental health and emotional disorder conditions and other conditions associated with substance misuse. Many of these at-risk children and young people are already socially excluded and embroilment within the YJS is likely to exacerbate this social exclusion from mainstream society.

The cost to society both in terms of financial cost and impact on individuals and communities is very high indeed. Although nine years old, a 2011 NAO Technical Paper for the MoJ, *The cost of a cohort of young offenders to the criminal justice system*[2], provides an indicative cost of £8,000 per year per young

---

[1] [youth-justice-statistics-bulletin-march-2019.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)
[2] [The cost of a cohort of young offenders - Technical paper (nao.org.uk)](https://nao.org.uk)

offender to the criminal justice system only. If the societal costs of recorded and unrecorded crimes on individuals, properties and businesses then the impact runs into the billions per annum and a recent Home Office research report (Heeks, 2018) indicates an estimated £59 billion figure for England and Wales in 2015/16, although the proportion of that resulting from young offending is not given.

2.2 Neo-liberalism and its influence on the YJS

In exploring the policy context for the UK criminal justice system, it is important to acknowledge the prevailing neo-liberal attitudes of successive governments in the twenty first century as it has had a profound impact on policy approaches to criminal justice. Dunkel (2014) charts the influence of neoliberalism on youth justice practices in Europe, including England and Wales, from the 1990s onwards made manifest in the intensification of youth justice interventions such as raising minimum sentences for youth detention and additional forms of secure accommodation. In keeping with the neoliberal mindset of lessening state responsibility, the YJS have incorporated a 'correctionalism' approach with individual responsibility as a core concept component along with restitution (reparation), restorative justice and retribution (the 4 'R's). The risk-needs-responsivity (RNR) model for desistance, covered in section 2.7.2), is heavily influenced by neoliberal approaches to criminality. The emphasis on individual culpability and 'pay back' contrasts with the diversion, decriminalisation, deinstitutionalisation and due process (the 4 'D's) underpinning policy in the 1960s and 1970s. The importance of the neoliberal policy influence on the YJS is that it informs current practice in relation to young offending and potentially limits the scope or opportunity for a Project Rejuvenate heritage intervention within the YJS, namely young people in custody and interventions that entail restitution and restorative justice.

2.3 Children's policy and law

The UK became a signatory of The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989) in 1990 and periodically reports on compliance with its articles, most recently in 2015 (HC, 2015). In relation to youth justice Article 37 and 40 apply and the guidance is clear about acting in the best interests of the child with direction to avoid institutional care where possible considering the wellbeing, and proportionality with regards to circumstances and the offence (Article 40.4). The 2003 Government's *Every Child Matters* Green Paper (DoE, 2004) proposed changes in policy and legislation in England to maximise opportunities and minimise risks for all children and young people, focusing services more effectively around the needs of children, young people and families. This led to the publication of the 2004 Children Act (HC, 2004) with a key provision to focus on outcomes that mattered to children and young people and placing a duty on Local Authorities to ensure inter-agency co-operation to improve the wellbeing of children and young people.

In relation to offending by children and young persons, the principal Act of Parliament is the Crime and Disorder Act 1988 (HC, 1988). Within the Act the statutory aim of the youth justice system is to prevent offending by children and young persons. Governance is overseen by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) and Local Authorities were required to establish multi-agency Youth Offending Teams (YOTs). The role of the YOTs includes assisting Police with out of court disposals, supervising children and young people serving a community sentence and those released from custody.

2.4 Criminal Justice System (CJS) policy framework

The CJS policy fabric is comprehensive and features children and young people sufficiently in depth generally as to be informative for this project. The 2002 *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners* report by the Social Exclusion Unit (2002) provides a general overview of causal factors for criminal offending and an Annex covering these in relation to juveniles (pp. 154-170). The nine key causal factors are:

- Education
- Employment
- Drug and alcohol misuse
- Mental and physical health
- Attitudes and self-control
- Institutionalisation and life-skills
- Housing
- Financial support and debt
- Family networks

The 2010 Government Green Paper *Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders* (MoJ, 2010) set the policy tone for the CJS to punish offenders, protect the public and reduce reoffending. The reform emphasis included sentencing, restorative justice for victims and societal payback, and rehabilitation. Section 5 on Youth Justice (*ibid*, pp. 67-75) does, however, make clear an appreciation that early intervention and diversion from criminal activity is crucial and how critical YOTs are in this endeavour but offers little insight into how Project Rejuvenate could support the work of the YOTs. Two key reports that have influenced recent Government policy in the last decade, namely the *Taylor Review* (Taylor, 2016) and the *Bradley Report* (DoH, 2009) and subsequent *The Bradley Report Five Years On* (Durcan et al., 2014) which do have a bearing on the project.

2.5 Taylor Review 2016

This influential review delivered a mixed appraisal of the effectiveness of the multi-agency YOTs, cited the important role of the health services, particularly the provision of accessible mental health support, and education in the multi-agency approach by local authorities. His reform recommendations included decentralisation, empowerment at lowest possible level in local authorities, holistic and integrated approaches, a strong diversion emphasis, a restorative approach where criminality has occurred (victim restitution), advocacy for secure schools for young people receiving custodial sentences for the most serious offences, and better handover and transition provision upon resettlement for convicted offenders. Taylor identified a range of children and young person needs linked to improving life prospects through access to improved welfare, health and education as means to divert individuals from entrapment in the YJS. He specified addressing health issues, particularly for the one-third with mental health conditions, learning difficulties, the impact of dysfunctional and chaotic families (drug and alcohol misuse, physical and emotional abuse, and offending), and from being victims of crime themselves. He singled out the requirement to reduce the criminalisation of looked after children as they were five times more likely to be cautioned or convicted than children in the general population and the greater propensity of behavioural problems with children and young people in care homes. The Government response endorsed the early intervention and prevention measures, recognised the benefits of a range

of protective factors with an aim to build resilience in young people by improving access to education, health services, family support and positive role models, and were supportive of secure schools.

2.6 2009 *Bradley Report* and 2014 *The Bradley Report Five Years On*

Lord Bradley was commissioned by the Government to undertake an independent review to determine to what extent offenders with mental health problems or learning disabilities could be diverted from prison to other services and what were the barriers to such diversion (DoH, 2009, p.4). The Chapter 2 section on early intervention for children and young people (*ibid*, p. 29-33) advocates early intervention by GPs, Schools, the Police and YOTs as the most likely agencies to have initial contact with young people.

Relevant education policy stems from the Department of Education *Educational Excellence Everywhere* White Paper (DoE, 2016). Key sections of this paper set out Local Authority responsibility for ensuring the needs of vulnerable pupils are met; that the education system has a duty to build character and resilience in every child (6.33); that children with additional needs (6.6), including those with special educational needs and disability (SEND) and other vulnerable children who have challenging home circumstances or are on the edge of care; and the reform of Alternative Provision for pupils with significant behavioural problems, complex medical or mental health conditions, and extreme vulnerability due to personal and social issues, placing a responsibility on schools to commission education for pupils they have permanently excluded.

2.7 Theoretical underpinnings

Theory underpinning offending divides into one of two categories: early intervention to prevent an individual becoming an offender (prevention) and what stops an offender from re-offending (desistance). Taking each in turn:

2.7.1 Early Intervention (Prevention)

There are two main strands comprising early intervention theory and these are addressing risk factors that have been shown to predict later offending and antisocial behaviour and reinforcing protective factors that have been demonstrated to buffer young people against criminal engagement.

Factors associated with the development of criminal behaviour are categorised at the individual level (low intelligence (IQ), low empathy, impulsivity, hyperactivity); within the family (poor family management, family conflict, low income, poor housing); at school (disengagement, low achievement, attending disorganised schools); and at the level of the local community (living in deprived neighbourhoods, associating with delinquent peers, experiencing feelings of alienation) (Ross, 2010).

Identified protective factors are:

- Resilience
- Self-efficacy (believing that one can perform tasks successfully)
- Having a positive outlook
- Having a stable, warm, affectionate relationship with one or both parents
- Bonds with teachers, other adults or peers who hold positive attitudes and model pro-social behaviours

There are three categories of preventative intervention:

- Universal prevention
- Selective intervention (target individuals or neighbourhoods where risk factors are relatively high)
- Indicative prevention (targeted at those young people who have shown signs of offending, antisocial behaviour, or brushes with school authorities or the YJS)

Ingredients of effective interventions:

- Embodying 'therapeutic' philosophies via counselling and skills training that nurture positive change
- Activities to help control behaviour and enhance young people's ability to participate in everyday pro-social activity
- Multi-modal programmes (Lipsey, 2009)

2.7.2 Abstaining from crime (Desistance)

Desistance is a theory of change model that has been adopted by the CJS. Desistance theory emphasises the need for a holistic, adaptable, and person-centred approach to support offenders who wish to stop offending. The HM Inspectorate of Probation *Desistance and Young People* 2016 report (HMIP, 2016) sets out a distinction between primary and secondary desistance, theoretical approaches that contribute to desistance hypotheses, growing interest in the immature research field on children and young person desistance compared with adult research, and some critical observations of direct relevance to our research. In terms of definitions, **primary desistance** relates to the short term aim to stop the offender offending while **secondary desistance** relates to a more holistic and longer-term ambition where the offender develops a personal narrative that supports the continuation of a non-offending lifestyle. Current desistance theory posits five hypotheses:

- **Maturation**. In *Growing out of crime,* Rutherford (1986) argues that offending can be viewed in the context of a young person's maturation into adulthood and as such is a transient phase and part of 'growing up'. The home and school are regarded as the best developmental control environments.
- **Rational Choice and Volition**. Clarke and Cornish (1985) highlight the absence of offender decision making in criminal behaviour theory and tend to regard the offender as a passive figure in deterministic approaches that explore criminal dispositions or environmental contexts.
- **Development of Social Bonds**. Laub and Sampson's (2001) *Understanding Desistance from Crime* article postulated that strong social bonds can explain desistance from criminal behaviour in adulthood where there was a background of juvenile delinquency. Qualitative data analysis points at stable employment and good marriages as key institutions of informal social control in the transition to adulthood.
- **Self-identity**. Maruna's (2001) qualitative research on ex-offenders telling their stories points towards offenders needing to make sense of their lives and gain a self-identity that is a platform for making positive change from deviant behaviours and that positive incentives to do so can facilitate the process.
- **Cognitive Transformation**. Giordano et al (2002) describe the desistance journey for an offender as a four-stage process involving emotional growth and changes in preferences as follows:

- An openness to change
- Exposure and reaction to hooks for change
- Imagining and believing in a 'replacement self'
- A change in the way that offending and deviant behaviour is viewed

The critical observations made by the report relevant to our project research are that:

- One size does not fit all
- Children and young person voices should be heard
- Individual circumstances and needs are considered

The prevailing desistance approach in the youth justice system is the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model. Its application in practice in England and Wales is via the YJB structured youth justice assessment tool called ASSET. ASSET examines a young person's offending and identifies associated risk factors, criminogenic needs, and protective areas in their life. This tool is not without its critics. Almond (2012) argues that ASSET is stigmatising, deficit-based (negative) tool and ignores inequities and discrimination encountered by certain groups in society, such as minority ethnic young people.

An alternative methodology called the Good Lives Model (GLM) that was originally developed to work with adult sex offenders does appear to have wider promise with other offender profiles including young people. While seeking to reduce risk it also explicitly supports offenders to develop more meaningful and fulfilling lives and so at the core of the model is a strengths-based approach rather than the risk management stratagems that dominate the RNR model (Ward and Brown, 2004). The GLM model systematically considers the relationship between risk factors and human needs or goods as there is a need to motivate offenders to adopt more pro-social means and personally meaningful ways in achieving those goals.

An example of the application of GLM principles to address the risk factors of poorly developed social relationships, competency and autonomy with qualitative evaluation is the Preventing Youth Offending Project (PYOP) based in Portsmouth (Wainwright and Nee, 2014). The PYOP took referrals of prolific young offenders from social workers, the local YOT, the Education department and others and provided individualised holistic support interventions from trained project workers. The plans encompassed one-to one or group therapeutic activities and music, art and drama workshops as well as outdoor activities to develop self-esteem, healthy competition, and interpersonal skills. Some of the individual programmes ran for longer than 18 months. The evaluation identified the themes of improving social awareness, achieving some self-development, and establishing self-hope with each of those attributes contributing to developing a positive future identity that was achievable and motivating.

There has been a protracted and lively discourse about the relative merits and limitations of the two models (Andrews, Bonta and Wormith, 2011) in relation to the degree that holistic, flexible and person-centred approach is entailed in the respective models, but a key issue highlighted by Case and Haines (2015) is that the neoliberal underpinning of the RNR model risks disengagement by the young person at the outset and that youth justice practice must put the child first and the offender second. The Children First, Offenders Second (CFOS) model argues that engagement needs to be understood and practised from a child's perspective. The model conceives offending as only one element of the child's broader social identity and so youth justice practice should be focused on the whole child and that interventions

place children as part of the solution rather than part of the problem. The Welsh Government is cited as an exemplar of the CFOS approach and in keeping with the UN Convention of the Rights of a Child.

3. Youth Justice System (YJS) operation and stakeholders

3.1 Potential access points for a Project Rejuvenate intervention

There appear to be four main access points for interventions in the YJS:

- Young people at risk of entering the YJS
- Young people in custody (*out of scope for Project Rejuvenate*)
- Young people serving community sentences
- Young people in resettlement

3.2 Agencies involved with children and young people at risk of offending or are in contact with the YJS

The 'touch points' for children and young people at risk of offending or are in contact with the YJS are numerous but fall mainly within education, health, the CJS and local authority services.

Sector	Agency	Team	Engagement purpose
Health	NHS	Liaison and Diversion (L&D)	Diversion
		Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)	Prevention and diversion
		GPs	Prevention
Education	Secondary Schools		Prevention
	Colleges		Prevention
	Secure Schools		Diversion and desistance
Local Authority	Children and Family Services		Prevention
	Youth Offending Teams (YOT)		Prevention, diversion, and desistance
	Social Services		Prevention
Criminal Justice System (CJS)	Youth Justice Board (YJB)		Prevention
	Police		Prevention and diversion
	Police Crime Commissioner (PCC)		Prevention, diversion, and desistance
	Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)		Diversion and desistance
	Judiciary		Desistance
	Young Offender Institution (YOI)		Desistance, education, and resettlement
	National Probation Service		Desistance and Resettlement

Table 1: Agency interfaces with children and young people at risk of offending or engaged in offending

4. Literature Review

4.1 Resources

As stated in the introduction the literature review is not exhaustive and the research has been predominantly derived from the following sources:

- University of Bath Library
- SCOPUS and Web of Science Database search engines
- Google and Google Scholar web search engines
- Personal contacts

The categories of resource relate primarily to theory and policy relating to the criminal justice system and YJS, research articles on the efficacy of arts and cultural sector interventions with offenders, and some articles pertaining to young people and heritage interventions with an emphasis on promoting educational engagement.

4.2 CJS perspective on what works in managing young people who offend?

A key source of evidence is contained in the 2016 MoJ commissioned report *What Works in Managing Young People who Offend? A summary of the International Evidence* (Adler, 2016). Factors in an effective intervention are summarised as (*ibid*, p. 1-2):

- Matching services to the individual's risk of reoffending with a focus on those people assessed as having a higher risk.
- The needs of the individual: focusing attention on those attributes that are predictive of reoffending and targeting them in rehabilitation and service provision.
- An individual's ability to respond to an intervention: maximising the young person's ability to learn from a rehabilitative programme by tailoring approaches to their learning styles, abilities, and strengths.
- Therapeutic programmes with approaches that include skills building, such as Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and social skills; restorative, for example victim-offender mediation; and counselling and mentoring in some contexts.
- Use of multiple services that address a range of offending related risks and needs rather than a single factor.
- Programme implementation: quality and amount of service provided and fidelity to the programme design.
- The wider offending context: considering family, peers, and community issues.

Importantly the international evidence does not support interventions that include prison visits to deter young people from offending or 'Boot camps' (*ibid*, p. 3). Less the arts and culture and heritage projects mentioned in Section 4.3 and 4.4, the literature is thin on description of project or programme content making it difficult to explore the potential for 'swapping in' or adding a Project Rejuvenate heritage initiative into existing YJS processes.

4.3 Arts and Culture sector interventions

Interventions are predominantly delivered in custodial settings and include music making, singing and song writing, performing arts and creative writing. There are a range of consistent insights concerning the efficacy of these interventions in the literature.

Music-making appears to be indicative of the types of arts-based interventions that are participative for young people in the YJS. Daykin et al (2017) conclude that music-making is capable of increasing young person's confidence, knowledge and skills and in some cases offers real hope for a differently imagined future in which creativity plays a part. The authors describe the positive (smoothing running and management of tension or disorder) and negative (inhibiting or distracting participants and compromise privacy) impact of staff present in the sessions. For the musician facilitators the ability to relate and establish rapport was a key factor as was reflexive awareness for adapting to the needs of the participants in meeting agreed goals. For the participants the musical affordances were diverse and could deliver personal agency in keeping with the aims of the intervention, but in some cases could also create conflict and feelings of failure or exclusion. In terms of an analysis of the methodology Kougiali et al (2018, p.19) in their review of 12 qualitative studies cite that the interventions create 'socially safe spaces' in which personal agency can develop. They also suggest that instructors follow Freire's democratic pedagogical approach: teachers act as facilitator, musical knowledge is perceived as creative self-expression, the classroom is community and performance is action.

The Arts Council England (ACE, 2018) report on arts and culture in health and wellbeing and in the criminal justice system synthesises the published literature and draws out the needs from the perspective of the young person offender:

- Autonomy
- Agency
- Respect for others and self
- A 'therapeutic alliance' with the facilitating practitioner based on warmth, openness, and non-judgmental behaviour
- Interventions matched to individual requirements and ones that include increasing self-esteem, resilience and building skills

It also makes clear that the quality of the intervention programme is also important. Practitioner training, experience and supervision are deemed desirable. The credibility of the practitioner as an artist or recognised professional is cited as a key engagement factor with young people. Also, the duration of the programme is a criterium for success with longer lived projects generally better for serious youth offenders. Arts and culture interventions can be a gateway to engagement in more formal learning. In summary, arts and culture based interventions can contribute to:

- Psychological and attitudinal change
- Increased learning capacity and motivations
- Social skills building
- Improving self-esteem and confidence
- Developing communication and social skills
- Enabling people to work as part of a group

4.4 Heritage interventions

The review has identified just a single heritage intervention that has been actively targeted at young people at risk of offending or have offended (Pudney, 2017a). However, in addition, the review has identified five heritage themed interventions to date that have involved young people, offenders or have elements that could inform the development of a Project Rejuvenate conceptual model. Turning to heritage interventions for young people that are directly or indirectly linked to lower socio-economic opportunities there are two programmes that warrant inclusion, namely the Higher Education Field Academy (HEFA) initiative across England and the "Unloved Heritage?" project in Wales.

4.4.1 Heritage Graffiti Project

The single published heritage intervention targeting young offenders was the Heritage Graffiti Project (HGP) conducted in YOI Parc, Wales. The intervention comprised archaeology workshops using artefacts, design workshops connecting participant narratives to place in a heritage context and concluding with painting workshops to create a mural on an exercise yard wall. The outputs of the project were exhibited at the National Assembly of Wales. Evaluation methods were predominantly qualitative and included observations and conversations recorded in the facilitator's project diary, photography, a time-lapse photograph film, and vox-pop interviews. The chief challenge found in the evaluation was monitoring behavioural change (Pudney, 2017a, p.83) and was recognised as a short coming for this project and another prison-based intervention with adults run by the author. In line with other examples cited in this report the need for flexibility in the delivery of the sessions to adapt to dynamic circumstances relating to the offender audience and environment was deemed important.

4.4.2 MORTARIA

Pudney (2017b) also ran a prison based intervention, entitled MORTARIA (Motivating Offender Rehabilitation Through Archaeological Recording, Investigation and Analysis), for adult offenders. Its focus was on exploring the potential social benefits of archaeology through developing transferrable skills by active engagement with archaeology. Workshops were facilitated by the community archaeologist using artefacts to develop heritage themes with participant engagement in a range of numeracy, literacy, oral, aural, and creative activities. The sessions employed a mix of didactic and experiential pedagogy. Preparing, cooking and the eating of historical cuisine was an important and popular component of the programme. The prison environment could be volatile, and the author undertook self-protection training and there were numerous restrictions in place concerning the import of items into the prison, including electronic media. Impact was evaluated under three main headings of access to heritage (a rudimentary quantitative measure), learning (qualitative through the production of participant concept maps), and behavioural changes (subjective and observational qualitative approach). As with the HGP project, the challenge of evidencing behavioural change was cited and additionally demonstrating any longitudinal benefit of the intervention.

4.4.3 "Unearthed"

One of the co-authors does have direct experience of facilitating a heritage and creative themed intervention within an adult prison environment. While the audience and incarceration aspects are not within scope, "Unearthed" does comprise elements that could inform a prevention or desistance programme for young persons.

Case Study: Unearthed
Unearthed was a project developed to work with the most isolated in our society, prisoners. Devised by Leigh Chalmers, Unearthed was a historical, archaeological, and personal look into place and identity. Working in partnership with The Mobile Museum and Hoodwink Theatre, this 10-week project was delivered during January 2019.
Using an archaeological ceramic handling collection, 8 male prisoners, several of whom were 'lifers', from HMP Erlestoke in Devizes, learnt about ordinary people over different periods in time. Interspersed between and complementing the archaeology, there were four interactive creative sessions designed to enable participants to unlock their own stories.
The project concluded with several sessions in the prison ceramic studio where the men created a personal object depicting their story. They were asked; 'In 1000 years' time, if someone unearths your piece of pottery, what do you want that say about you, what is your story'?
The handling sessions were a huge success. The men were keen to learn and to share what they already knew with the rest of the group, they said they could 'feel the history' in the objects they held, and they appreciated the opportunity to do so.
The identity sessions were harder and challenged the men in a different way. During one particular session using maps the men were almost silent pouring over ordnance survey maps of places they knew, where their families were, where they had lived, places they had been.
Unearthed provided the participants with many opportunities – to learn, to socialise, to talk with new people and to experts, to listen to each other, to share and to create, to achieve and to feel proud of themselves. By engaging with heritage, they supported one another and developed a deep sense of self, something that can be elusive in a prison setting.
To add to the success of the project, the final pieces were exhibited at Salisbury Cathedral during Prison Week in October 2019. This meant that family and friends of the prisoners could go and see the work of their loved ones exhibited. This created a shared experience and led onto conversations during visiting hours about something other than prison life, it was a moment they all could be proud of.
"I know it was called Unearthed but it brought you back down to earth and made you realise how long you have been here and how small you are in time".

4.4.4 Higher Education Field Academy (HEFA)

The best evaluated heritage intervention with an educational motivation driver appears to be the University of Cambridge's 'Widening Participation' programme, entitled the Higher Education Field Academy (HEFA) that ran from 2005 until 2013 involving 3496 disadvantaged state-educated teenage participants. It was designed to raise educational aspirations, enthusiasm, and attainment through participation in archaeological excavation, namely $1m^2$ test pits over the course of two days in teams of three or four under professional supervision. The test-pitting programme was part of a wider research design. The process that entailed a varied and challenging scheme of assessed work allowed the learners to develop and refine a range of skills, cognitive, technical, social and personal, important in education and employment (Lewis, 2014).

While the aim of the programme was to encourage secondary pupils from lower socio-economic groups to consider tertiary education, its target audience had an obvious overlap with Project Rejuvenate's young people at risk of offending. Moreover, the intervention regarded archaeology as a vehicle for

engaging young people on a level playing field with the subject not part of the curriculum and its inter-disciplinary nature lending itself to developing a wide range of skills, including 'soft skills' not included in the traditional curriculum, whose lack could significantly hinder young people from disadvantaged backgrounds (*ibid*, p. 298). These personal, learning and thinking skills (PLTS in the National Curriculum) do appear in the desirable characteristics of successful prevention and desistance intervention programmes with young people.

The adopted pedagogical approach was 'learning by doing' expounded by the American philosopher John Dewey which had the advantage of catering for different learning styles (visual, audio, and kinaesthetic). Within that constructivist experiential approach, the programme also required elements of didactic teaching, for instance in the correct use of equipment.

In terms of impact the programme was clearly a success. The quantitative and qualitative evaluation was derived from applications, performance assessments, written and verbal feedback of a large sample size with a greater than 80% completion rate for the written feedback form. 91% rated the experience 'good' or 'excellent' and 84% enjoyed it more than they expected to. In raising aspirations for higher education there was a 26% rise in interest in applying to university and a halving of those rejecting the option. Attitudes to post-16 education was positive too with 79% feeling more positive. The acquisition of new skills such as creative thinking, verbal communications, and structured working, were rated between 76-87% in respondents.

Qualitative feedback indicated that there was a socialisation gain from the experience and making new discoveries had the positive impact in generating engagement. Additionally, the trust implicit in the responsibility for fulfilling a 'real' task contributing to a higher research purpose led to a genuine sense of achievement. The diversity of activity entailed in the test pitting ranging from hard physical labour to critical analysis of evidence ensured that every individual could contribute irrespective of differing attitudes or capability and to see the value of being a member of a team.

4.4.5 Unloved Heritage?

Unloved Heritage? (Griffiths, 2020) comprised seven regional projects across Wales developed out of consultation with young people and was responsive to the archaeology and social circumstances of the region. The project was about engaging, enthusing, and inspiring young people throughout Wales to get involved with their local heritage and showcase creatively under-appreciated sites. Each project was led by young people, supported by partner organisations, and used creative activities designed to explore the heritage worlds around young people and to tell the stories of their explorations. A wide variety of methods and approaches were adopted to create a legacy of increased archaeological and heritage knowledge for interpreting local heritage sites. A great strength of the scheme is the centrality of being youth led. It has involving them in developing soft skills such as project design and management and personal development and delivered genuinely empowering and creative experiences. The YouTube link provides a short case study insight into the project - Treftadaeth Ddisylw? | Unloved Heritage? - Llanelli - YouTube. The report includes important insights from one of the community archaeologists supporting the Llanelli project.

4.4.6 Operation Nightingale

While the target group of Operation Nightingale is wounded, injured and sick service personnel and veterans, these archaeological fieldwork projects deliver a therapeutic experience for the participants

set within a social construct with learning and development opportunities which in some cases has led to further education and employment. Moreover, this initiative is now long standing and has been delivered by partner organisations across the United Kingdom and has some published evidence to support its efficacy in improving wellbeing, most recently in *Antiquity* (Everill, Bennett and Burnell, 2020) but also Finnegan (2016). As such this initiative is worthy of some analysis for potential benefits that could be transferred across to the young person at risk audience that this Project is aiming to support.

Operation Nightingale projects adhere to the twin principles of adhering to professional archaeological standards and practices while ensuring that the welfare of the participants is catered for. Generally, an archaeological practice, university, or charity, such as Waterloo Uncovered, provide structured and supervised fieldwork opportunities with a research aim for participants to gain practical experience of archaeological techniques. Alongside the welfare provision, chiefly comprising a mental health professional or mental health first aider and access to medical or support facilities, participants normally stay near the site away from the home or barracks environment which encourages socialisation activities outside working hours and an 'escape' from challenging environments for some. The breadth of physical and intellectual activity and range of skills practised appear to be an important factor in enabling participants to derive the most benefit from the experience as does facilitating staff with the temperament and ability to respond to individual needs during the project. For the service community the outdoor setting and team orientated task-based approach helps provide a familiar and 'safe' environment. The evaluation evidence has been focused on wellbeing, both quantitative (WEMWBS, PHQ-8 and GAD-7) and qualitative and does indicate that participation in archaeological fieldwork contributes to improved wellbeing for this community.

Dr Karen Burnell, Solent University, is chairing the MARCH Network Archaeology for Veteran Mental Health and Wellbeing research to try to identify the various causal mechanisms that appear to be behind the apparent success of the project.

5. Stakeholder Consultation Insights

5.1 Stakeholders consulted

A total of 10 consultations have taken place so far with organisations / individuals who work in support of vulnerable young people. This is not solely young people (YP) who are offending or at risk of offending but a broader look at what options is available at the 'prevent' point of intervention. They have been:

Organisation	Project
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	Milestones **https://www.wiltshirewildlife.org/milestones-wiltshire**
Hampshire Cultural Trust	Horizon 2020 https://www.hampshireculture.org.uk/young-people/horizon-2020
David Kendall – Consultant	Reading and creative writing in prisons http://www.davidkendall.co.uk/
National Justice Museum	https://www.nationaljusticemuseum.org.uk/

Youth Adventure Trust	https://www.youthadventuretrust.org.uk/
Sue Martin – Artist and facilitator	https://suemartin8.wixsite.com/mysite-5
Unique Voice	https://uniquevoice.org/
Gemma Schnell – Wellbeing & Safeguarding Officer, St Joseph's School	http://www.sjcs.org.uk/
Splash	http://www.communityfirst.org.uk/yaw/splash/
Dyfed Archaeology (Sarah Rees)	https://unlovedheritage.wales/llanelli/

For some the main aim of the intervention was to get YP back into mainstream school, *(Hampshire Cultural Trust)* for others (*Youth Adventure Trust*) it was to provide the YP the chance to shake off the labels from school and to offer up experiences and opportunities to improve wellbeing, mental health and self-esteem. For both groups, the emphasis was on getting the YP to engage.

Both *Wiltshire Wildlife Trust* and *Unique Voice* have experience of working with young offenders. For WWT this was a less successful project as there were problems with getting the YP to attend and when they did, there were so many adults working in support of the YP that there was no place for any peer-to-peer support or interaction. Conversely, Unique Voice take predominantly drama projects into young offender institutes (YOI) where they can work with more than one YP at a time; they felt that their projects had been successful.

At the time of writing the report we have been unable to consult with Young Offender Teams, the Probation Service and the Police Youth Lead and this has a bearing on the development of the pilot programmes in terms of participant group covered in Section 7.1.1. Future evolution of the project in terms of desistance target groups will need to consult these agencies. The full consultation notes are contained in **Annex A**.

5.2 Past practice and existing models

We discovered two types of existing models, **outdoor and active** and **creative and classroom based**. Both have their merits, meet different needs and serve a range of purposes.

All models researched follow the school academic year calendar as this is a rhythm that the YP is familiar with. There are numerous programmes that run during term time and work with schools as the referral partner (e.g., *Wiltshire Wildlife Trust), a*nd other programmes that take place during the school holidays offering the YP support outside of school (e.g., *Splash).* There is a mix of residential, one day events and longer courses.

The following recommendations and insights were given by all the organisations / individuals who were consulted:

• A YP needs time and the space to adjust

- Give the YP choice and an input into what they want their outcomes to be
- A regular change helps a YP build resilience to interact with other adults
- The quality of the engagement is key to giving the YP the right tools to succeed
- Change takes time
- Run with the YP sparks of interest
- Meet the YP basic needs – warmth, food, consistency to engender a feeling of safety
- Be consistent
- Consider group size carefully
- Do not be like school
- Create a space where the YP can be themselves
- Understand that achievements are individual experiences
- Finance cannot be a barrier to participation. All equipment, clothing, bedding etc can be provided free of charge if need be.

5.3 Impact and evaluation methods

It is fair to say that evaluation of the interventions on offer is sporadic at best. Hampshire Cultural Trust have produced several project reports which are available on-line, and which are written very much with the participants in mind as opposed to the funders.

The two quantitative frameworks that were mentioned over the course of the discussions were the Stirling Children's Wellbeing Scale (Liddle, 2015) and the UCL Museums Evaluation Toolkit (Thomson and Chatterjee, 2015). Both have been used with success.

Other organisations rely on qualitative feedback from teachers, family members, social services etc to judge the impact of the intervention. Others will work with the YP themselves and use their targets and aims as the framework by which to assess the impact.

Continual assessment and monitoring of how a YP progresses through a course is essential and these observations become learning actions to be further agreed with the YP.

There is certainly space here to create a robust evaluation framework, incorporating both 'light touch' quantitative and qualitative methods, and it might be worth considering a wider evaluation on the impact the intervention has on the YP family and home life and education.

5.4 Critical success factors

The consultations drew up a range of suggestions on the ingrediency needed to set up a successful project

- 12-week period is an optimum length of time for a course
- A mix of creative and risk-taking tasks
- Set the YP up to succeed and achieve
- Respond to the interests of the YP
- Referral forms that ask the right questions – questions that stimulate responses as opposed to tick boxes
- Work in a dynamic way – respond to the interests of each individual and embed their feedback back into the program

- Moments for side-to-side conversations with the YP
- Care and connection – taking the time to look after the YP, feed them, the right clothing, safe spaces etc
- Opportunities for socialising, learning, fun, and creativity

5.5 Staff, mentors, and role models

Choosing the right staff and ensuring robust staff training was mentioned as being essential in underpinning the success of the course. The training courses most mentioned were:

- Safeguarding Training
- Trauma Informed Training (which will cover Adverse Childhood Experiences ACES)
- Mental Health First Aid

The quality of the engagement is the key to giving the YP the right tools to succeed. The following feedback highlights other important factors to consider when looking for the right staff who will be instrumental in insuring that this happens:

- Staff who will lead by example and be consistent
- Staff who can cascade knowledge and experience to the rest of the team
- Staff who support each other
- Use additional support staff who are not responsible for the delivery of the work but there to support the YP. It is good role modelling to have staff joining in
- Put in the groundwork and training with the adults involved

Selecting the right staff is paramount as these adults will become the mentors and role models that the YP will look up to. Investment in staff can also have an impact on changing staff attitudes towards interventions – this was noted by the Wellbeing & Safeguarding Officer from a referring school.

In addition to this, high staff to YP ratios are advisable as this provides each YP with the support they might need whilst maintaining capacity within the team.

5.6 Identify access points

The consultations to date indicate two broad engagement environments; outdoor and active and creative and classroom based.

5.6.1 Outdoor and active

Half of the organisations / individuals consulted spoke about the dynamic impact engaging a YP in an outside space has on their wellbeing. An outside space is a "neutral space" and gives a YP freedom to achieve and take supported risks. It may be that there is a physical activity that they are involved with, or it might simply be that they are sitting in a hammock listening to the bird song. The important factor is that they are included without being forced to take part and that they have an "acceptable amount of control" and they can access the activity or task in a way that is achievable for them.

5.6.2 Creative and classroom based

Creative interventions which are predominately classroom / room based was another access point used to engage with YP. For example, *Hampshire Cultural Trust* work across 7 alternative education services

and provide visiting artists to facilitate moments of creativity and learning over a 5-week period (one 45-minute lesson a week for 5 weeks). The emphasis of this intervention is engagement, and the main aim is to get the YP back into mainstream school. The feedback from one of the artists, *Sue Martin*, who had worked on this project was interesting, and she noted that she had to be "flexible and adaptable" to meet the needs of the YP.

5.7 How to understand the audience

The following points were noted:

- Clear but not too intrusive application / referral forms
- Ask questions such as why do you want to do this course; what benefits are you looking for?
- Every young person is different, they different triggers, different home lives and different opinions. Understanding them as a whole means taking the time to understand them as individuals. And as such, different interventions work for different groups.

6. Preliminary Conclusions

6.1 Potential 'fit' for Project Rejuvenate

The survey of the literature and evidence of relevant practice relating to the YJS does indicate opportunities for a Project Rejuvenate initiative to contribute to either prevention or desistance efforts. In terms of addressing causal factors for criminal offending a heritage intervention has the potential to support engagement in education, skills development for employment, the promotion of physical and mental health, and developing life skills. In terms of protective factors in prevention approaches, a heritage intervention has scope to provide role models for promoting pro-social behaviours and building self-efficacy and a positive outlook in young people. Moreover, although the evidence base for heritage practice is not large, there is sufficient to indicate that a heritage intervention can offer activities to control behaviour and enhance a young person's ability to participate in everyday pro-social activities. There is, however, a clear distinction between the potential for a heritage intervention to create or provide a therapeutic environment or experience and the delivery of therapeutic interventions as referred to in YJS policy and practice in Section **2** and **4.2**. It would also appear that heritage-based interventions suit a strengths-based approach to prevention or desistance, whether as part of the RNR or GLM models.

Looking at the arts and cultural sector's contribution to working with young offenders it is important to note that most of the interventions are conducted within a custodial institution and that engagement in artistic creativity is a key distinguishing characteristic of such interventions for its neuroscientific benefits in relation to cognition and learning and promoting wellbeing, for example in music-making (Hallam, 2016). This benefit may not be so replicable or pronounced in a heritage intervention but that does not mean to say that a creative heritage activity would not be part of an intervention, in fact far from it. The effects of arts-based interventions cited in Section **4.3** do appear to correlate with or replicate those evident heritage programmes with young people or veterans as in the case of Operation Nightingale and as such lend themselves to further analysis in developing a conceptual model in Phase 2 of Project Rejuvenate.

The research conducted to date has not been able to elucidate a definitive 'fit' for a Project Rejuvenate heritage initiative within existing YJS practice. The impact of Coronavirus on working arrangements and

the busyness of agencies has made it too difficult within the timeframe to identify the appropriate young person audience, access point and referral agency and/or partners with sufficient confidence to progress a pilot project within the YJS for now. Based on the findings though it is the education engagement hook that heritage engagement can provide that stands out as the most accessible and intuitive offer that the sector can contribute as a pilot project in the near term. There is a core philosophy and competency in the heritage sector in promoting and delivering educational benefits to young people. Schools seem to be a logical partner if we elect to focus on early prevention; they have a clear understanding of the potential participant groups and a responsibility to support those for whom mainstream education is a challenge.

6.2 Challenges and risks

The consultations have been important in identifying some of the challenges and risks in working with vulnerable young people. A Project Rejuvenate intervention will need to consider how challenging behaviours and safeguarding issues are managed. *Unloved Heritage?* Staff have experienced abusive behaviour, safeguarding disclosures, potential safeguarding situations, and participant attachment boundary scenarios. Additionally, there can be some very basic needs such as food, clothing and sanitary products that can be a barrier to participation if not catered for, and staff can expect to hear some harrowing life stories. Moreover, any staff delivering a heritage intervention will need to appreciate that the participant audience may have limited understanding or appreciation of archaeology or heritage and may not care at all; managing expectation and project design may need to underplay the heritage theme by treating it as a vehicle to deliver the protective factors or address causal factors mentioned in Section **6.1** which could be unpalatable for some. Staff selection and training and potentially access to supervision will be necessary to prepare for delivering a successful programme.

6.3 What works

So far, in identifying what works for interventions with young people from existing practice in supporting vulnerable individuals or those in contact with the YJS that is either transferable or desirable in designing a heritage-based intervention the following critical success factors have been identified either as components or outcomes.

6.3.1 Components:

- Selection and training of the facilitator or practitioner to ensure preparedness in working with and being credible to this participant group
- Meets individual needs, including basic needs, and is responsive to those needs to cater for diversity.
- Involves co-design with the participants
- Activity or time for the participant to be reflexive
- Incorporates activity that is engaging, enjoyable and mood enhancing
- Opportunity for external (non CJS) acknowledgement for outputs or achievements to assist in building self-esteem and self-confidence
- Provision of 'safe space' – an environment for young people to engage in the activity free from threat
- Work with the appropriate referral partners and ensure that they fully understand the aims, objectives, and requirements of the intervention

- Difference – not like school

6.3.2 Outcomes:

- Develop a sense of self and identity
- Increase personal agency
- Builds social capital: a sense of community, social skills, co-operation, and trusted relationships
- Encourages engagement in learning and developing new skills

6.4 Evaluation

Evidence for robust evaluation is generally lacking with the HEFA programme perhaps the principal exception. The consultation insights indicate the need for a light touch mixed method approach that is young person appropriate and that is tied to defined Project Rejuvenate participant outcomes. Some quantitative and qualitative tools that have been employed in heritage interventions have been identified (Sections **4.4.4**, **4.4.6** and **5.3**) but their suitability for the objectives and audience of Project Rejuvenate is explored in Section **7** and **8**.

7. Development of a Conceptual Model

7.1 Introduction

The review has revealed gaps in knowledge which must be acknowledged and considerable complexity in both the scale of the challenge and YJS landscape. There are some contrary indicators within the document on what works and what occurs in practice. Examples include the presence of authority figures involved in the education or YJS setting acting as barriers to engagement for interventions, a contrast between the desirability of participant input, or ownership, in a project versus the need to provide a structured environment to promote life skills as a contrast to the chaotic existence participants experience in their home lives, and active-outdoors / indoors-creative dichotomy in intervention approaches. The Project team discussed the following considerations to help frame and focus the approach to developing a conceptual model for a heritage intervention:

7.1.1 Audience group – target early intervention (prevention) or desistance (issues of scale, challenge, partners, outcomes, and impact sought)?

In addition to the challenges in understanding how the desistance referral mechanisms and requirements of YJS agencies work during the research phase, the lack of familiarity with working with young offenders and the greater experience and confidence of heritage staff working with schools plus their ubiquity in terms of future scaling considerations indicated that the pilot programmes should target early intervention with at risk pupils.

7.1.2 Group interventions or individual interventions for participants (capacity, resource, and impact)?

From what the team could determine from contact with a YOT it is apparent that most non-custodial desistance interventions are conducted on a one to one basis. This does not fit with the insights from the review which favours group based interventions and would have resource implications that would be incompatible for the heritage sector to facilitate

7.1.3 Structured intervention for participants to follow or a participant led/co-designed approach (HEFA versus Unloved Heritage?)?

In balancing the needs to engage and promote agency in the participants with an intervention framework that enables the desired outcomes to be achieved and for an evidence base to be established, the recommendation is to follow a semi-structured intervention approach for the pilot programmes.

7.1.4 Should the intervention have an instrumental heritage component, or should it just be a 'vehicle' to support prevention/desistance outcomes?

Although heritage educational charities are well versed in using a heritage theme to facilitate national curriculum learning outcomes and heritage settings, just like landscape or nature settings, can enable non-heritage activities to occur, it is strongly felt that engagement with heritage has an intrinsic value of its own in relation to self-identity, a sense of belonging, personal agency, learning and skills acquisition. In terms of wellbeing there is potential for hedonic (happiness) and eudaimonic (fully functioning) effects through engagement with heritage. It is an important aspect of a pilot programme to test this assumption in order that a heritage-themed intervention can be distinguished from other cultural or arts based programmes. In terms of future commissioning or funding, demonstrating the benefits and/or efficacy of the heritage component of an intervention would be highly advantageous.

7.1.5 Interventions include a creative element within their design (to tap into some of the benefits associated with arts and culture interventions)?

Notwithstanding the evidence of the benefits of creative activity in the arts and culture sector, its inclusion in a heritage-themed intervention for this target group is logical and aligned. Creative activity is a motivator for engagement and an aid to developing a sense of identity and autonomy and arguably most heritage is the consequence of human creativity in one sense or another.

7.1.6 Interventions include an outdoors, physical activity core (deliberate bias in favour of the HEFA/Unloved Heritage? / Operation Nightingale approaches)?

The evidence base for the wellbeing benefits of being outdoors is growing whether that is in a natural or heritage landscape (Abraham, A., 2010) and a large proportion of archaeological discovery occurs in an outdoor setting. Moreover, there is a growing educational movement towards outdoor learning characterised by 'forest schools' (MacEachren, 2013; Waite, 2016) and is associated with improved learning outcomes. Moreover, one of the identified critical success factors for successful interventions with the target group is that the programme is not like school. For those reasons, an outdoors setting is deemed an essential component of a pilot heritage-themed programme. A local Salisbury secondary school, St Joseph's, that is likely to be the WA pilot programme pupil referrer has recorded positive sentiment feedback from pupils that participated in a Wiltshire Wildlife Trust outdoors based activity project (**Appendix 1**).

7.1.7 Interventions have sufficient scope to permit an individual a degree of autonomy to cater for diversity and setbacks (design, time, and resource implications)?

Experience from involvement with Operation Nightingale and other heritage programmes indicates that the pilot programmes require sufficient flexibility to enable individuals to opt in or out of activity

recognizing that a range of personal factors may impinge on their ability to participate fully in a programme, but proximity to the activity, group or support is still more beneficial than a complete withdrawal. By having a semi-structured approach to the programme design such flexibility can be built in from the outset and by communicating that to the participants it shows a clear intent to promote autonomy that is often absent in their everyday lives.

7.1.8 To what degree will we train heritage staff or rely on partner expertise?

It is recognised that few heritage professionals have much experience in working with underserved groups or young people in general. Fewer still have experience working with this vulnerable young person audience. To address this experience deficit within the sector, it is deemed important to train participating heritage staff and to seek the support of partner organisations for whom this is core or a key component of their service offer. Given that the project is developing and then evaluating pilot schemes it is felt inappropriate to involve volunteers from either WA or CAT.

7.2 Theoretical framework

Additionally, the review of the literature and consultations indicates the absence of an underpinning theory linking interventions for young offenders, or those at risk of offending, to the protective and preventative factors and needs of young people identified as important for this category. In addressing some of these facets the review indicates that a heritage themed intervention needs to address more specific requirements than simply the promotion of general wellbeing, as important as that is, and as specified in Reference A to additionally promote potential and reduce re-offending. Moreover, the project is seeking to understand and explain what components or factors work, singularly or in combination, to effect a positive change for young people at risk of offending or are offending. These determinants of wellbeing identified in 6.3.2, namely personal agency, skills and social capital, represent strong themes throughout the research and consultations and align with the work of Deci and Ryan (Ryan, 2000) in relation to their self-determination theory.

7.2.1 Self-Determination Theory

Self-determination theory (SDT) starts from a premise that people are inherently curious, vital, and self-motivated and this tendency towards personal agency, learning and responsible actions is normative. However, this positive approach to life can be easily side-tracked or diminished by external influences, principally the social environment. SDT is an approach to human motivation and personality 'that highlights the importance of humans' inner resources for personality development and behavioural self-regulation' (Ryan, 2000, p.68). Its focus is on studying people's natural growth tendencies and innate psychological needs that underpin self-motivation and the conditions that nurture these positive processes. Deci and Ryan postulate that the basic psychological needs of 'competence', 'autonomy' and 'relatedness' appear essential for enabling the ideal operating of the natural inclination for growth and integration, as well as for constructive social development and personal wellbeing.

Central to SDT is an understanding of the nature of motivation and a construct of motivation is demonstrably a continuum ranging from internal (intrinsic) to external (extrinsic) motivation. Intrinsic motivation is assumed to be a characteristic of humans from birth but requires a supportive environment for this self-motivation to survive and thrive. SDT focuses on the latter and the conditions that either sustain and promote intrinsic motivation or the social or environmental circumstances that

have the opposite effect. A sub-theory, Cognitive Evaluation Theory, (Ryan, 2000, p.78) is employed to explore the importance of competence and autonomy in relation to intrinsic motivation. In relation to fostering competence positive external feedback, communication and rewards assist the process. However, without a sense of autonomy, the experience that an individual's behaviour is self-determined, feelings of competence are not enough alone to enhance intrinsic motivation. The caveat to the sub-theory is that it only applies to activities that have an intrinsic appeal to the individual. Additionally, SDT hypothesises that relatedness has a bearing on intrinsic motivation and that it will flourish in environments that provide a sense of security and relatedness, based on the positive correlation of secure infant attachment to a parent and exploratory behaviour.

Self-determined motivation is not exclusive to intrinsic motivation and much of it relates to external social dynamics in influencing behaviours and the willingness of an individual to adopt, comply or reject those influences. These responses depend on the degree to which a requested or directed behaviour are internalised and integrated with internalisation referring to the absorption of a value or regulation and integration as the process of transforming that regulation into their own regulation so that it eventually manifests from their sense of self. SDT looks at the processes through which non-intrinsically motivated behaviours can become self-determined and the ways in which the social environment influences those processes. The term extrinsic motivation relates to the performance of an activity to obtain a specific outcome that is different form doing an activity for the inherent satisfaction of the activity itself (intrinsic motivation). Deci and Ryan's (Ryan, 2000, pp.72-73) sub-theory, Organismic Integration Theory (OIT), details the range of extrinsic motivation and contextual factors that span the spectrum of self-determination in relation to the degree of autonomy an individual enjoys. At one end of the scale is 'amotivation' with no sense of value or control and at the other is 'intrinsic motivation' representing full autonomy, interest, and satisfaction. 'Extrinsic Motivation' sits between the two and has a progressive self-regulation taxonomy comprising in turn 'External Regulation' (imposed), 'Introjected Regulation' (not fully accepted, but done in relation to maintain self-esteem for example), 'Identified Regulation' (perceived value or importance of a behavioural goal) and 'Integrated Regulation' (congruent with one's other values and needs). The advantages of greater internalisation appear to include more behavioural effectiveness, greater volitional persistence, enhanced subjective wellbeing and better assimilation of an individual within their social group. Facilitating the integration of extrinsic motivation is assisted by social conditions that promote autonomy, competence and relatedness and of interest to this project is the external factors that may cause alienation or ill-being that could lead to young offending behaviour and how a programme may address them.

7.2.2 SDT 'fit' for Project Rejuvenate

The relevance of SDT to developing a conceptual model for Project Rejuvenate are manifold. Six of the nine CJS causal factors cited for offending (Section **2.4**) relate to SDT, namely education, employment, mental health, attitudes and self-control, life skills and family networks as predominantly extrinsic motivational factors and this is supported by both the Taylor Review (Section **2.5**) and DoE (Section **2.6**). Family, school, and local community are regarded as social environments in which extrinsic motivation plays a key role in prevention (Section **2.7.1**) and autonomy, competence and relatedness are implicit in the described protective factors. Similar connections to these three basic psychological needs are also contained in the desistance theories of maturation, volition, development of social bonds, self-identity, and cognitive transformation in behaviours (Section **2.7**). Moreover, much of the psychological grounding of SDT is rooted in child and young person development and there is research evidence in the

literature for the application of SDT in educational (Burgueño et al., 2020) and sporting contexts (Balaguer, 2012) with young people. The three basic psychological needs of competence, autonomy and relatedness appear to provide a straightforward framework to link the complex environmental factors that contribute to offending and the means to try to address them in the design and evaluation of a preventative or desistance intervention approach. They provide a mechanism to understand the rationale and purpose of each component of an intervention and measures to test cause and effect of those components.

7.3 Design components

The literature research, contributor experience and insights gained from external consultations were combined to produce a set of fundamental design components for a heritage-themed intervention to work with young people at risk of offending. There are six design criteria that are core components of the young person participant experience in the conceptual model, and they are:

- Outdoor activity
- Young person agency
- Meaningful and high quality heritage engagement
- Creative activity
- Socialisation opportunities
- Celebration and recognition of achievements

For each component there is a supporting descriptor, a reference to the SDT basic need(s) effect it supports, mapping against the offending causal factors and protective factors, and the evaluation indicators. This is depicted in the table at **Annex B**.

7.4 Programme construct and delivery requirements

In addition to the design components of a pilot project the same triangulation of knowledge sources has been used to produce a range of considerations that will influence the construction and delivery of the programme. These components and factors are as follows:

- Programme duration (developing and embedding programme gains for the participants)
- Staff selection, training, and support
- Staff to participant ratios
- Optimum participant numbers
- Participant resource requirements
- Risk management
- Alignment of relevant policies for participating organisations
- Evaluation
- Future scalability

These considerations are articulated in more detail in a table at **Annex C**.

7.5 Pilot Programmes

Objective 2 in Reference A was the development of two pilot programmes and associated budget that would also consider scalability and sustainability. In developing the pilot programmes Wessex

Archaeology and Canterbury Archaeological Trust have adopted a common approach to the design components, construct and delivery articulated in sections **7.2** and **7.3**. Moreover, both organisations have agreed to the prevention approach to young offending and thus are targeting young people of secondary school age referred to them from schools or pupil referral schemes in respective regions. With an eye on scalability and sustainability both organisations have partnerships as key enablers in their proposals. In the case of Wessex Archaeology, the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust partner has been chosen for both its expertise with this young person demographic and for its membership of a national network of Wildlife Trusts that could represent an opportunity for scaling. The regional partners for Canterbury Archaeology Trust's programme also explores the concept of localised partnerships matched to the heritage opportunities in any given region. The WA pilot programme is at **Annex D** and the CAT pilot programme is at **Annex E**.

7.6 Pilot Programme Costings

Annex F provides a breakdown of the costs for the two pilot programmes developed by WA and CAT. The budgets have been prepared on a Full Cost Recovery model. The pilots share a common budget framework and cost parameters for ease of reference. The largest cost factor is staff time, comprising the participating heritage organisations, partner organisations and other external facilitators. Evaluation costs have been determined based on the daily cost of an evaluator requiring one day's collation and analysis for every day of evaluation. The principle variation in budgets is reflected in the respective programme durations; WA at 12 weeks and CAT at 8 weeks although overall time for the participants is similar.

8. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

8.1. Introduction

The evidence base for the efficacy of heritage themed interventions in promoting wellbeing or supporting underserved individuals and groups is generally lacking and where it exists the robustness of the evidence is generally poor compared to comparable sectors. Across the arts, culture, museum and heritage sectors, longitudinal studies to explore the longer term, residual benefits of interventions are chronically lacking from an examination of the published research literature. A key part of the Project Rejuvenate research is to establish an evaluation methodology that addresses some, or all, of this evidence lacuna, albeit working with just one underserved community, namely young people at risk of offending.

8.2. Observations and issues concerning research involving children and young people

8.2.1 Differences in approach when research involves children

Academic discourse on the differences in relation to research programmes involving children or adults has been arguably overstated. Current social science views on the different worlds of adulthood and childhood reflect that children are:

- Progressing through a stage towards adulthood (developmental differences)
- Culturally different (different construction of the world) as a group and as individuals

Moreover, it is commonly accepted that children have a different and sometimes a more limited vocabulary and understanding of words. This has implications for the language used and methods of conveyance of any evaluation question set and how the resultant data is analysed.

8.2.2 Principles and ethics in research involving children

Kirk (2007) summarises the principles and ethical issues involved in research involving children and young people. Young people should be involved as active agents in the research and researchers should have measures in place to manage any distress caused by a young person's participation in research. The three ethical considerations are power relations, informed consent, and confidentiality.

8.2.2.1 Power relations:

- Using methods that allow children to feel part of the research process and which give them the maximum opportunity to provide their views
- Being responsive to children's own agendas
- Involving children as part of the research team
- Using group interviews
- Checking on children's willingness to participate throughout the interview (including non-verbal cues)
- Rehearsing with children how to decline participating or answering particular questions
- In interview studies giving children control over tape recorders

8.2.2.2 Informed consent:

- Potential participants gain knowledge through the provision of information they can understand
- Consent is voluntarily given
- Has the capacity or competence to give their consent

8.2.2.3 Confidentiality:

We should anticipate safeguarding disclosures concerning a participant or others known to them and will need to communicate our legal responsibility to act on a safeguarding disclosure

8.3. Aims of the Evaluation - what are we trying to achieve?

The project evaluation framework is designed to address the following three aims:

8.3.1 Efficacy in prevention and promoting wellbeing

Demonstrate that heritage themed interventions can support vulnerable young people in relation to satisfying basic psychological needs as described in self-determination theory that may work towards prevention of youth offending and contribute to wellbeing.

8.3.2 Longitudinal impact

To determine whether the impact of an intervention has a lasting effect, i.e., endures beyond the duration of the intervention (longitudinal).

8.3.3 Distinctive heritage causal factors

Identify what parts of a heritage themed intervention are effective in building autonomy, competence and relatedness and understand why they have that effect in the young person. Moreover, we seek to determine:

- what the heritage intervention directly contributes towards intrinsic or extrinsic motivation (i.e., exclusively related to the heritage component of the activity)
- and how the non-heritage factors/elements contribute to motivation (e.g., effect of facilitators as role models).

It is essential that we try to establish whether the heritage engagement component is a factor in the effectiveness of the pilot, i.e., it stands alone as a discrete benefit gain for the participants and/or acts as an enabler, or multiplier, for gains in the other components of the programme. If we are unable to achieve a demonstration of uniqueness through the heritage element(s) then the programmes as designed would not be distinct from a 'forest school' or similar nature/landscape based programme. The association of place-making and identity in relation to heritage may be instrumental in generating a distinction from other types of interventions.

8.4. Evaluation Approach

To meet these aims, Project Rejuvenate will need to employ a mixed methods evaluation framework comprising both quantitative and qualitative measures. Additionally, the project evaluation approach will include measures to assess any longer term benefits of the intervention. Furthermore, in addressing potential causes of bias in evaluating a new programme intervention the intention is to have control groups to run alongside the two pilot programmes.

8.4.1 Quantitative Measures

To answer Q3.1.1 and Q3.1.2 it is suggested that quantitative data is recorded via two approaches:

8.4.1.1 Basic Psychological Needs Scale (BPNS)

The BPNS questionnaire has been produced specifically to evaluate programmes in terms of SDT and scores the impact on autonomy, competence and relatedness against a standardised question set. The questionnaire asks 21 questions that are scored using a 7 point Likert scale. An example form is at **Annex G**. In terms of application, it is suggested that the questionnaire is completed before or at the start of the programme, midway through the programme and either just before programme end or at the 'celebratory' event (i.e., not the final session as a wellbeing 'dip' can be reasonably expected which would skew the results). There is scope to adapt the question set within the context of the pilot programmes.

8.4.1.2 School Measures

Evaluate the effect of the programme on measures that record attitude, behaviour or engagement with education that are used by the referral organisation (e.g., school). These measures could include attendance, attainment, emotional behaviour, conduct behaviour, learning behaviour or similar that are recorded for all pupils or for pupils that are already in some form or intervention process such as excluded pupils or those with a SEN profile. There is greater chance of being able to examine any

longitudinal impact of the intervention as this avoids the natural decline in respondent participation in longitudinal surveys and is a cost effective measure. **Appendix 2** provides some examples of the school attendance and behaviour measures in use for schools in Wiltshire and Oxfordshire. The two pilots may not be able to replicate the same measures given that the schools may operate evaluation differently, but it should still be possible to discern change, or otherwise, from each intervention and potentially provide evidence to support a longitudinal effect.

8.4.2 Qualitative Measures

8.4.2.1 Causality

In approaching Q3.1.3 to address the causality behind the effectiveness of the intervention it is recommended that a qualitative evaluation approach is employed. We will be dealing with vulnerable, developing young people meaning that engagement with evaluation could be challenging and not easily understood. A light touch approach would seem best suited for this audience group. Semi-structured interviews that could generate themes for subsequent qualitative analysis supported by facilitator observational data (communication, collaborative behaviour, engagement, achievement, fulfilment, mood)and photo/video records (all with consent), participant testimonials and completed projects/products would be in scope.

8.4.2.2 Question/observation framework approach

Given the agreed model for the pilot programmes our common qualitative evaluation framework would need to be designed to assess the contribution of each of the constituent elements of the programme and their relative impact in relation to each other. So, for instance, a semi-structured interview would need to ask questions pertaining to being outdoors, having a degree of autonomy within the programme, the impact of the heritage engagement activity, creative activity, opportunities for socialising in a peer group, and a sense of achievement or attainment from the culminating event/outputs in the context of the anticipated SDT effect (competence, autonomy and relatedness) in language that is easily understood by the participants. In exploring the significance of the heritage engagement component, we may wish to explore identity/place-making in addition to competence gains (learning and skills acquisition) and intrinsic motivation ('for the joy of it' – hedonistic wellbeing). Given the recommendation that participants should be involved in the programme, by extension that could be extended to the evaluation process – if they are bought into the 'why' of the evaluation participants are more likely to respond positively to the process. A question set for the qualitative evaluation will need to be developed and it is recommended that this is done after conducting a Theory of Change workshop with the participating organisations.

8.5. Evaluation robustness

8.5.1 Minimising bias

While the proposed mixed methods approach with a longitudinal study opportunity represents a comprehensive framework, ideally the project will include a control group. A randomised controlled trial (RCT) is perceived as the gold standard for evaluation of a new intervention or treatment as it assists in minimising certain sources of bias. The only immediate way of addressing this might be to ask the referral organisation to randomly select the participants into the pilot programme and a control group (those eligible but do not participate in the pilot) and compare their school data records over the

intervention period at the same survey points and in any post programme intervals that contribute to the longitudinal study. This will require the active co-operation of the referral organisation.

8.5.2 Validity of results from the samples
We will be dealing with relatively small cohort sizes across the two pilots which means that determining robust statistical significance in the evaluated quantitative data could be challenging. Assuming the combined cohorts will number 24 young people, this will be less than the recommended n=30 sample size and could affect validity. Provided the right methodology is employed with the qualitative evaluation the sample size is generally less problematic in determining validity than in quantitative approaches. With a control group it would be appropriate to consider analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical testing to identify if the differences between the control group and/or the pilot programme qualitative results are significant or due to chance. Further research and selection of validation methodologies will be required once the evaluation approach for the pilots is refined following the conduct of a Theory of Change model exercise.

9. Bibliography

ACE, 2018. *Arts and culture in health and wellbeing and in the criminal justice system A summary of evidence.* A.C. England. Available from: *https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication/arts-and-culture-health-and-wellbeing-and-criminal-justice-system-summary-evidence*.
Adler, J.R., Edwards, S.K., Scally, M., Gill, D., Puniskis, M.J., Gekoski, A., Horwath, M.A.H. M.o. Justice, 2016. *What Works in Managing Young People who Offend? A Summary of the International Evidence.* Ministry of Justice Analytical Series.
Almond, T., 2012. Asset: An assessment tool that safeguards or stigmatizes young offenders? *Probation journal,* 59(2), pp. 138-150.
Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J. and Wormith, J.S., 2011. The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Model: Does Adding the Good Lives Model Contribute to Effective Crime Prevention? *Criminal justice and behavior,* 38(7), pp. 735-755.
Balaguer, I., 2012. Coaches' interpersonal style, basic psychological needs and the well- and ill-being of young soccer players: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences,* 30(15), pp. 1619-1630.
Burgueño, R., González-Cutre, D., Sevil-Serrano, J., Herrador-Colmenero, M., Segura-Díaz, J.M., Medina-Casaubón, J. and Chillon, P., 2020. Validation of the Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction in Active Commuting to and from School (BPNS-ACS) Scale in Spanish young people. *Journal of transport & health,* 16, p. 100825.
Case, S. and Haines, K., 2015. Children First, Offenders Second: The Centrality of Engagement in Positive Youth Justice. *The Howard journal of criminal justice,* 54(2), pp. 157-175.
Clarke, R.V. and Cornish, D.B., 1985. Modeling Offenders' Decisions: A Framework for Research and Policy. *Crime and justice (Chicago, Ill.),* 6, pp. 147-185.
Daykin, N., Viggiani, N., Moriarty, Y. and Pilkington, P., 2017. Music-making for health and wellbeing in youth justice settings: mediated affordances and the impact of context and social relations. *Sociology of health & illness,* 39(6), pp. 941-958.
DoE. Department for Education. D.f. Education, 2004. *Every Child Matters.*
DoE, 2016. Education Excellence Everywhere White Paper. *Education Journal,* (264), pp. 4-8.
DoH. D.o. Health, 2009. *The Bradley Report: Lord Bradley's review of people with mental health problems or learning disabilities in the criminal justice system.* London.
Durcan, G., Saunders, A., Gadsby, B. and Hazard, A., 2014. The Bradley Report five years on: An independent review of progress to date and priorities for further development.

DÜNkel, F., 2014. Juvenile Justice Systems in Europe – Reform developments between justice, welfare and 'new punitiveness'1. *Kriminologijos studijos,* 1(1).

Everill, P., Bennett, R. and Burnell, K., 2020. Dig in: an evaluation of the role of archaeological fieldwork for the improved wellbeing of military veterans. *Antiquity,* 94(373), pp. 212-227.

Finnegan, A., 2016. The biopsychosocial benefits and shortfalls for armed forces veterans engaged in archaeological activities. *Nurse Education Today,* 47, pp. 15-22.

Giordano, P.C., Cernkovich, S.A. and Rudolph, J.L., 2002. Gender, Crime, and Desistance: Toward a Theory of Cognitive Transformation. *American Journal of Sociology,* 107(4), pp. 990-1064.

Griffiths, S., Edwards, B. and Reynolds, Ff., 2020. Public Archaeology: sharing best practice. Case studies from Wales. *Internet Archaeology,* (55).

Hallam, S., 2016. The Impact of Actively Making Music on The Intellectual, Social and Personal Development of Children and Young People: A Summary. *Voices : a world forum for music therapy,* 16(2).

HC, 1988. *Crime and Disorder Act.*

HC, 2004. The Children Act.

HC. H.a. HL, 2015. *The UK's compliance with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.* London: Stationary Office.

Heeks, M., Reed, S.,Tafsiri, M. and Prince, S. H. Office, 2018. *The economic and social costs of crime.*

HMIP. H.I.o. Probation, 2016. *Desistance and young people.*

Kirk, S., 2007. Methodological and ethical issues in conducting qualitative research with children and young people: A literature review. *International journal of nursing studies,* 44(7), pp. 1250-1260.

Kougiali, Z., Einat, T. and Liebling, A., 2018. Rhizomatic affective spaces and the therapeutic potential of music in prison: a qualitative meta-synthesis. *Qualitative research in psychology,* 15(1), pp. 1-28.

Laub, J. and Sampson, R., 2001. Understanding Desistance from Crime. University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, C., 2014. 'Cooler than a trip to Alton Towers': Assessing the Impact of the Higher Education Field Academy, 2005–13. *Public Archaeology,* 13(4), pp. 295-322.

Liddle, I., 2015. Emotional and psychological well-being in children: the development and validation of the Stirling Children's Well-being Scale. *Educational Psychology in Practice,* 31(2), pp. 174-186.

Lipsey, M.W., 2009. The Primary Factors that Characterize Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Overview. *Victims & offenders,* 4(2), pp. 124-147.

MacEachren, Z., 2013. The Canadian Forest School Movement. *LEARNing landscapes,* 7(1), pp. 219-233.

Maruna, S., 2001. Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

MoJ. M.o. Justice, 2010. *Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders.* The Stationery Office.

Pudney, C., 2017a. Romans and Reducing Recidivism: Archaeology, Social Benefit, and Working with Offenders in Wales (Part 1). *Public archaeology,* 16(1), pp. 19-41.

Pudney, C., 2017b. Translational Public Archaeology? Archaeology, Social Benefit, and Working with offenders in Wales (Part 2). *Public archaeology,* 16(2), pp. 74-89.

Ross, A., Duckworth, K., Smith, DJ., Wyness, G., Schoon, I. D.f. Education, 2010. *Prevention and Reduction: A review of strategies for intervening early to prevent or reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour.* Centre for Analysis of Youth Transitions.

Rutherford, A., 1986. *Growing out of crime.* Harmondsworth: Harmondsworth : Penguin.

Ryan, R.M., 2000. Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist,* 55(1), pp. 68-79.

Taylor, C. M.o. Justice, 2016. *Review of the Youth Justice System in England and Wales.* London.

Thomson, L.J. and Chatterjee, H.J., 2015. Measuring the impact of museum activities on well-being: developing the Museum Well-being Measures Toolkit. *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 30(1), pp. 44-62.

UN, 1989. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Unit, S.E. O.o.t.D.P. Minister, 2002. *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners.*

Wainwright, L. and Nee, C., 2014. The Good Lives Model - new directions for preventative practice with children? *Psychology, crime & law,* 20(2), pp. 166-182.

Waite, S., 2016. Comparing apples and pears?: a conceptual framework for understanding forms of outdoor learning through comparison of English Forest Schools and Danish udeskole. *Environmental Education Research,* 22(6), pp. 868-893.

Ward, T. and Brown, M., 2004. The good lives model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, crime & law,* 10(3), pp. 243-257.

Annexes:

A.   20201217_AnnexA_Full Consultation Notes Dec 2020_Proj Rejuvenate Ph 1 report_V1.0_LC

B.   20210121_Annex B_Pro Rejuvenate_design concept_GW

C.   202103_Annex C _Programme Construct & Delivery Requirements_GW

D.   20210318_Annex D_WA Pilot Programme_LC

E.   20210308_Annex E_CAT Pilot Programme_AR

F.   20210318_Annex F_WA & CAT Pilot Programme Budget_LC_AR

G.   202110225_Annex G_BPNS form_GW

Appendices:

1.   20210318_Appx 1_Young People Feedback_WWT_StJSchool_GW

2.   20210318_Appx 2_School Attendance and Behaviour Policies_GW