

**Whakamanawa te Hou Ora o nga Rangatahi:
Lessons from New Zealand's National Youth Development Strategy**

Prepared by
Jennifer Appleton Gootman

With funding from the sponsors of the
Ian Axford Fellowship in Public Policy

December 2003

The Ian Axford Fellowship in Public Policy

We acknowledge and thank the following corporate and government sponsors that support the programme:

- Air New Zealand
- ERMA New Zealand
- Fonterra
- LEK Consulting
- The Department of Internal Affairs
- The Department of Labour
- The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
- The Ministry for the Environment
- The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
- The Ministry of Economic Development
- The Ministry of Education
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- The Ministry of Health
- The Ministry of Justice
- The Ministry of Research, Science and Technology
- The Ministry of Social Development
- The National Bank
- The Office of the Commissioner of Police
- The State Services Commission
- The Treasury
- Transpower New Zealand Ltd

The Ian Axford Fellowships were named in honour of Sir Ian Axford, a New Zealand astrophysicist and space scientist.

Since his education in New Zealand, England and later at Cornell University and the University of California, Sir Ian has been closely involved in the planning of several space missions, notably the Voyager probes to the outer planets. Since 1974, Sir Ian has been director of the Max Planck Institute of Aeronomy in Germany. He is the recipient of many notable science awards and was named "New Zealander of the Year" for 1995.

In the world of space science, Sir Ian has emerged as one of the great thinkers and communicators, and a highly respected and influential administrator. Currently, he is working to create the first mission to interstellar space with the Voyager spacecraft.

The Ian Axford Fellowships in Public Policy have three goals:

- To reinforce United States/New Zealand links by enabling fellows of high intellectual ability and leadership potential to gain experience and build contacts in each other's countries.
- To increase fellows' ability to bring about changes and improvements in their fields of expertise by the cross-fertilisation of ideas and experience.
- To build a network of policy experts on both sides of the Pacific that will facilitate international policy exchange and collaboration beyond the fellowship experience.

Fellows are based at a host institution and carefully partnered with a leading specialist who will act as a mentor. In addition, fellows spend a substantial part of their time in contact with relevant organisations outside their host institutions, to gain practical experience in their fields.

The fellowships are awarded to professionals active in the business, public or non-profit sectors. The United States and New Zealand selection committees look for fellows who show potential as leaders and opinion formers in their chosen fields. Fellows are selected also for their ability to put the experience and professional expertise gained from their fellowship into effective use.

CONTENTS

<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u>	2
<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	4
<u>PART I: SETTING THE STAGE</u>	6
<u>Overview and Introduction</u>	6
<u>Research Methods</u>	7
<u>Definitions</u>	8
<u>New Zealand / United States Comparison</u>	8
<u>PART II: NEW ZEALAND YOUTH POLICY CONTEXT</u>	14
<u>Multi-Sectoral Involvement</u>	14
<u>Data and Indicators on Youth</u>	18
<u>Evaluations on Youth</u>	19
<u>Youth Workers</u>	19
<u>Treaty of Waitangi</u>	20
<u>United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCROC)</u>	21
<u>PART III: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AOTEAROA</u>	22
<u>Development of the Strategy</u>	22
<u>Overview of the Strategy</u>	23
<u>Youth Development in the United States</u>	25
<u>Implementation of the Strategy</u>	25
<u>Organisational Change at the Ministry of Youth Affairs</u>	27
<u>PART IV: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT – FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE</u>	28
<u>Evaluating the Impact of the Strategy</u>	28
<u>The Strategy in Practice</u>	29
<u>Youth Worker Networks</u>	34
<u>Beyond Programme Descriptions</u>	39
<u>Promising Next Steps</u>	39
<u>PART V: CONCLUSIONS AND LOOKING AHEAD</u>	42
<u>Lessons From Youth Development in Practice</u>	42
<u>Future Directions</u>	44
<u>Application to the United States</u>	50
<u>APPENDIX A: Interviewees and Discussants</u>	52
<u>APPENDIX B: Glossary of Terms</u>	55
<u>CITATIONS</u>	56

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I deeply appreciate the opportunity the Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowship in Public Policy afforded my family and me to spend six months in New Zealand.

Many individuals and organisations deserve thanks for their contributions that made my experience in New Zealand both enriching and enjoyable. I appreciate the support of the sponsors and board members of the Ian Axford Fellowship, the Commonwealth Fund of New York, and Fulbright New Zealand for recognizing the value of my project and for selecting me for this opportunity. Jennifer M. Gill and the rest of the staff at Fulbright New Zealand provided superb orientation, as well as ongoing assistance during our stay in New Zealand.

I was very fortunate to be welcomed into the Ministry of Youth Development. The staff at the Ministry is a group of smart, hard working, creative, and resourceful individuals who exemplify teamwork. They were supportive both professionally and personally, offering me open access to valuable resources and institutional knowledge, candid feedback, and opportunities to participate in everything from programme site visits to lunchtime netball. I particularly value the groundwork that Henry Dowler laid for me at the beginning of my project, Anne Carter's ongoing support of my work, and Anne Hartley's willingness to assist me during a period of organisational change at the Ministry. David Hanna also was very generous with his time, knowledge, and perspective.

The Roy McKenzie Centre for the Study of Families at Victoria University of Wellington and its director Jan Pryor connected me to valuable professional networks and helped me frame the scope of my inquiry.

The foundation for my work on this project was the conversations I had with central and local government policymakers, service providers, youth workers, young people, and other community leaders throughout New Zealand. I am very grateful to those listed in Appendix A for the insights they shared with me. The young people were especially courageous, telling me stories about their lives and experiences in youth development programmes. Those who work with youth are committed, generous, and deserve special recognition for their invaluable contribution to the lives of young people and the communities in which they live.

I also appreciate the support and encouragement of my colleagues at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, DC – particularly Susanne Stoiber, Michael Feuer, Jane Ross, Amy Gawad, and Elizabeth Townsend.

My Axford Fellow colleagues, Daniel Pollak, John Smith, and Carlton Eley, were valuable intellectual sounding boards, as well as enjoyable comrades with whom to explore and experience New Zealand.

Finally, my husband Marek was my greatest ally, both in my pursuit of this opportunity and during our time in New Zealand. He made professional sacrifices that enabled my participation in the fellowship. He offered encouragement, policy insight, and editorial advice, and he spent endless hours entertaining and caring for our daughter Saige.

Tena koutou katoa.

Jennifer Gootman
December 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa (YDSA or the Strategy) was launched by New Zealand's Ministry of Youth Affairs (MoYA) in early 2002. This Strategy is a unique example of government policy creating a platform for public and community agencies to approach policy and programming for young people aged 12 to 24.

The YDSA offers a framework to provide positive experiences and counter negative trends through youth development policy and programmes. The principles of youth development promote a fundamental shift in focus from youth problems to building on their assets, recognizing that young people are partners and contributors. Youth development theory proposes that many problems of young people, such as substance abuse and offending, are coexisting and mutually reinforcing, and solutions lie in providing more integrated, holistic services. The YDSA encourages investment in broader efforts that support youth to reach their potential in all areas of their lives.

Over the past decade, government agencies, foundations, and the private sector in the United States (US) increasingly began to invest in a range of separate programmes and activities for youth. These programmes are beginning to reflect a youth development approach, however, most continue to be categorical and fragmented, diminishing their effectiveness.

In contrast, New Zealand has made significant progress toward a national vision and strategy for youth development through the YDSA. Its release culminated more than ten years of discussions about public policy for young people in New Zealand, evolving over a long period through shifting political landscapes and leadership.

This project developed lessons from the New Zealand experience related to effective youth development programme functioning and the relevance of the YDSA. Site visits and discussions with young people, youth workers, and service providers, coupled with a review of the Strategy's development, interviews with Government policymakers, and an examination of youth programmes and planning processes yielded the following observations:

Creation of the Strategy: The Strategy was prepared through a community-based process reflecting the input of a range of stakeholders, including young people, and moves from focusing narrowly on problems to a more holistic youth development approach.

Application of the Strategy: Important elements of effective youth development programmes include charismatic leaders and the vision and commitment of individual youth workers and community organisations; a focus on helping youth to build relationships as a primary programme goal; and connecting youth development with community, iwi, and hapu development activities.

Impact of the Strategy: The best source of knowledge about youth development practice exists at the community level. The Strategy has reached individuals and groups representing diverse communities, and there are several comprehensive local and regional efforts to implement the Strategy. Examples of creative, successful youth development programmes are in practice at both the local and national levels in New Zealand.

Challenges for the Strategy: The impact of the Strategy appears to be impeded by the lack of a clear national implementation plan or process. A large cross-section of stakeholders involved in youth policy and programming continue to struggle with understanding the concept of youth development and apply it in practice. Tangible links between and among government policies across age ranges are not clear in practice, and

while several government principles and initiatives across departments are conceptually aligned, few appear to have operational links.

These observations reveal successes in the design and early influence of the YDSA, as well as significant challenges to its meaningful implementation at scale. They highlight possible future directions for New Zealand policymakers and community leaders where continued work could enhance the reach and the impact of the Strategy:

1. Implementation Plan: Develop a plan and process to translate the youth development principles into more specific actions at the national and local levels.
2. Strategy Implementation Group: Create a multi-sectoral implementation group involving relevant national and local public and private representation.
3. Training and Technical Assistance: Increase youth development knowledge among stakeholders at all levels (government policymakers, service providers, youth workers, etc.) through training, tools, and ongoing technical assistance.
4. Evaluation and Data: Strengthen the evidence base with evaluation and data collection.
5. Reforms in Current Funding: Connect youth development principles into existing programme funding mechanisms.
6. Demonstration Projects: Test holistic youth development programmes through interagency / intergovernmental collaboration and services integration at the community level.

New Zealand's experience in designing and implementing the YDSA suggests several themes for programme design and government policy in the US, particularly at the state level. This experience offers transferable lessons despite the differences between the two countries in scale, culture, and laws.

The identification of a perfect youth development programme that can be replicated across communities is impossible. The diversity of young people, their particular needs, and surrounding environments makes it unrealistic for a single programme to fit all situations. There also is an aspect to working with young people that is an art, not a science, and programme success often is dependent on intangible variables such as the personality of the youth worker or the interpersonal relationships within a particular group of young people.

Yet, the YDSA demonstrates that a consensus document outlining a strategy for youth development can: (1) assure a consistent framework for effective youth programme design; (2) provide a tangible vehicle for political commitment and rationale to generate organisational change; and (3) guide alignment of intergovernmental and interagency resource commitments.

In both its successes and challenges, the development and preliminary implementation of New Zealand's youth development strategy clearly represents a significant first step toward delivering more appropriate and effective youth supports. These efforts afford both conceptual and operational lessons for youth development programming.

PART I: SETTING THE STAGE

- Describes the purpose of this project, the research methods for the collection and synthesis of information, and key definitions used throughout this paper.
- Discusses comparisons between New Zealand and American youth.

Overview and Introduction

Adolescence is the critical transition period between childhood and adulthood. During this time in personal development, young people define their independent social, intellectual, and spiritual identities, and explore education and career options. They also confront the natural complexities of managing emotional, physical, cultural, and intellectual growth. Many young people face serious socio-economic challenges, such as health problems, family and community violence, intergenerational abuse of drugs and alcohol, lack of economic opportunity, a decline in traditional family and social support networks, underachieving schools, and distressed neighbourhoods. All of these competing dynamics affect the immediate health and wellbeing of adolescents and their positive involvement in, and contribution to, society as adults.

Over the past decade, government agencies, foundations, and the private sector in the US increasingly have begun to invest in a range of separate programmes and activities for youth intended to provide positive experiences and counter negative trends. Many of these programmes are beginning to reflect a “youth development” approach that:

- enhances the protective factors in young people’s lives, as well as addressing risk factors
- supports a sense of belonging to, and connection with, key social environments (families, schools, training, work, communities, and peer groups)
- ensures young people have safe, caring relationships
- promotes young people’s active participation in all areas of their lives.

Research indicates that youth development programmes enable young people to both avoid problem behaviours and acquire the foundational attitudes, competencies, values, and social skills needed to be successful in adulthood. There is evidence that integrating positive developmental opportunities into the lives of young people yields measurable benefits to youth and the communities in which they live (National Research Council, 2000; Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2002b, 2000d; Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1989; Eccles et al., 1993; Pittman et al., 2000; Blum and Rinehart, 1997; Quinn, 1999).

However, most youth programmes continue to be categorical, fragmented, and focused on problem-specific activities, diminishing their effectiveness. In order to enhance their value, policymakers in the US are beginning to consider frameworks that better connect discrete youth activities and promote a youth development approach. The Federal Government is conducting ongoing discussions about policies and legislation to promote youth development, including the crafting of a collaborative statement about the principles of youth development and the importance of supporting youth development programmes (Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, 2003). Periodically, national events bring together policymakers, community leaders, youth service providers, and young people to promote youth development. A number of individual states also are attempting to better

coordinate approaches to youth policy; for example, at least 20 states have an interagency structure in place to consider youth policy (Ferber et al., 2002), and some national organisations are promoting initiatives to better align policies for youth at the state level. However, any efforts to craft a comprehensive strategic plan for youth development are in their nascent stages. In general, state youth policies remain disconnected from one another, and efforts toward an overall national approach for youth policy have been limited.

In contrast, New Zealand has made significant progress toward a national vision and strategy for youth development. In February 2002, the New Zealand Government's Ministry of Youth Affairs (MoYA)¹ launched the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa (YDSA or the Strategy) (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2002c). The release of the Strategy culminated more than 10 years of discussions about public policy for young people in New Zealand, evolving over a long period through shifting political landscapes and leadership.

The YDSA provides a platform for public agencies to approach policy and programming for young people aged 12 to 24, and it provides an action framework for individuals, groups, and organisations which work at the community and local level with young people. The YDSA aims to shift thinking from a focus on youth problems to viewing young people as partners with assets and the ability to contribute in all sectors of society.

This project examined the YDSA, related child and youth policies; programmes, activities, and opportunities for youth in New Zealand; and relevant literature and data, with the intent of:

- highlighting for both the US and New Zealand policymakers and community leaders ways that youth development theory and policy has been applied in programmes, activities, and services for youth across geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic variations
- informing New Zealand policymakers on possible next steps for enhancing the impact of the YDSA and for promoting the principles of youth development among a greater number and broader set of youth-serving organisations and programmes
- identifying transferable lessons for national, state, and local youth development strategic planning in the US.

Research Methods

This project was conducted between July and November 2003 under the auspices of the Ian Axford Fellowship in Public Policy. Following a review of written materials and preliminary meetings with policymakers in Wellington, site visits and interviews were conducted around New Zealand with various stakeholders involved in the design, delivery, and funding of youth programmes and youth policy, as well as individuals responsible for the preparation and training of those who work with youth. These included policymakers in central and local government, as well as youth workers, youth work trainers, health professionals, academic experts in various related fields, and philanthropists funding youth services or programmes. Conversations with young people involved in various youth programmes were also included.

¹ The Ministry of Youth Affairs was disestablished on 1 October 2003 and re-established as the Ministry of Youth Development within the Ministry of Social Development (MSD). See Part III for a further discussion of this organisational change. This creates some confusion in identifying the Ministry throughout this paper. The Ministry is referred to as the Ministry of Youth Affairs or MoYA until the point in the paper in Part III which describes the organisational change and from that point on it is referred to as the Ministry of Youth Development or MYD, unless it is being referred to in citations or in an historical sense.

Individuals who contributed to these meetings and provided input and assistance are identified in Appendix A. Government policy papers, central and local government strategies, programme descriptions, programme evaluations, and strategic planning documents were also reviewed.

This report relies heavily on site visits, interviews, government reports, reports from non-governmental organisations, and other qualitative data. Very limited quantitative or evaluative data was available for analysis, and longitudinal data on youth wellbeing in New Zealand, particularly as it relates to the involvement of young people in youth development programmes or activities, is scarce. Furthermore, evaluation of youth development programmes in New Zealand is restricted to a few studies. The added value of this report is the perspective of an impartial outside investigator with international insight who has had the opportunity to talk to various stakeholders engaged in this issue from across New Zealand.

Definitions

There is no international consensus about the period that defines adolescence, nor is there consensus within New Zealand or the US. Adolescence and the onset of adulthood may be set by legal definitions, such as the age at which a child is emancipated for tax purposes, or can face criminal prosecution as an adult, leave school, or vote. This period also may be defined by social transitions, such as moving to full independence by ceasing reliance on family or whanau (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 1994). In some contexts, adolescence is defined by what is characterized as traditional adult responsibilities. Individuals who have not been married or had children, or have not taken up leadership responsibilities in their community, for example, may still be considered “youths”. External factors also may influence the parameters of adolescence. For example, adulthood may be delayed for some young people due to rising costs of tertiary education and limited employment opportunities.

The United Nations (UN) General Assembly defines youth as those persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years inclusive² and the World Health Organisation defines youth as 10 to 24 years (UNICEF, 1998). Consistent with MoYA’s definition of the period of adolescence, the policies and programmes reviewed in this paper focus primarily on young people inclusive of ages 12 to 24.

Many terms are used to describe people during adolescence: teenager, young person, and young adult. In New Zealand there also are some culturally specific terms for youth, such as taiohi, rangatahi, taitamariki, and tupulaga talavou.³ Youth, young person, and adolescent are used interchangeably in this report to describe this population.

New Zealand / United States Comparison

New Zealand and the US sit on opposite sides of the world. New Zealand’s population of almost 4 million is less than two percent of the US’ population of 300 million. New Zealand is made up of the North and South Islands and a number of smaller islands, with a total area of approximately 270,000 square kilometres or 105,000 square miles — approximately 36 times less than the total area of the US. In New Zealand, the ethnic composition is white / European (Pakeha), Maori (the indigenous people of New Zealand), Pasifika, and Asian. The US’ ethnic composition is predominantly white, black, Hispanic / Latino, and Asian. What then makes youth policy in New Zealand a worthy comparison for the US?

² Definition available online at www.young-ga.org.

³ Maori and Samoan terms used throughout this report are summarised in Appendix B.

Youth Population

The youth populations in New Zealand and the US are similar in various ways:

- As a percentage of the population, young people aged 12 to 24 in both New Zealand and the US comprise approximately 18 percent of the total populations (Statistics New Zealand, 2001; US Census Bureau, 2000a).
- The youth populations in both New Zealand and the US are ethnically more diverse than the total populations, and the proportion of the non-white youth populations in both countries are expected to grow over the next several decades. In New Zealand 70 percent of the total population is Pakeha and 63 percent of the youth population is Pakeha. In the US, whites comprise 72 percent of the total population, but only 64 percent of the adolescent population. Maori, Pasifika, and Asian groups are increasing as a proportion of the total group of young people, reflecting their relatively high birth rates and numbers of women in childbearing ages (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). New immigrants from Asia, Africa, and Eastern Europe will likely contribute to an increasingly diverse youth population in New Zealand. Likewise, the percentage of young people who are white in the US has steadily decreased, while Hispanic, black, and Asian youth have increased as a percentage of the total youth population (Lopez, 2002).
- Young people are declining as a proportion of the total New Zealand population and are expected to continue to decline over the next 50 years due to lower birth rates and fewer women of childbearing age (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2003). Likewise, although the number of adolescents is steadily increasing, the youth population in the US is decreasing as a percentage of the total population (US Census Bureau, 1999; National Adolescent Health Information Center, 2000).

As noted, making comparisons between New Zealand and the US with regards to the total population size and ethnic groups is difficult; however, in order to create context, there are individual states in the US where relevant comparisons can be made to New Zealand's population of 4 million, which is 70 percent white / European (Pakeha). For example, the State of Maryland's population of 5 million is 65 percent white, the State of Connecticut's population of 3.4 million is 82 percent white, and, the State of Arizona's population of 5.1 million is 78 percent white.

Youth Issues

Although perfectly parallel information is difficult to capture, there appear to be similar trends in numerous youth issues, attitudes, concerns, and behaviours in both New Zealand and the US, as demonstrated in the following table.

	New Zealand	United States
	(+) Improving conditions or circumstances (-) Worsening conditions or circumstances	
EDUCATION	(+/-) School completion has been shown to promote better outcomes. Fewer young people are staying in school until age 18. This may be explained by an increasing number of youth gaining credentials through tertiary institutions (Ministry of Education, 2001; Statistics New Zealand, 2001).	(+) More young people are graduating from high school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002).
CRIME	(-/+) Offending attributed to under-17-year-olds has increased over the last 12 years, but much less so over the last seven years (Becroft, 2003).	(+) Serious juvenile crime has decreased (US Department of Health and Human Services, 1999).
ILLICIT DRUG USE	(-) Marijuana is disproportionately popular among young users (NZHIS, 2001) and around 10 percent of young people are estimated to be dependent on cannabis by the age of 21 (Ministry of Health, 2002b).	(+) Illicit drug use among youth has remained stable or decreased over the last six years (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2003; US Department of Health and Human Services, 1999).
SMOKING	(+) There is some evidence of a decreasing rate of smoking among youth, although smoking rates among youth are still high. (-) Young women are smoking more than young men (ASH New Zealand, 2002).	(+) Smoking among youth has declined in the last five years. (-) Young women are smoking more than young men (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2003).

	New Zealand	United States
ALCOHOL	(-) Alcohol consumption is common. By 15 years of age, almost 90 percent of young people have consumed alcohol, and more than a third of all young people report an episode of binge drinking (more than five alcoholic beverages consumed within four hours) in the last four weeks (Adolescent Health Research Group, 2003).	(-) Binge drinking among youth, particularly white and Hispanic youth, is high (National Center for Health Statistics, 2000; Blum et al., 2000)
SEXUAL ACTIVITY	(-) 10-30 percent of youth have had sexual intercourse by the time they reach 15 years of age, and about half have had intercourse by the time they are 16 or 17 years old (Ministry of Health, 2002). (+) Of those having sex, over half report always using contraceptives (Adolescent Health Research Group, 2003). (-) Six out of 10 pregnancies among women under age 25 years are reportedly 'unwanted' (Dickson et al., 2002).	(-) Young people are becoming sexually active at younger ages (National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 2003). (+) Sexual activity has declined among young people, contraceptive use has increased (National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 2003), and the rate of babies born to adolescents has decreased (National Center for Health Statistics, 2003b).
SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES	(-) Compared to other age groups, young people (aged 15 to 24) are over represented in the rates of sexually transmitted infections (Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited, 2001).	(-) Rates of sexually transmitted diseases and both HIV and AIDS are high among adolescents (National Center for Health Statistics, 2000). One-half of new HIV infections occurred among people under the age of 25 and one-quarter of new infections occurred among people between 13 and 21 (Kirby, 1998).

	New Zealand	United States
PHYSICAL HEALTH	<p>(-) Young people are spending an increasing amount of time in sedentary activities, such as watching television and using the computer, leading to reduced activity, which is often linked to higher rates of obesity, heart disease, and diabetes (Adolescent Health Research Group, 2003).</p> <p>(-) Approximately one third of young people report having a long-term health condition, such as asthma (Adolescent Health Research Group, 2003)</p>	<p>(-) The prevalence of obesity among young people aged 12 to 19 is high and is increasing (National Center for Health Statistics, 2003a, 2000).</p>
SUICIDE	<p>(-) Suicide (and self-inflicted injury) rates among young people are much higher than among the total New Zealand population (Ministry of Health, 2002d).</p> <p>(+) Since 1995 the youth suicide rate in New Zealand has declined. The number and rate of youth suicide for 2000 are the lowest since 1986, and the most recent data (provisional for the year 2000) shows that the youth suicide rate decreased for five consecutive years (Ministry of Health, 2002d).</p>	<p>(-) 13 percent of young people have had suicidal thoughts or have attempted suicide (National Center for Health Statistics, 2000; Blum et al., 2000).</p> <p>(-) The suicide rate among US youth has increased since the 1950s (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2002).</p>

Most notable in both New Zealand and the US are the ethnic disparities in youth achievement and wellbeing. Generally, non-white youth in both countries are doing comparatively worse than white youth. Young people living in poorer communities also are doing comparatively worse. Links between concentrations of certain ethnic groups living in circumstances of poverty may explain some of these disparities.

In the US, for example, black youth and youth from poorer communities are doing worse than white youth and those from more affluent communities on school testing achievement (Campbell et al., 2000; Jencks and Phillips, 1998). School dropout rates among American youth have declined, but the rate of Hispanic dropouts is still more than four times that of whites (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). Rates of sexual activity are particularly high among black youth living in poor communities (Blum et al., 2000; National Center for Health Statistics, 2000). Interestingly, smoking rates among Hispanic and white young people are notably higher than among black youth (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2003). Poverty rates among black and Hispanic children are much higher than among white children, and have been so since the US Census Bureau began making separate estimates (US Census Bureau, 2000b).

In New Zealand, Maori and Pasifika youth are not achieving as well as Pakeha. For example, despite the decreases in suicide among youth, the Maori youth suicide rate is still approximately 50 percent higher than the non-Maori rate. While rates of tobacco smoking among youth have declined, more Maori youth smoke than non-Maori youth (Ministry of Health, 2002a). Maori young people also are more at risk of dying than are non-Maori youth (Ministry of Health, 2002). Furthermore, Pakeha and Asian young people tend to leave school with higher qualifications than Maori and Pasifika youth.

Although a decreasing proportion of the total population, today's adolescents still are the next generation of community, business, science, and political leaders, and they will teach and care for the next generation of children. A case can be made in both countries, therefore, that community success is dependent upon young people who are healthy, positive, successful citizens, and therefore need investments and opportunities that promote their wellbeing.

New Zealand Innovation

Examining New Zealand's youth development policy as a case study for the US also is supported by the premise that New Zealand serves as a particularly innovative country. A small population and democratic leadership creates opportunities for creativity in public policy (Hanna and Whitfield, in press). New Zealand's size has given its business and political leaders the ability to respond quickly to calls for change. New Zealand is described as having a "can do" attitude that allows coordination of its efforts at the national and business level in the search for solutions to problems (Ministry of Economic Development, 2003). In various fields, New Zealand has been an incubator and test bed for new ideas. For example, New Zealand has been the site for the testing of such innovations as the nationwide EFTPOS system linking all trading banks.

Most importantly, New Zealand is unique internationally as the only country to have developed a national strategy for youth development. Therefore, it serves as an important illustration for how government policy can work toward supporting young people to develop the skills and attitudes they need to take part positively in society.

PART II: NEW ZEALAND YOUTH POLICY CONTEXT

- Explores the role and engagement of various sectors in youth development policy and programming.
- Describes New Zealand evaluation and data sets relevant to youth development.
- Depicts the role of “youth workers” and other professionals who work with youth.
- Explains the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi and other guiding principles that affect youth development policy and programming.

Multi-Sectoral Involvement

Youth programmes and activities in New Zealand are organised, funded, and delivered through diverse entities. These include central government, local government, schools and universities, youth organisations, religious institutions, ethnic / cultural networks and communities, community centres, community trusts, and specific sector-based programmes (i.e., drug and alcohol reduction programmes, suicide prevention programmes, health awareness programmes).

Central Government

New Zealand is a parliamentary democracy and a constitutional monarchy with the Queen of England as the titular Head of State and a Governor-General representing her presence in the country. Although a part of the process of government, the Queen and the Governor-General remain politically neutral and do not get involved in the political debate.

The New Zealand Government has three branches: the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary. Although each branch has a different role, they are not totally separate from each other. New Zealand has a single chamber of Parliament known as the House of Representatives, whose primary function is to:

- enact laws
- provide a government
- supervise the government's administration
- allocate funding for government agencies and services
- redress grievances by way of petition.

Parliament is elected using the mixed member proportional (MMP) system. Following an election, the party or coalition that commands a majority of the votes in the House of Representatives forms the Government.

The Government is accountable to Parliament for its actions and policies. Ministers are responsible for the various government departments and agencies, answering to Parliament for their own actions and policies and for the actions and policies of the departments and state agencies under their jurisdiction. Most ministers are members of Cabinet, which is the main decisionmaking body of the Government.

Many departments and agencies and their respective ministers have responsibility for public policies affecting young people. Some provide a policy framework for youth issues and

others directly fund youth programmes, services, and activities. The bigger government departments have responsibility for the majority of youth policy. Key departments include:

- The Ministry of Youth Development (formerly Ministry of Youth Affairs: refer to footnote 1)
- The Ministry of Social Development
- The Department of Internal Affairs
- The Ministry of Justice
- The Treasury
- The Ministry of Education
- The Department of Child, Youth, and Family Services
- The Ministry of Maori Development (Te Puni Kokiri)
- The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs
- The Department of Labour
- The Ministry of Health

Several cross-departmental organising groups have been convened to discuss government policy and programme coordination for youth, but there generally has been a fragmented approach to public policies for young people with few linkages or strategies across policy boundaries. Central government's policies for youth in New Zealand historically have targeted services and interventions to address a specific youth problem or activities focused on the youth stage of the life cycle, traditional educational programmes, or employment preparation skills. Departments worked in isolation to address youth programmes and there have been disagreements about the boundaries and policy responsibilities. Young people tended to be passive players who were not asked to participate in identifying solutions.

The Ministry of Youth Affairs was created in 1990 in order to address some of this fragmentation by identifying the key issues facing young people, the resources available to positively support adolescents, and the suggested role of government policy in supporting and promoting community services to address youth needs. MoYA provides government and other agencies with advice on young people and their future. This includes researching and reporting on young people's issues, and contributing to other matters affecting young people. Its primary aims are to promote the direct participation of young people aged 12 to 25 in the social, educational, economic, and cultural development of New Zealand, both locally and nationally.

MoYA administers the Youth Corps and Specialist Youth Service Corps programmes which involve young people in 20-week courses offering a mix of challenging recreation, personal development, skills acquisition, work experience, and practical learning.

Local Government

New Zealand has no state or provincial government. New Zealand local authorities include 12 regional councils and 74 territorial authorities (some of which have regional council functions). Of the 74 territorial authorities, 15 are city councils and 59 are district councils. Councillors and mayors are elected in each of these councils to represent New Zealanders at the local level.

Regional councils are responsible for managing environmental resources and animals and regional civil defence preparedness. Territorial authorities (district and city councils) are responsible for community wellbeing and development, environmental health and safety (including building control, local civil defence, and environmental health matters), infrastructure (road and transport, sewerage, water / stormwater), recreation and culture, and resource management, including land use planning and development control.

The Local Government Act of 2002 created an important shift in the purpose of local government and provides new opportunities for local authorities. The Act strengthens local democracy and sustainable wellbeing of communities by promoting a more responsive and flexible style of local government. This Act reflects a change in the traditional powers and functions of local government by promoting:

- a new purpose of local government that supports the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities
- sustainable development, which takes into account the needs and expectations of future generations in the decisionmaking process
- an opportunity for councils to choose activities they undertake and how they should undertake them, including a consultation process.

The Act requires local government to lead the process of defining community outcomes and priorities, work with various stakeholders, including the local authority, central government, non-governmental organisations, the private sector, and community members, to work together on identifying important community goals and a plan of action, and monitor how services contribute to achieving the outcomes. Councils are required to prepare Long-Term Community Council Plans every three years, outlining how the local authority intends to address community wellbeing over time. A community consultation process enabling the community to exchange information on council decisions and issues is an important element of this process (Local Government New Zealand, 2003).

There are examples of city and district councils that take an active role in promoting youth policies and programmes through local government. Specific such examples will be highlighted in Part IV.

Non-Governmental Organisations

Various non-governmental youth organisations, some of which are partly funded by government grants, run youth programmes and provide youth services and activities. These various youth opportunities are provided through:

- volunteer youth organisations, including national organisations such as Guides New Zealand, Scouting New Zealand, Project K, Venturers, Rangers, YMCA, and independent, community level youth projects
- religious and church institutions, run through both local community churches and the national church organisations
- sector-specific organisations, such as health, justice, or employment organisations.

Other non-governmental organisations have been influential in promoting youth development by providing training or resource support to multiple youth organisations. Examples of two such key youth organisations include the New Zealand Association for Adolescent Health and Development (NZA AHD) and the Federation of New Zealand Youth Organisations (FONZYO). NZA AHD is a national network organisation for people working with young people in health, education, social work, and other sectors to promote adolescent health and development. It conducts training and conferences to improve the knowledge base of individuals who work with youth (predominantly health workers). FONZYO represents national youth programmes such as Guides New Zealand, Scouting New Zealand, Girls Brigade, Boys Brigade, Venturers, Rangers, and YMCA.

There also are both formal and informal networks of youth workers across New Zealand. These networks come together monthly or so to offer support, networking, and training, as

well as a venue for sharing of ideas, approaches to youth programming, and to better coordinate work in the region. A national network of youth workers from about 20 regions also meets monthly through teleconferencing. This sector of youth worker networks is in development and there is increasing interest in formalising this work.

Cultural Organisations

Cultural organisations, including iwi- and hapu-based Maori youth programmes and Pasifika community-based youth programmes, are an important facet of the youth sector. While many youth activities target the broad range of young people, there are youth programmes targeted specifically to the interests, cultural education, and concerns of specific cultural groups. These may be provided through general community activities and events or by way of music, cultural, kapahaka, language, or sport activities.

Philanthropic Organisations

Central government is a primary funder of youth services and programmes in New Zealand; however, private funders also contribute to the provision and direction of youth services. Compared to the US New Zealand lacks the multitude of private foundations capitalised by industrialists and entrepreneurs. Therefore, the New Zealand philanthropic sector is small and cannot support long-term, large-scale initiatives,. Nevertheless, the sector has grown steadily over the past 15 years. The main types of philanthropic organisation in New Zealand include⁵:

- private family trusts and foundations, most of which have a regional focus
- community trusts which evolved out of the sale of New Zealand's regional trust banks
- energy trusts which resulted from the restructuring of the electricity industry
- commercial gambling organisations which distribute a proportion of gambling proceeds
- community foundations, which are a new, but growing, set of organisations.

The total amount of resources from these philanthropic organisations directed to programmes that focus on young people is difficult to capture. No single organisation is solely devoted to the wellbeing of young people, and many of the funds awarded are directed to activities that affect the larger community, of which youth are just one part.

Philanthropy New Zealand is a member organisation that involves over 100 organisations representing private and community trusts. Its objectives are to:

- improve public understanding of the role of grantmaking trusts and foundations
- advance and protect the common interests of private and corporate grantmakers
- foster co-operation between grantmaking trusts and foundations and between individual and corporate donors
- encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between members of the Association
- increase the number of philanthropic trusts and foundations and grant making organisations within New Zealand
- liaise where appropriate, with government, local authorities and the voluntary and corporate sectors on areas of mutual interest (Philanthropy New Zealand, 2003).

⁵ Developed by Iain Hines, J R McKenzie Trust, Wellington.

Data and Indicators on Youth

An important factor that has the potential to influence the direction of youth policies is information generated on the status of young people. Research, data, and indicators on young people, particularly as they relate to identifying areas of concern, may help inform decisionmaking on youth policy and programming.

The two most significant data sets on New Zealand youth are derived from the Christchurch Health and Development Study and the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study. While these are both regional studies and not representative of all ethnic groups in New Zealand, they are high profile, high quality studies of youth in New Zealand and have had a big impact on New Zealand child and youth policies.

The Christchurch Health and Development Study is a longitudinal study of a birth cohort of 1265 children born in Christchurch in mid-1977. These children have been studied at birth, four months, one year, annual intervals to age 16, and again at 18 and 21. Recent research has focused on issues relating to the mental health and personal adjustment of cohort members as young adults. The study has published over 200 articles in peer-reviewed journals.

The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study is a long-running cohort study of approximately 1000 babies born in Dunedin in 1972-73. The study members have been assessed at birth, at age three, then every two years up to age 15, and again at ages 18, 21, and 26 years. Plans are in place to carry out the next assessments in 2004 when the study members are aged 32. Recent assessments have included a broad range of studies in the psychosocial, behavioural medicine, and biomedical research areas. To date, well over 850 publications and reports have been generated from this ongoing study.

There is some additional important research and indicators on youth included in the following:

- Competent Children Project (regional study)
- Longitudinal Survey of Income, Employment and Family Dynamics (focused on adults, with limited information on children)
- Te Hoe Nuku Roa (focused only on Maori children and adults)
- Benefit Dynamics Project based on Benefit Administration data (focused on adults; tracks adults and children only while on benefits)
- Department of Labour study of immigrants (focused on adults and tracks immigrants only)
- Income Supplement to the Household Labour Force Survey (focused on adults; two-wave tracking only) (Hill, 2002).

Youth 2000 is the most contemporary survey of adolescent health and wellbeing in New Zealand. A survey of almost 13,000 young people aged 13 to 17 was conducted through schools that were randomly selected to participate. Topics covered by the survey included family background, living arrangements, relationships with parents and other family members, interest and achievement in school, and health behaviours and conditions. The survey also collected information about participation in jobs, sports, and social activities, relationship to friends, and spirituality. As this was a one-time survey and no comparable data exists, it does not show change in behaviour, attitude, and situation over time.

Evaluations on Youth

Despite the limited formal evaluations of youth development programmes conducted in New Zealand, some noteworthy examples exist of evaluations that have collected evidence on programme processes and impacts of programmes and activities on youth.

An evaluation was undertaken to gather information on the day-to-day operations, outcomes, and perceptions of the Canterbury Youth Worker Collective. The evaluation reviewed the services and activities provided by the collective, the relevance and effectiveness of these services to the target group, strengths and areas for improvement, and the accountability of the project and services. This evaluation did not provide information on the impact of the work of the collective on youth outcomes, attitudes, or behaviours.

Projects funded as a part of the Department of Internal Affairs' Social Entrepreneurship Fund are involved in both process and outcome evaluation. Each organisation works collaboratively with the Department of Internal Affairs to create a set of evaluation questions and related indicators on the project. Six- and 12-month project reports, combined with discussions with the community worker, provide data that Internal Affairs' Research Services uses to complete evaluations

The New Zealand Police, in collaboration with the Ministry of Justice, conducted a comprehensive evaluation of their Youth At Risk Programmes. A three-year study included formative, process, and outcome evaluation components based on interviews with programme providers at the beginning and conclusion of the evaluation period, questionnaires from a random selection of key stakeholders inquiring about expectations and perceived outcomes, and the collection of financial data. The evaluation was focused on measuring the extent to which the programmes developed a strategic approach to participant selection and programme implementation, building supportive capacity of participants' families, and fostering the integration of programmes with other agency and community initiatives. Their findings indicated success in most of these areas, with some variability across programme sites.

Annual evaluations are conducted of Project K, a national programme that engages 13- to 15-year-olds in recreation, goal-setting, and mentoring activities designed to build self-esteem, teach life skills, give life direction, and promote good health and education. Evaluations measure such factors as self-esteem, changes in students' attitudes and behaviours, fitness, and academic achievement, and have shown improvement in behaviour at home, effort at school, relationship to friends, relationship to teachers, attention at school, and attendance at school. Plans are underway to incorporate a four-year longitudinal study into these evaluations.

Youth Workers

Individuals who work with young people have a great deal of influence on the experiences young people have in youth programmes. This group of individuals may include health professionals, teachers, social workers, case managers, and truancy officers. Not reflected through these professional networks are the many people who work with youth but have no formal, specific professional training that categorises them in one of these traditional professions. This group of individuals have come to be called "youth workers" by many in New Zealand, as well as in many international contexts. This is a term that will be used in this report to describe such individuals who work with youth.

The role of a youth worker varies depending on the employing organisation's philosophy and the programmes they run for young people. A youth worker may:

- establish, maintain, and strengthen working relationships with young people, and their families
- provide support, information, and resources to young people
- provide a link between young people and social services, and arrange referrals to the appropriate services
- plan, deliver, and evaluate programmes with and for young people
- train and manage volunteers
- manage budgets
- write reports and prepare applications for funding
- advocate on behalf of young people
- promote youth development and youth participation in communities.

A fundamental characteristic of youth work is that it is not a distinct occupation and there is no single skill area associated with youth work. Rather, the tasks undertaken by youth workers tend to overlap with many other professionals, such as classroom teachers, outdoor instructors, health workers, and social workers.

Youth work is very much centred on the relationship youth workers develop with young people. It is this relationship that distinguishes youth work from other professions. Lloyd Martin, in his book exploring perspectives on youth and youth work in New Zealand explains that "... other professionals will normally form a client / professional relationship in order to deliver services. In contrast, a youth worker will see the relationship as the primary goal, and use the service they provide as a context within which that relationship can be developed" (Martin, 2002; 116).

Youth workers in New Zealand also are a diverse group with varying degrees of education, training, experience, and skills. Very few training options, limited credentialing, and few career paths exist for youth workers. Most youth workers develop necessary skills through on-the-job training and experience or through sporadic training opportunities such as those offered through regional youth worker collectives.

Salaries for youth workers are not standardised and are typically low, even as compared with other youth-serving professionals, such as teachers and social workers. Part-time youth worker positions or volunteer youth worker opportunities also are very common.

Treaty of Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi plays a unique and important role in New Zealand and it is important to highlight the Treaty as a backdrop to the development and implementation of public policy and the delivery of youth services in New Zealand. The Treaty of Waitangi, signed by both the British Crown and Maori in 1840, is an agreement through which Maori recognised the Crown's right to govern and develop British settlement, and the Crown guaranteed Maori protection of their interests, land rights, and citizenship.

In practical terms today, the Treaty promotes the awareness of Maori cultural issues. Its relevance to the youth development policy discussion is the importance of ensuring the specific concerns of Maori youth are considered, that policies and programmes are relevant to Maori youth and the Maori community, and that Maori adults and youth are involved in all levels of planning, development, and delivery of services.

There is no comparable legal standing for ethnic groups in the US.

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCROC)

Increasingly, human rights conventions influence domestic policymaking. New Zealand has responded to the UN Convention by developing a work programme across approximately 16 government agencies to implement UN Committee concluding observations. The Convention promotes a core principle of non-discrimination that further supports the right of indigenous children to enjoy their own culture, religion, and language. New Zealand takes seriously its commitment to children's rights. The youth development framework reflects these principles.

In sharp contrast, international conventions and a rights-based philosophy are not a significant influence in the US, and the US has not ratified this Convention.

PART III: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AOTEAROA

- Reviews the process undertaken to develop the YDSA.
- Summarizes the youth development principles underpinning the YDSA.
- Highlights youth development efforts in the US.
- Describes steps taken to disseminate the YDSA.

Development of the Strategy

When the Ministry of Youth Affairs was formed in 1990, there was an attempt to develop a national youth policy. Various drafts of a national youth policy were written and discussed with community non-governmental organisations, but these efforts were superseded by priorities to respond to other government youth initiatives.

In the mid-1990s, MoYA embarked on a comprehensive process of exploring how to move youth policy beyond the historical short-term and reactive focus on youth problems and progress toward a coherent approach to youth policies. A review of youth literature and an examination of international youth programming and policy was conducted, which led to the vision that youth policy in New Zealand ought to shift from focusing on young people's deficits and fixing these problems, to focusing on a youth development perspective that emphasises the social, emotional, intellectual, and physical development of youth. These new ideas and corresponding written materials from this period laid the groundwork for the development of the YDSA.

The development of the YDSA was done through a comprehensive, community-based process involving broad consultation with both adults and youth from diverse communities, public discussions, and the opportunity for public submissions commenting on drafts circulated throughout the development process. Senior government officials from across central government were well informed and engaged throughout the process.

The primary group of consultants, the External Reference Group, consisted of eight people from academic, community, and business organisations, such as the New Zealand AIDS Foundation, Auckland University of Technology, and Hastings District Council, as well as two young people. This group met several times over the course of a year, providing advice on the formation of the Strategy by informing the contents of the discussion document, advising on the design of the consultation exercise, and assisting with the incorporation of the consultation feedback into the final Strategy. A Youth Advisory Forum involving up to 50 young people from the Wellington area participated in a series of eight meetings organised to generate input directly from youth aged 16 to 24 on the development of the Strategy.

Opportunities were offered to provide written response on an early strategic planning document. An initial document, *Supporting the Positive Development of Young People in New Zealand – A Discussion Document on a Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa* (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2001c), was disseminated broadly to various public and private entities, including local authorities, religious organisations, education and training sector agencies, central government agencies, youth organisations, special interest groups, and Maori and Pasifika organisations, as well as to individual youth and adults. There were over 160 responses from adults and agencies to this discussion document. An additional 1200

secondary-school-aged young people were involved in preparing 227 responses received from young people to the document. The written responses were compiled into summary analysis documents (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2001a, 2001b).

A series of consultation meetings were held throughout New Zealand. Public meetings and focus groups were held with adults and youth from across the country. Sixteen meetings were held with parents and adults working with young people, and 11 meetings were held with young people. An additional 500 adults and 250 young people attended additional public meetings in local communities. Many of these meetings were held with individual ethnic communities, including Maori, Pasifika, and new immigrants.

Each of these components of the Strategy's development process contributed to the shaping of the final Strategy released in February 2002.

Overview of the Strategy

The YDSA promotes a fundamental shift in the focus from youth problems to understanding that young people are partners and contributors, with the community broadly supporting their development. Youth development theory proposes that many of the solutions to what are seen as problems of young people, such as substance abuse and offending, are coexisting and mutually reinforcing, and solutions lie in providing broader, more holistic services. The YDSA encourages investment in efforts that support youth to reach their potential in all areas of their lives. It focuses on changing attitudes about the contribution of young people – from passive observers to active participants.

The YDSA was published in a 51-page document that sets out how Government, working with families and communities, can support young people to develop the skills and attitudes they need to take part positively in society, now and in the future. The document describes the conception and development of the Strategy, as well as a summary of research that led to the creation of the principles contained within it.

The Strategy identifies six fundamental principles that are designed to promote youth development. It also highlights four goals for applying the youth development approach in a variety of settings.

Youth Development Principles

1. Youth development is shaped by the big picture.

Wider social and economic contexts and dominant cultural values set the big picture within which young people grow up. Outcomes for young people are affected, for example, by their family's economic and social circumstances, changing political dynamics, and the physical environment in which they live. Cultural context also influences young people. Issues of race and ethnic identity, as well as association with particular youth sub-cultures (e.g., hip-hop, athlete, etc.) shape a young person's associations with others and the larger society. The Treaty of Waitangi is significant in defining cultural and social obligations and responsibilities for youth in New Zealand.

2. Youth development is about young people being connected.

Healthy development is shaped by young people feeling welcomed, valued, and understood in many social environments. Four primary social environments have an impact on young people: their family and whanau; their community; their school, university, training institution, or workplace; and their peers. Youth development, then, is closely linked to healthy families, strong communities, healthy schools, and supportive

peers. In a Maori context, it is closely linked to strong whanau, hapu, and iwi. Strong connections to these environments can combine to form a supportive web that protects and fosters development. Negative experiences in one environment can be reduced through quality support in others.

3. Youth development is based on a consistent strengths-based approach.

A strengths-based approach recognises that both risk and protective factors are an important part of development. Young people need opportunities to build their capacity to resist risk-taking behaviours that will increase the likelihood that they will have both difficulties in life and poor health and wellbeing. But they also need opportunities to develop skills and strengths that will help protect them from the impact of unavoidable events. Young people need social, emotional, physical, and autonomy skills for healthy development.

4. Youth development happens through quality relationships.

Supportive relationships with family, other adults, and peers help young people develop trust, communication skills, and personal identity. The way that people relate, listen, and respond to young people affects the quality of relationships. Training for adults working with young people can help them work effectively with youth. This training can include understanding the changing world of young people, understanding contemporary youth culture, processes for triggering their participation, and practice at relating to youth as equals and partners.

5. Youth development is triggered when young people fully participate.

Providing opportunities for young people to increase their control of what happens to them and around them contributes positively to their development and engagement. Opportunities for young people to influence, solve problems, inform, shape, design, and contribute actively to youth programmes and activities can lead to more ownership of the activity or programme and help ensure that policies, services, and programmes meet young people's needs and interests. Effective youth participation includes being informed, having an effect on outcomes, organising themselves, making decisions or being involved in making decisions, and being involved in follow-up.

6. Youth development needs good information.

Effective research, evaluation, and information gathering should continually inform youth development. Collecting information and data about young people and about youth development activities, services, and programmes is important for continually refining and improving opportunities for young people.

Youth Development Goals

The YDSA identifies goals for applying the youth development approach that can be applied to the varied settings and organisations that contribute to youth development policies and programmes:

Goal 1: Ensuring a consistent strengths-based approach to the many settings and organisations that contribute to youth development.

Goal 2: Developing skilled people to work with young people.

Goal 3: Creating opportunities for young people to actively participate and engage.

Goal 4: Building knowledge on youth development through information and research.

Literature Review

Literature considered as the foundation for the development of the Strategy was compiled into *Building Strength: Youth Development Literature Review* (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2002b) and published as a document closely linked to the YDSA. The primary focus was literature that identified how to achieve good outcomes for young people in their families, peer groups, schools, careers, and neighbourhoods and communities. Although drawn predominantly from international studies (primarily US literature), this review also included the limited research on the development of young people in New Zealand. Like the YDSA, this literature review was distributed broadly to groups and individuals working with young people.

Youth Development in the United States

There is currently no national strategy for youth development in the US. There have been a number of discrete national efforts to promote youth development, but these have not successfully resulted in national strategic planning, or implementation of resources or support to implement a national strategy.

The Younger Americans Act, a bill introduced in 2002, would, if passed, establish a national youth policy and authorise funds to mobilise American communities to ensure opportunities for positive development are available to all young people. This legislation would support youth access to: ongoing relationships with caring adults; safe places with structured activities; access to services that promote healthy lifestyles, including those designed to improve physical and mental health; opportunities to acquire marketable skills and competencies; and opportunities for service and civic participation. This legislation has widespread and diverse support with over 40 national organisations collaborating for its passage, but it has not been passed by Congress.

The US Department of Health and Human Services led a collaborative effort involving diverse federal departments, non-profit organisations, advocacy organisations, intergovernmental associations, and others in the development of a short statement around principles for the positive development of America's youth. *Toward a Blueprint for Youth: Making Youth Development a National Priority* (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2002) defines youth development and reflects on how to promote youth development, but has not been developed beyond this initial stage.

Individual states have developed youth policies, but “no state has in place a single coherent youth policy that serves as a lens for assessing and planning individual policies” (Ferber et al., 2002; 2). Some of the states that have been developing more coordinated approaches to youth policy include Arizona, California, Connecticut, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

Implementation of the Strategy

The YDSA was designed as a long-term plan about how all young people could be more fully and positively engaged in New Zealand. It was intended to provide direction for youth policy and programmes, as opposed to specific ways of operating. Following a public release of the YDSA, the document was sent to groups and individuals across New Zealand involved in youth programmes and policy, including central government departments, local authorities, youth workers, and organisations that provide opportunities for young people.

Meetings with key leaders within central government were conducted in order to discuss the youth development principles and present suggestions for inclusion of the principles in other government strategies and policies.

Since the development of the YDSA, this Strategy has been the foundation for the work of the Ministry of Youth Affairs (and its successor, MYD) and is integrated into the Ministry's output planning and Work Programme. It is the basis of all facets of its work, including its attention to issues of youth suicide, young males, and drug education.

Parallel Youth Development Strategies and Products

Following the release of the YDSA, MoYA also developed several products to complement the Strategy.

E Tipu Rea (Keelan, 2002) was developed as a parallel document to the YDSA with a focus on integrating youth development into working with Maori youth. It was published in 2002 as a kit with practical activities that can be used by organisations, groups, or individuals working with Maori youth. Activities include ideas such as conducting group brainstorming sessions on the needs of youth, developing youth websites, creating media publicity about youth issues through newspapers, radio, and television, developing music, drama, and arts performances, developing mentoring programmes, teaching Maori language, and setting up youth centres. Each activity is linked to a principle contained in the YDSA and includes practical tips, activity plans and ideas, and suggestions for adult and youth roles in the activity's process. Printed copies of this kit were distributed to Maori youth organisations and programmes, and the kit was made available through the Internet.

Keepin' It Real (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2003b), released in April 2003, focuses specifically on increasing youth participation in policy development, programmes, services, and organisations. This document goes into significantly more detail than the YDSA on the Strategy's principle focused on youth participation. It highlights reasons for fostering youth participation and typical barriers to youth participation. It presents a set of questions for organisations to consider as they assess the involvement of young people in their organisation. These questions consider organisational commitment to youth participation and training opportunities for young people. *Keepin' It Real* provides concrete examples of youth participation and offers a set of principles to guide organisations as they seek to more successfully promote youth participation. These include informing young people, consulting young people, ensuring ongoing participation, sharing decisionmaking with young people, and supporting youth-initiated and youth-led initiatives. *Keepin' It Real* acknowledges that different methods of participation will suit different projects or different stages of the same projects. It also considers the fact that attracting diverse groups of young people will require various strategies to engage different youth to participate. Finally, it addresses some of the practical considerations, such as seeking parental consent, ensuring confidentiality, and conducting meetings in youth-appropriate venues and styles.

Youth Development: Youth Participation Case Studies (McGachie and Smith, 2003) further highlights the effectiveness of promoting youth participation. This report describes the ways in which six diverse organisations have actively engaged youth in their activities. The report describes key elements of organisational change and the benefits of the youth participation to both the young people and adults involved.

The Ministry also publishes a youth development newsletter, *Connect*, three times a year. This newsletter highlights examples of youth development in practice and is distributed to a wide range of individuals and organisations throughout New Zealand.

Training and Outreach

The YDSA, *E Tipu Rea*, and *Keepin' it Real* served as the framework for some limited training to policymakers, service providers, and youth workers on integrating the principles of youth development into opportunities for youth. These training sessions included formal presentations of the contents of the Strategy, as well as informal meetings with policymakers and community leaders across New Zealand.

A national conference in July 2002, *Involve 2002*, created a significant opportunity for young people and individuals working with young people to share knowledge, ideas, and experiences about youth development. Almost 500 people attended this conference, which was a collaborative effort of MoYA and the New Zealand Association for Adolescent Health and Development (NZAAHD).

Organisational Change at the Ministry of Youth Affairs

Almost a year after the release of the YDSA, the State Services Commission began evaluating the Ministry of Youth Affairs to assess its capacity as one of the smallest stand-alone ministries, and to explore options for building greater capability and influence. The results of this review completed in August 2003, highlighted several strengths, such as robust relationships with the youth sector, and clearly articulated strategy, focus, and priorities. However, the review also identified some gaps in policy capability, resources and systems, and dealings across Government.

This review resulted in re-establishing the Ministry of Youth Affairs as the Ministry of Youth Development (MYD), and incorporating it as a semi-autonomous body within the Ministry of Social Development (MSD). The change was intended to improve the Ministry's capacity, develop increased opportunities to add value to cross-government relationships, and combine the youth-related policy work being done across departments into a cohesive unit. Benefits anticipated include the opportunity to leverage MSD's wider regional networks and status as a major sector leader; reduce overlaps and improve coordination of youth policy-related work; better harmonise youth development programmes, family support, and employment programmes; and access MSD's databases and integrated data sets, as well as policy research and evaluation capability.

The review of the Ministry and the decision around organisational change does signal that the Government places value on youth development and the YDSA and is committed to further enhancing the Ministry's effectiveness. The impact of this change in resources and capacity will only be revealed over time.

PART IV: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT – FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE

- Highlights examples of government youth policies, programmes, and training opportunities.
- Identifies the guiding principles of various government departments.
- Summarizes youth perspectives on participation in youth development programmes.
- Describes some of the ongoing government and community work that is being undertaken to promote youth development.

Activities and programmes for youth are provided by national and local organisations across New Zealand. The extent to which these organisations incorporate youth development principles in the delivery of services varies.

Evaluating the Impact of the Strategy

The principle mechanism to understand the impact of a given policy is a formal evaluation that preferably involves a scientific analysis of outcomes. A rigorous evaluation determines the value of investment in a particular approach and provides a basis for better programme design. It can help funders and policymakers make informed choices about future resource support. At an individual programme or service level, staff, participants, and funders can track achievement of objectives and help make changes to improve programme effectiveness.

One useful framework for evaluation in the context of youth development programmes entails consideration of six questions (National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2002):

- Is the theory of the programme that is being evaluated explicit and plausible?
- How well has the programme theory been implemented in the sites studied?
- In general, is the programme effective and, in particular, is it effective with specific subpopulations of young people?
- Whether it is or is not effective, why this is the case?
- What is the value of the programme?
- What recommendations about action should be made?

The YDSA includes a paragraph that acknowledges the importance and challenges of evaluation in this sector and indicates that the YDSA will be closely monitored. However, the YDSA does not describe what this means in practice.

Given the limited resources available to the Ministry of Youth Affairs, there was no formal evaluation or monitoring of the extent to which the Strategy's principles are integrated at the programme level or the impact of these principles when incorporated. Some evaluations have assessed the effectiveness of individual youth programmes in New Zealand, but these did not consider the application of the YDSA or the influence of youth development principles on the wellbeing of youth.

In the absence of a YDSA evaluation, this report used the National Research Council framework as the basis for questions during site visits and interviews with representatives of youth-serving programmes in New Zealand:

- To what extent do various stakeholders (i.e., service providers, youth workers, and policymakers) understand the concept of youth development?
- To what extent do various stakeholders know what it means to apply youth development principles to public policy and programme design and implementation?
- To what extent have the YDSA principles influenced central and local government policy and been incorporated into the design and delivery of youth programmes and services?
- To what extent have the wellbeing and outcomes of young people been influenced by participation in programmes applying a youth development approach?
- In cases where youth development has shown an impact on the wellbeing and outcomes of youth, are there particular components of the Strategy that have had the most influence?

The Strategy in Practice

Case studies included in this review represent diverse experiences, geographic locations, and programme emphasis. The programmes visited and individuals interviewed were selected if they met at least one of the following criteria: demonstrate a history of attracting and retaining youth participants, practise a unique or creative approach to delivering youth services, or demonstrate either anecdotal or formal evaluation evidence indicating that these opportunities positively benefit youth.

A representative range of knowledge and engagement with the YDSA was a further consideration. Some of the individuals or groups included in the review were thoroughly knowledgeable about the YDSA, intentionally incorporated the principles into their work, or suggested that the principles were closely aligned with how they deliver services. Many were relatively familiar with the Strategy, but did not specifically integrate the Strategy into their operating principles. Others had very little or no knowledge of the Strategy.

Finally, a key priority was visiting programmes offering an opportunity to interact directly with young people and youth workers in order to include youth perspectives and experiences. Individual meetings, group discussions, and work alongside youth and youth workers created both formal and informal opportunities to discuss their experiences.

While efforts were made to include a diverse set of activities, these programmes and activities only represent a small sample of the vast number of opportunities available to youth and youth workers across New Zealand. Many other innovative youth-focused projects are operating in communities around the country. The exclusion of any particular programme does not, in any way, represent a lack of programme quality, success, or alignment with the YDSA.

Central Government

Cabinet Directive

In November 2001, nine months following the release of the YDSA, the New Zealand Cabinet agreed that the Strategy forms the basis of a platform for public service agencies when developing policy advice and initiatives relating to youth 12 to 24 years of age, and directed all departments to consult with MoYA on how to apply the Strategy when developing policy advice relating to those in this age group (Hong, 2003).

This directive was an early and important message about the relevance of youth development to all government youth policies and programmes. The response to this directive across Government, however, has been mixed.

A June 2003 report published by MoYA summarises the extent to which the Government has adopted the youth development framework (Hong, 2003). This report contains the results of a survey that explored the response of government agencies to the Strategy. The objectives of this research were to measure MoYA's effectiveness in promoting the youth development approach, changes in knowledge of government regarding the youth development approach, and changes in the application of policy as a result of the youth development approach. The survey was also designed to collect information to assist decisionmaking about future initiatives, such as training, resource development, and joint planning and project work with key government agencies. The survey included an email survey and phone and face-to-face interviews with managers and staff of policy groups across the social sector agencies, including Department of Child Youth and Families; Department of Internal Affairs; Department of Labour; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Justice; Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs; Ministry of Social Development; and Ministry of Maori Affairs.

This process considered how interviewees viewed the Strategy, its fit within government and their work, the value the Strategy added, and ways of working together in relation to the Strategy.

Feedback from this survey provided useful insight regarding the awareness, relevance, and usefulness of the YDSA to government policy across departments. Most importantly, it provided ideas about the ways in which the Strategy could be promoted in the future.

This report indicated that, apart from officials who had been working on projects that involved MoYA, there appeared to be little active on-going promotion and visibility of the Strategy within the central government. It was suggested that more clear connections need to be made between the YDSA and the work of the other groups and agencies and that there is a need for technical assistance on the principles included in the Strategy. Workshops and seminars, as well as presentations to government leadership groups, would provide increased visibility, understanding, and promotion of the Strategy. Informal meetings with managers across agencies would also connect the Strategy with work across the social sector. Most importantly, there was feedback that there needs to be a stronger focus on the practical application of the Strategy, with particular attention to the ways in which young people could be involved in policy development processes and decisionmaking. It was suggested that training opportunities with "how to" guides about applying a youth development approach across disciplines would be useful.

New Government Strategies

Several government departments have intentionally incorporated the principles in the YDSA into departmental strategies or policies, and others have a specific focus on youth policy or the development, funding, and support of youth programmes or activities that are working toward the future inclusion of youth development. While this is not a thorough review of all that Government is doing in, for, and around youth policy, it highlights three of the key strategies that relate most directly to the principles of youth development in the YDSA, as well as a set of activities funded by the Department of Internal Affairs that are increasingly taking a youth development approach.

One of the most significant overall strategies is contained in *Sustainable Development for New Zealand: Programme of Action* (Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2003). This report highlights the important role of Government in articulating outcomes and directions for New Zealand and sets directions and actions on the Government's plans around the issues of water quality and allocation, energy, sustainable cities, and child and youth development. The central premise of "sustainable development" is that public policy development must meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet

their needs. It requires: looking after people; taking the long-term view; and taking account of the social, economic, environmental, and cultural effects of decisions. This strategy also recognises the importance of partnerships with other sectors, including local government, cultural leaders, the private sector, non-governmental organisations, and communities.

This report highlights investing in child and youth development as a government priority. It recognises that long-term benefits of supporting the success of young people exist and one step to a sustainable future is through promoting knowledge and skill acquisition and addressing social and health barriers of young people. It considers the links between child and youth development and the Government's goals of economic growth, social wellbeing, cultural strength and diversity, and healthy environments.

The *Agenda for Children* (Ministry of Social Development, 2002a) is a government strategy aimed at improving the lives of children aged 0 to 17. The *Agenda for Children*, also developed through an open consultative process, and the YDSA are closely related in principle and have been brought together under the Government's "Action for Child and Youth Development" work programme. The *Agenda for Children* takes a "whole child" approach that, like a youth development framework, addresses children's issues by focusing on a child's whole life and circumstances, as opposed to isolated issues or problems, and considers what children need for healthy development rather than simply reacting to problems as they arise. The *Agenda for Children* summarises research on healthy child development and identifies seven key action areas for promoting the Agenda. These action areas include: promoting a whole child approach; increasing children's participation; ending child poverty; addressing violence in children's lives with a particular focus on reducing bullying; improving central government structures and processes to enhance policy and service effectiveness for children; improving local government and community planning for children; and enhancing information, research, and research collaboration relating to children. The Agenda highlights examples of each of these action areas in practice in various settings in New Zealand and possible future developments and directions.

Published about six months following the publication of the YDSA, *Youth Health: A Guide to Action* (Ministry of Health, 2002b) sets out goals, objectives, and specific actions aimed at improving the health of New Zealand's youth aged 12 to 24. This guide specifically incorporates the philosophical shift espoused in the YDSA of seeing young people as valued participants in the community, as opposed to "at risk" and "problems to be solved" (Ministry of Health, 2002). This guide promotes the creation of opportunities for young people to actively participate and engage in health policy and health service delivery and to be involved in health decisions that affect them. This guide is largely strategic, offering a set of action ideas targeted to District Health Boards, rather than promoting or offering resources for particular project activities. The Ministry of Health is not formally tracking the impact of this guide on youth health activities, and no follow-up training or technical assistance is being conducted to further promote these principles. There is anecdotal evidence, however, that in response to the *Guide to Action* youth representatives have been added to approximately eight District Health Board committees.

Other examples of government policies and programmes that have an impact on youth exist but were not designed with the principles of the YDSA as a framework. The Department of Internal Affairs, for example, runs a number of programmes that were created in advance of the Strategy's development. Although these activities did not intentionally incorporate the principles of the YDSA, their goals are closely aligned with the youth development principles. The primary link between these projects and the YDSA is their focus on youth in the broader context of community development. Internal Affairs is also in the process of retrospectively linking these existing projects even more closely with the YDSA. The Social Entrepreneurship Scheme seeks to address basic causes of youth alienation by employing a key person at the community level as a "social entrepreneur" who can create an environment

for youth development through community and youth-driven initiatives. The Community Based Youth Development Fund supports six projects that focus on providing youth development opportunities as an approach to lessening risks of self-harm and suicide. The Youth Worker Training Scheme offers small grants for training opportunities for youth workers. Lottery Youth provides grants for projects which provide skills and personal development opportunities for at-risk and disadvantaged youth. Finally, the Crime Prevention Scheme supports youth development projects aimed at reducing youth offending by strengthening community support services for youth (Department of Internal Affairs, 2003).

A Plethora of “Principles”

There has been a move in government departments and agencies to have operating principles around which policies and programmes are designed and delivered. It is interesting to note that principles across government departments are aligned conceptually, but there is limited strategic alignment. These examples of Government’s guiding principles demonstrate their conceptual alignment.

Government Department	Guiding Principle
Ministry of Youth Development	Youth Development Youth participation in decisions that affect them, their family, their community, and their country, and promoting for youth a: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sense of contributing something of value to society • feeling of connectedness to others and to society • belief that they have choices about their future • feeling of being positive and comfortable with their own identity.
Prime Minister and Cabinet	Sustainable Development Promotes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • looking after people • taking the long-term view • taking account of the social, economic, environmental, and cultural effects of our decisions • encouraging participation and partnerships.

Government Department	Guiding Principle
Ministry of Social Development	<p>Whole Child Approach</p> <p>Supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focusing on the big picture, on the child's whole life and circumstances, not just isolated issues or problems • focusing from the outset on what children need for healthy development, rather than simply reacting to problems as they arise • looking across the whole public service at what can be done to support children's healthy development, instead of looking for single-sector solutions.
Ministry of Health	<p>Social Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promotes the wellbeing of the population as a whole and of disadvantaged groups within it • aims to improve health, education, housing, employment, living standards and safety • focuses on all outcomes to bring about change.
Department of Internal Affairs	<p>Community Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourages local solutions to local problems • builds government / voluntary sector partnerships • provides excellent services to citizens and customers through best use of information technology.

Local Government

A number of territorial authorities have included the youth development principles in council policies and the provision of youth services at the local government level. Others specifically began to more strategically develop youth policy in response to the Strategy. Territorial authorities have also been instrumental in supporting the development of youth worker networks that coordinate youth services across regions.

Christchurch City Council

The Christchurch City Council has developed a comprehensive plan to improve social outcomes for Christchurch youth. This plan is a collaborative effort between the Christchurch City Council, central government agencies, and the Canterbury District Health Board. This plan is cross-departmental, inclusive of community organisations, and forward thinking. In developing this plan, the City Council acknowledged that better results for young people could be achieved by coordinating activities across Government. The Christchurch

Social Policy Interagency Network (CSPIN), with representation from organisations across city agencies, worked to identify actions for addressing key issues related to youth, and developed a set of youth priorities for agencies to respond to over the next three years. These priorities, as well as the group's operating principles, are very closely aligned to the youth development principles. For example, in delivering services, a priority is to develop and deliver youth services with a strength-based approach. CSPIN has also agreed to monitor its progress monthly and report on its findings annually.

Hastings District Council

In 1998 the Hastings District Council embarked upon a process of developing a citywide youth policy that would engage young people in positive behaviours. Five years later the city has a range of youth services and facilities that were conceptualised and planned by young people. The centrepiece of these projects is @tomic, a youth centre that brings together music, sport, leisure, and educational activities in a safe drug- and alcohol-free environment. The centre includes a skate park and other sports facilities, billiards tables, video games, and a café. The District Health Board also runs a youth health centre in @tomic, offering doctor and nurse services, counselling, and peer support. Other youth activities in Hastings include Te Ao Marama arts education programme, community clean-up service projects, band competitions, self-esteem classes, and special music and sport events. Young people continue to be a part of the Council's process in Hastings through an active Youth Council.

Nelson City Council

The Nelson City Council established a Youth Council in 1998 and has increased the involvement and responsibility of this 18-member Council each year since. The Council is involved in organising youth events, distributing youth information packs, attending and presenting at youth development conferences, and supporting local youth organisations in many different ways. One of the signatures of the Youth Council was their involvement in assisting with the design and development of Pioneer Park, ensuring that it reflected the needs and interests of its community's youth. The City Council provides encouragement and support to the youth councillors, as well as practical tools and resources for its operation.

Youth Worker Networks

Canterbury Youth Workers' Collective

The Canterbury Youth Workers' Collective began in 1999 with funding by the Christchurch City Council. This collective grew out of a movement in the city to explore with young people their concerns and get their ideas on how to improve wellbeing for young people in the city. Following the tragic murder of two young people in Christchurch, young people organised a silent march to ask the mayor to make Christchurch a safer place for young people. The mayor and city council recognised the importance of coordinating youth services in the region and funded a fulltime staff member to run the Collective and coordinate youth services and youth workers. The Collective provides training, support, and career assistance to youth workers. The Collective also developed a legal "code of ethics" that serves as the basis of operating principles among members of the Collective. The Collective has grown over the years to a membership of approximately 250. The City Council has continued to be supportive and generous, funding a fulltime coordinator to run the Collective and youth development activities through the region.

Comm.Action

Comm.Action⁶ (Youth Development Community Development Action Research Training Network) is a rural community development network focused on youth development in the Central Otago region. A diverse youth and adult steering committee, which has worked to identify youth needs, interests, and concerns, advises the staff of Comm.Action. Youth and adult coordinators work together on project teams to address the youth interests. Various projects have been developed and implemented, such as alcohol-free dance parties, the development and distribution of *Sound Off!*, a free youth newspaper, a youth radio show, youth sports events and tournaments, and the design and running of a community youth centre. Comm.Action is also working to increase the skills and capacity of youth workers in the Central Otago region through the development of a youth workers' collective that includes regional advising, networking, training, "e-mentoring" among youth workers, and participation in youth workers' training.

Tairawhiti Youth Workers Council

Tairawhiti Youth Workers Council (TYWC) is a network of professionals and volunteers working with children and youth in the Tairawhiti region and is supported by the Gisborne District Council. For the past 10 years this network has met on a regular, often monthly, basis. It has developed a code of ethics for members and created a Trust under which to facilitate the activities of the network. This network is in the process of compiling the results of research conducted on the wellbeing of youth in the region with a vision for developing a regional youth development strategy.

Non-Governmental Organisations

Examples of non-governmental organisations that offer youth programmes, services, or activities are plentiful throughout New Zealand. As described previously, these programmes range in size, focus, and process. They are funded by a range of sources and directed and staffed in diverse ways. These are just a few examples of programmes in which young people are offered opportunities to experience youth development in practice.

Youthline

Youthline⁷ is a community organisation with a long history of providing opportunities for youth and their families to engage in active community participation. Youthline specifically targets youth, but does so by engaging the community in delivering activities and services to youth. Since 1970 Youthline has offered a range of services, such as a youth (phone) help line, adolescent and family counselling, alternative education programmes, a pregnancy centre, special events, and training seminars and workshops. Youthline makes developing young people as youth leaders a priority. Young people are involved at all levels of the organisation, from providing counsel to the Youthline staff regarding programme activities and operations to serving as Youthline volunteers and often eventually as paid staff. A centrepiece of Youthline's youth services is its youth leadership training programme. A training curriculum takes youth through a defined set of skills. Youthline has intentionally incorporated into its services the principles of the YDSA.

⁶ Information available online at www.panz.org.nz/cd_pg/youth/CD_Alex.html.

⁷ Information available online at www.youthline.co.nz.

Te Ora Hou

Te Ora Hou⁸, based in Kaiti but also a part of a national network of similar organisations under Te Ora Hou Aotearoa, is a faith-based programme that aims to put young people in mentoring relationships with caring and relevant role models who live in the same community. The foundation for its work has been to practise youth development by building on the strengths and interests of young people through long-term relationships with the youth and their whanau. Te Ora Hou runs a number of activities and programmes, including boys' clubs (Tama Toa), girls' clubs (Nga Mokopuna o Titirangi), alternative education programmes (Te Taumata Alternative Education), teenage parent programmes, and multicultural performance groups. It also supports the development and maintenance of recreational spaces such as a skate park and a retreat centre.

Papakai Marae Trust

Papakai Marae Trust is the sponsor organisation running both the Taupo and Turangi Conservation Corps Programmes situated at the Tuwharetoa Ki Tongariro Outdoor Pursuits Centre. This programme involves young people in a 20-week course that introduces them to the outdoor adventure tourism industry to prepare them for a chance at obtaining quality, rewarding, and sustainable employment in the community. This programme works with youth who are not prospering in traditional educational settings, have little or no Te Ao Maori, are not recognising the natural taonga (treasured setting) around them, are not developing a work ethic or work skills, and may be experiencing social problems such as drug abuse and criminal behaviours. The youth participate in conservation and work projects to benefit the community where they live. There is an educational component to the programme so that the young people leave the course with a new set of skills and credentials, including fire safety, radio communication, tool safety, first aid, and risk management. They are given instruction in preparing a resume and are taught drivers theory so that they can acquire a driver's licence. A work experience component of the programme gives the young people hands-on experience working in an industry that they identify with their supervisor, who then assists to arrange the work experience. These youth participants also are offered opportunities to engage in challenging recreation activities such as bush walking, kayaking, snow boarding, and caving.

Wellington Salvation Army

Wellington Salvation Army also runs a Conservation Corps Programme. Young people participate in conservation and service projects, employment experience, practical education, and challenging recreation components, while focusing on teamwork, individual skill development, and confidence building during a 20-week course. Te Ao Maori is also built in as an integral component of the programme. Programme supervisors focus on teaching through experiential and co-operative learning with young people engaged in strategic planning and programme improvement exercises.

Southland YMCA

The Southland YMCA supports a Specialist Youth Service Corps Programme in Invercargill. Like the Youth Development Corps Programmes, this programme, also funded by MYD, engages young people in 20-week courses that include a combination of recreation, community service activities, education, and life skills development. This programme, however, targets 15- to 17-year-old moderate-risk youth offenders who are considered appropriate for community intervention, rather than entering the adult justice system. The aim is to reduce the risk of their entering the adult justice system in the future. Youth

⁸ Information available online at www.ora.org.nz/aboutus.htm.

engage in activities that offer them positive experiences with their community and assist them improve relationships with their families. The programme also helps develop personal strengths and skills, such as confidence, goal-setting, and assertiveness. The role of the programme supervisor as a mentor has been particularly important to the young people in these programmes. Having strong role models (specifically male role models) who provide unconditional support and encouragement serves to increase confidence, particularly for the young men on the programme.

Project K

Project K⁹ is a national programme aimed at building self-esteem and giving life direction to 13- to 15-year-olds by teaching life skills and promoting good health and education. A three-stage programme run over the course of 14 months, Project K includes a 3-week wilderness adventure, personal goal-setting around academic, fitness, health, and personal goals, community service, and mentoring. It is created as a “franchise” operation by which communities deliver the programme locally through the support of a specially designed charitable trust. The principles contained in the YDSA are reflected in its operating principles, particularly in relation to assisting young people in developing relationships with community mentors.

Tamaiti Whangai

Tamaiti Whangai is a marae / community-based project, ethnically linked to Maori and Pasifika families in the Hutt Valley. It is run by Te Runanganui o Taranaki Whanui, the governing body of Te Atiawa Maori tribal group, based at Waiwhetu, Lower Hutt. The multi-faceted programmes run by Tamaiti Whangai involve children, young people, and families, focusing on education, sports and exercise, culture, whanau support, and community support. Tamaiti Whangai approaches youth programming as being integrally connected to activities provided across the community and across age groups, and therefore promotes the development of youth by supporting the wellbeing and integration of the entire Hutt Valley community.

Out There

Out There aims to improve the wellbeing of “queer” (their term of choice to describe gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, takataapui¹⁰, and fa’afafine¹¹) young people in New Zealand by promoting the creation of environments supportive of queer youth. Funded by the Department of Internal Affairs, the primary goal of Out There is to train professionals working with young people (youth workers, teachers, social workers, counsellors, teachers, peer support workers, public and sexual health nurses) on issues related to queer youth. Reflecting the youth development principles, Out There training focuses on the importance of considering young people in the context of the greater community and recognising that being queer is not a deficit or a risk. Young people are included as ongoing advisors to this project.

⁹ Information available online at www.projectk.org.nz.

¹⁰ Maori term for individuals who have same-sex partnerships.

¹¹ Samoan term for Pasifika males who have either been socialised as girls or decided that they want to be “like a woman” (literal translation). It is a gender identity label as opposed to a sexual identity.

Hutt Valley Youth Health Service

The Hutt Valley Youth Health Service (HVVHS) provides young people from the Hutt Valley access to services to promote their mental, physical, spiritual, emotional, and social health. It focuses on building the personal capacity of young people by involving them in activities and interventions that focus on building resiliency and preventing problem behaviours and outcomes. The HVVHS offers medical assistance, specialist referrals, and health workshops. The Service also opened four school-based health clinics recently. The HVVHS is committed to engaging the Hutt Valley community, particularly young people, in the operations and activities of the Service and therefore young people are involved in all aspects of the Service, participating as advisors to the Service Manager on both programme decisions and employment, serving on the governance board, and being employed as peer support workers who interact directly with young people.

He Huarahi Tamariki

He Huarahi Tamariki¹² is a school-based programme for young people who are unable to complete their basic formal education due to pregnancy and the birth of a child. Run by He Huarahi Tamariki Charitable Trust, this programme's focus is the academic training of these young people, but its approach takes into consideration all aspects of these adolescents' lives – their social, emotional, and physical health and the health of their children, their socioeconomic needs, their family circumstances, and their role as parents. The Trust also runs the Griffen School for Early Learning, which is an on-site early childhood programme for the children of the students, and the Outreach Programme, in which teachers go into the home of a young expectant or new mother to support her and her child and encourage her to continue with schooling.

Youth Development Training

Groups and individuals around New Zealand are using the youth development principles as a foundation for the training of youth workers, health workers, community workers, teachers, and others who work with youth. There is no common curriculum being used for this training and there is no database or other method of tracking where and how training occurs. Many of the programmes included in the case studies above use some aspect of the YDSA and youth development principles in their staff training. Other training opportunities are provided through various organisations. The Centre for Youth Health, for example, has integrated the youth development principles into the education and training they offer to health professionals who work with youth. Their workshops cover diverse health topics and include participants such as youth workers, case managers, and youth sports coaches. Praxis¹³, run by the Youth Cultures and Community Charitable Trust, provides a youth worker training certificate in 'Youthwork and Community Mission' through its network of partnerships with churches, mission organisations, and community groups. This training programme integrates youth development principles into its training curriculum. There also are individuals across the country who include youth development in presentations and training of various youth-serving professionals.

¹² Information available online at www.hht.school.nz.

¹³ Information available online at www.praxis.org.nz.

Beyond Programme Descriptions

In the absence of programme evaluations, interviews with young people involved in various youth programmes provided insight to some of the key issues that motivate participation and engagement, and the effect of these opportunities on youth behaviour and attitude. Group discussions and individual interviews with young people and youth workers yielded important insight.

Although the young people came from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and geographic locations, they delivered consistent messages. Young people reported that the best parts of participating in youth programmes / activities included the opportunity to:

- meet other young people
- interact with adults in the community
- learn skills
- acquire credentials (e.g., drivers licence, first aid certification, radio communications skills)
- experience new things (e.g., travel)
- simply have something to get up for in the morning.

They suggested that these opportunities led to an increase in:

- self esteem
- confidence
- motivation to pursue new goals and prospects for personal advancement
- employment and educational opportunities
- hope for their future.

Young people explained that the most important element of good programmes is youth workers who treat them with respect, are fun, and support them unconditionally. They chose to participate in youth development programmes for a variety of reasons, but an overwhelming motivation was to provide them with skills that would help them secure and retain a job. Many young people described having had a lack of vision about future opportunity and a sense of despair prior to participation in youth development activities. Particularly among young people who had left school, they indicated they had been doing “nothing” prior to participating in the programme and were motivated by their newly developed routine to their day.

Promising Next Steps

At both the government and community levels, work is underway to increase the knowledge base about youth development and to use the YDSA to improve opportunities for young people. These are just a few examples of many ongoing efforts.

Ministry of Youth Development

The 2003 / 2004 Work Programme of MYD includes a number of outputs designed to further promote the understanding and application of the YDSA across Government and at the community level. Funding is allocated for three workshops on *Keepin' It Real*, two training sessions on *E Tipu Rea*, and at least two seminars on the youth development approach. There also is a plan to convene community meetings with a range of stakeholders and youth in nine communities across New Zealand (Northland, Auckland, Waikato, East Coast / Hawkes Bay, Manawatu / Taranaki, Wellington, Nelson / Marlborough, Canterbury, and Otago / Southland). These meetings are designed to promote youth development, with a

focus on youth participation, and to develop a relationship at the community level for continued input on the youth development process.

MYD, in collaboration with the Health Research Council (HRC), has funding to develop a population-based national survey of the health and wellbeing of young people in order to inform decisionmaking about how best to contribute to the wellbeing of young people in New Zealand.

Because there currently is no method to assess the status of young people in relation to Government's vision for their wellbeing, MYD contracted with the Roy McKenzie Centre for the Study of Families at Victoria University to prepare a literature review that investigates ways to measure young people's confidence levels. This review concluded that there is no recognised tool for measuring confidence, and a robust tool would take into account internal and external factors, cultural aspects, age appropriateness, and the principles of the YDSA. MYD is exploring the costs and possibility of inserting confidence measures in existing complementary surveys.

MYD has a joint work programme with the Ministry of Education to assist the education sector to understand and effectively apply a youth development approach to education and training opportunities for 16- to 19-year-olds, to teachers' professional development, and curriculum development. Work is also being undertaken to work with the Ministry of Education to incorporate youth development indicators to incorporate into current monitoring and evaluation processes related to the secondary school sector.

MYD included in its work programme a goal of providing advice to the Ministry of Health on the application of youth development to the implementation of *Youth Health: A Guide to Action* (Ministry of Health, 2002b).

Other Data Collection and Research Efforts

The Ministry of Social Development has begun scoping the development of a new longitudinal study of children and young people in New Zealand. In 2002 the Ministry released a discussion paper, *Towards a Longitudinal Study of New Zealand Children and Young People*, that reviewed the range of issues that would need to be considered and a general assessment of the merits of this type of study. Two papers commissioned by international experts on longitudinal study further contributed to this discussion by highlighting the value of longitudinal study, describing the state of longitudinal data internationally, and making recommendations for such a study in New Zealand (Joshi, 2002; Hill, 2002). A workshop was convened in September 2003 that engaged government representatives and eminent researchers from across New Zealand in discussions about the value and feasibility of a longitudinal study, as well as management and funding considerations. There was general support at this meeting for a longitudinal study and a Reference Group is being formed that will explore this concept further. A series of papers on several main aspects of the longitudinal study – including objectives and conceptual framework of the study, design options, and governance and funding – also are being prepared.

There also are individuals and non-governmental groups taking an interest in furthering the collection and synthesis of data on youth and youth wellbeing in a way that reflects the youth development approach. For example, the Roy McKenzie Centre for the Study of Families at Victoria University of Wellington recently submitted a proposal to the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology to undertake a comprehensive study with a mixed-method, cross-lagged longitudinal design of youth in New Zealand. This study proposes to examine how connectedness supports youth in negotiating the challenges of adolescence,

and to identify modifiable factors that foster and enhance connectedness. The study would focus on young peoples' connectedness to communities and wider society, families and whanau, and schools. Measures would include outcomes such as confidence, academic performance, behaviour, and psychological wellbeing, incorporating Maori perspectives and indicators at all phases. This study would provide snapshots of New Zealand youth each year and analyse the causal links across time among potentially protective factors and positive outcomes.

The Collaborative Plan for Christchurch Youth described in Part IV has contributed to future work being considered by the Ministry of Social Development to support local interagency planning. A paper summarising the findings from this collaborative process has recently been released and promotes active implementation of this strategy in Christchurch and support for this new approach in other communities (Rennie and Fletcher, 2003).

National Youth Workers Network Research Project

The Department of Internal Affairs, with some limited assistance from MYD, is supporting the creation of a national professional standard for youth workers. Building on the existing local and regional networks around New Zealand, funding was allocated to the National Youth Work Network to conduct a two-year research project that identifies the needs of youth workers and how to increase their skills and capacities. This research will be followed by the development of a plan for youth worker training and credentialing, as well as a national code of ethics for youth workers.

PART V: CONCLUSIONS AND LOOKING AHEAD

- Summarises lessons from site visits and interviews.
- Highlights concepts for future action in New Zealand to further promote youth development.
- Identifies key observations for the United States.

Lessons From Youth Development in Practice

Site visits and discussions with young people, youth workers, and service providers, coupled with a review of the Strategy's development, interviews with government policymakers, and an examination of youth programmes and planning processes produced observations related to effective youth development programme functioning and the relevance of the YDSA.

Creation of the Strategy

- The process of developing the YDSA and related child and youth strategies was community based, reflecting the input of a range of community stakeholders, including young people.
- New Zealand espoused a vision for moving from a deficit-based approach toward youth policy to strategies that take a broader youth development approach.
- Efforts were made to link policies in New Zealand across the age spectrum, from young children through adolescence.

Application of the Strategy

- The charismatic leadership and vision of individual youth workers or community organisers is the primary driver for inclusion and application of youth development principles in programmes and services. Similarly, strong government leadership and the commitment of policymakers to promoting youth development influences the extent to which these principles are incorporated into policies and programmes across Government.
- In programmes demonstrating strong youth participation, positive youth feedback, and seemingly creative and varied activities, there is a focus on building relationships. These relationships occur at various levels – between the youth worker and the young person, among youth participants, and between the young people and community members, such as teachers, police, health workers, and employers. The development of these relationships often is the primary goal of the programme.
- Institutional support and resources are critical to the success of programmes. The source can vary (e.g., city or regional council, central government, philanthropic organisation) as long as there is a reliable funding stream and philosophical endorsement of the youth development principles.

- Community, iwi, and hapu development is the foundation for many successful youth development programmes. The needs of young people are integrally related to the greater needs of the community, and, similarly, the solutions to youth problems are related to community solutions.
- Among the six principles espoused in the YDSA, youth participation in design and ongoing decisionmaking about programmes was the most commonly implemented. This may be attributed to the very tangible and specific nature of the principle, easily translated from a policy into an action step.

Impact of the Strategy

- Young people involved in youth development programmes and activities believe that their participation improved their attitudes and motivation.
- The articulated principles of youth development resonate with service providers, non-governmental organisations, central and local government, philanthropists, youth workers, and young people. These principles also reflect the importance of community and whanau in a Maori context.
- Central government values the youth development approach and promotes its inclusion across government youth policies and programmes.
- The YDSA has reached individuals and groups representing diverse communities. Examples of creative, successful youth development programmes exist in practice at both the local and national levels in New Zealand.
- There are several local and regional comprehensive efforts to implement the YDSA, generally driven by the vision and commitment of an individual service provider or youth worker.
- The best source of knowledge about youth development in practice exists at the community level.

Challenges for the Strategy

- The impact of the Strategy appears to be impeded by the lack of a clear national implementation plan or process.
- A large cross-section of stakeholders involved in youth policy and programming, including policymakers, service providers, and youth workers, continue to struggle to understand the concept of youth development and apply it in practice.
- Tangible links between and among government policies across the age ranges are not clear in practice.
- Several government principles and initiatives across departments are conceptually aligned, but few appear to have operational links.
- Resources are needed to support:
 - the inclusion of youth development in existing programmes
 - experimentation in developing new programmes
 - training and education opportunities for youth workers
 - programme monitoring and evaluation.

Future Directions for New Zealand

These observations reveal successes in the design and early impact of the YDSA, as well as significant challenges to its meaningful implementation on a wider scale. The following themes highlight possible future directions for New Zealand policymakers and community leaders where continued work could enhance the reach and the impact of the Strategy.

(1) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: Develop a plan and process to translate the youth development principles into more specific actions at the national and local levels.

The creation of the national Strategy was an essential first step to promote youth development. It provided a consistent framework to align resources and secured the endorsement and commitment of Government to address youth needs in a comprehensive manner. The YDSA was widely distributed and well received by various stakeholders involved in youth programming. MoYA conducted some local training around the Strategy's principles and prepared a few additional products to facilitate inclusion in youth programming.

Nevertheless, the principles of youth development remain inaccessible to many who work with youth or influence youth policy, and the impact of the Strategy has been constrained in part by this lack of awareness and understanding. Few resources are dedicated to youth development programmes that are holistic, not problem-specific, and not targeted solely to at-risk or disadvantaged youth. Furthermore, central government programmes remain functionally disconnected and, although conceptually aligned, they lack the operational elements to advance youth development in practice and enable linkages across categorical activities.

Thus, the next phase of work should focus on pursuing a pragmatic and specific implementation plan for the Strategy. This is not a new concept. During the consultation process on development of the Strategy, the issue of implementation was anticipated and questions were raised about how to make it more than conceptual. It was suggested that a strategy not be prepared to "sit on a shelf" (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2001a).

The Cabinet Review of the Ministry of Youth Affairs was significant in that it recognised the importance of the YDSA and principles of youth development, and it recommitted the Government by creating a new organisational structure with access to more resources. This period of institutional transition for the Ministry of Youth Development creates an opportunity to re-examine its activities, establish strong leadership within the Ministry, and leverage its new institutional capability to further enhance the application of youth development to programmes and activities across New Zealand.

Elements of a strategic implementation plan could include the objectives that follow.

(2) STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION GROUP: Create a multi-sectoral implementation group involving relevant national and local, public and private representation.

Stakeholders with interests in youth policy and programming include central and local government policymakers; non-governmental organisations, including philanthropic organisations; youth workers; young people; and Maori groups. These stakeholders each offer unique contributions to the discussion around promoting youth development in individual programmes and community-wide.

Central government provides the historical framework around which the philosophy of youth development has been packaged into public policy and, given that the vast majority of youth programme funding is government provided, has a significant influence on promoting youth development policy and activities across government departments serving youth.

There is a particularly valuable source of knowledge about youth development at the community level in New Zealand. There are community-level stakeholders who understand and model how to practise youth development – what works, what needs to happen in order to further promote the Strategy’s success, and the challenges. This expertise at the local level is critical to furthering a dialogue about next steps in the implementation of the YDSA.

For some communities in New Zealand, local government is playing a critical role in the application of youth development to community-level planning and youth programming. Some of the best examples of youth development in practice in New Zealand have been driven by the commitment of a regional or city council to youth.

Non-governmental organisations, including large, nationally recognised programmes, small, independent community-based programmes, and other entities, such as church-based institutions, deliver the majority of youth services and programmes in New Zealand and thus bring to the table a community perspective.

Iwi groups and Maori organisations play an important role in providing youth services and activities. Whether iwi- or hapu-based or through a Maori-focused non-profit organisation, the delivery of youth development services and activities needs to be informed of cultural and contemporary issues related to Maori youth.

Although they offer a comparatively small source of funding for youth, private philanthropic organisations, such as family and community trusts and foundations, may contribute to the youth development discussion as they develop priorities around which they support youth programmes.

Individuals who work with youth (youth workers, health workers, social workers, truant officers, etc.) are often central to the manifestation of policy into practice since they are often the primary individual delivering services and programmes. Similarly, young people offer critical personal perspectives.

A multi-sectoral strategic planning group would promote collaboration between the Government and communities and would also support cross-departmental government coordination. Such a group, for instance, could work on plans to better strategically link the various government principles and strategies that were identified in Part IV.

(3) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: Increase youth development knowledge among stakeholders at all levels (government policymakers, service providers, youth workers, etc.) through training, tools, and ongoing technical assistance.

Easy-to-understand, practical, hands-on, user-friendly tools and ongoing training, and ongoing technical assistance, would make an important contribution to promoting youth development both within the Government and at a community level.

The YDSA includes a framework to help identify actions that can be taken to support positive development across social environments and government areas. It includes almost 200 suggestions for schools, non-governmental agencies, voluntary organisations, government-funded youth programmes, local government, and community programmes, on ways to promote a strengths-based approach, quality relationships, youth participation, and building further knowledge on youth development.

The translation of these action ideas into practical tools would help service providers, those who work with youth, and policymakers understand the application of youth development to policy development and service delivery. *Keepin' It Real* was developed as a tool to assist in promoting the Strategy's principle of increasing youth participation. This guide has been useful to service providers and youth workers seeking to more actively engage young people in leadership roles. Similar guides or "toolkits" for each of the six principles would contribute to improved understanding and application of the remaining youth development principles.

The youth development principles should be the foundation for the training of youth workers and other professionals working with youth (such as health workers, teachers, and social workers). Given the limited training and credentialing opportunities for youth workers, there is also a need to develop new training programmes in communities and regions where nothing else exists and to promote the inclusion of youth development into existing training programmes.

Youth workers should understand the merit of subtle integration of youth development into programme activities. Many of the programmes visited that are delivering youth development at the community level made the point that young people involved in their programmes do not know that they are engaged in "youth development" activities specifically. They suggested that the labelling of activities as "youth development" is often off-putting for youth. What youth care about is that the programmes are fun, create opportunities for them to be engaged, teach new skills, involve adult leaders who they both like and respect, and provide time and space to be with other young people. These are, in fact, all elements of youth development in practice.

(4) EVALUATION AND DATA: Strengthen the evidence base with evaluation and data collection.

Very few youth programmes and services in New Zealand have been formally evaluated. Many conduct what could be called "consumer satisfaction surveys" of youth participants. They ask questions around whether they enjoyed participating and what they learned from an activity, and collect suggestions for improvement and ideas for future programmes.

There is a growing body of American research, some New Zealand evaluation, and anecdotal support that suggests youth programmes applying youth development

principles have the potential to promote positive youth outcomes. New Zealand-based evidence to demonstrate this, however, is limited.

As described in Part IV of this report, monitoring of young people and evaluation of youth programmes is critical to ongoing policy and programme improvement, and continued support and promotion of youth development programmes.

Prior to the transition to MSD, the Ministry of Youth Development had no resources or designated evaluation staff. The Centre for Social Research and Evaluation at MSD is positioned to play an important role in assessing the evaluation needs of the MYD and participating in the evaluation of its programmes and policies.

Evaluative activity has recently been highlighted as a priority for the Government. In response to concerns that evaluation is not conducted and used effectively by the Government, a staff team from the State Services Commission and the Treasury conducted a review of evaluative activity in New Zealand and made suggestions on ways to improve it. *Doing the Right Things and Doing Them Right* (2003a) summarises these findings. This report reinforces the importance of evaluative activity in helping "... organisations learn from the past and make good decisions about how to improve existing and future policies and programmes to achieve the best results for New Zealanders" (p. 8).

Youth providers, evaluators, and policymakers do not always agree about the extent to which youth development programmes should undergo formal evaluation and the value of evaluation conducted on such programmes. But the absence of full agreement on the process of evaluation and the challenges of doing good evaluation of youth development programmes should not keep evaluation from happening. Instead, a variety of evaluative options should be considered. *Doing the Right Things and Doing Them Right* (2003), for example, promotes the use of different types of evaluative activity at different stages in the policy development and programme implementation cycle and acknowledges that formal evaluation is not always the best option.

Evaluation should be done in the best way possible given the state of the programme, resources, and evaluator skills. A review of evaluation methods for youth development programmes was included in *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development* (National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2000). This report suggested that all youth programmes undergo evaluation "... to improve design and implementation, to create accountability, and to assess outcomes and impact," but that "... the scope and rigor of the evaluation should be appropriately calibrated to the attributes of the programme, the available resources, and the goals of the evaluation" (p. 312).

A growing body of literature in the US discusses evaluation of youth development programmes. The Harvard Family Research Project¹⁴ is an important source of information on evaluations of out-of-school time programmes, of which youth development programmes are a primary focus. It highlights diverse examples of evaluations, descriptions of evaluation methods and terms, and describes challenges of conducting youth development evaluations.

Other international examples promote developing community capacity to design and conduct evaluations. The Stronger Families Learning Exchange of the Australian

¹⁴ Information available online at www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp.

Institute of Family Studies¹⁵, for example, has a model of evaluation that could be applied to the evaluation of New Zealand's youth development programmes. Community projects are assigned a staff mentor to guide them through the design of a research evaluation and help with data collection, analysis, reporting, and planning for change. The result is an evaluation, but it is also the development of community evaluation expertise.

Support for the collection of data on young people, particularly as it relates to an understanding of connections between youth wellbeing and youth development activities, is also important. Longitudinal study of youth will help build a knowledge base of contemporary adolescent issues; changes in behaviour, attitudes, competencies, and wellbeing over time; and correlations between opportunities for youth and these measures of wellbeing. Longitudinal studies require a long-term commitment and patience if they are to measure long-term outcomes. They also involve significant financial investment. Nevertheless, it is important that New Zealand not continue to rely on international data to develop local youth policy priorities and actions.

(5) REFORMS IN CURRENT FUNDING: Connect youth development into existing programme funding mechanisms.

A principal concern during the consultation process was one of financial resources. It was noted that "sufficient funding would be required to establish and implement a Strategy if there are to be any positive changes to the development of young people" (Ministry of Youth Affairs, 2001c; page 2). Thus, promoting youth development requires funders of youth programmes, activities, and services to operationalise the YDSA principles by explicitly incorporating them as funding criteria and measuring attainment.

For central government, this can be accomplished by redrafting Requests for Proposals (RPFs) that focus on youth to demonstrate how youth development principles are to be achieved. Examples of such government programmes include the Conservation Corps Programme (Ministry of Youth Development), the Specialist Youth Service Corps Programme (Ministry of Youth Development), the Social Entrepreneurship Fund, Youth Worker Training Scheme, Community Based Youth Development Fund (Department of Internal Affairs), and the Police Youth at Risk Programmes (New Zealand Police and Ministry of Justice).

The Foundation for Research, Science and Technology serves as a model for this effort. It has recently begun to draw attention to youth development by requiring applicants to demonstrate an alignment with the YDSA in RFPs that are youth-related.¹⁶

Local government and the philanthropic sector can similarly influence the structure of youth services through their funding requirements. They also can underwrite important activities that central government funding sources generally do not, such as joint programme planning, cross-programme case management, and area-wide training and networking among youth workers.

¹⁵ Information available online at www.aifs.org.au/sf/resources.html.

¹⁶ See *Request for Proposals for Research in Social: Public, Business and Economic Life in New Zealand*, available at <http://www.frst.govt.nz/Research/RFP-Social.cfm>, and *Maori Youth Development Request for Research Proposals*, available at <http://www.frst.govt.nz/Publications/guides-forms/RFP-JointFRST-HRC-Maori.doc>.

The Connecticut Center for Youth Development (CCYD) is a US example for this type of activity. CCYD creates regular opportunities to convene both public and private funders in the state for the purpose of coordinating public and private funding and support of youth development programmes. Bi-annual meetings of funders – including representatives of the State, cities, and family and community foundations – provide a forum to identify youth needs state-wide and promote inclusion of youth development principles in their funding plans.

(6) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: Test holistic youth development programmes through interagency / intergovernmental collaboration and services integration at the community level.

Youth often have multiple coexisting and mutually reinforcing problems that should be addressed holistically, as recognised in scientific literature and the YDSA principles of youth development. However, the Government's systems function in a manner that tends to impede this objective.

Youth programme financing currently is delivered through categorical funding streams from multiple government departments and programme offices, each with its own requirements for eligibility, uses, and accountability. Although delivered by different entities with different rules, these programmes generally serve the same population. Central government also dictates how much funding is allocated to a given youth problem, rather than affording flexibility to respond to local circumstances. These factors encourage discrete, fragmented services that focus narrowly on a particular intervention for a specific problem. Those youth workers who want to take a more holistic approach must try to piece together at the community level the varied and often conflicting funding sources.

Consistent with the principles in the YDSA, it would be valuable to test how government programmes can be better integrated to address youth issues. For example, a long-term demonstration project in a few localities could be undertaken without significant additional cost. Funds could be dedicated from existing youth-focused programmes across government agencies to create a distinct pool of resources with flexibility of use and administration. The purpose would be to address the objectives of all contributing programmes through a comprehensive approach that focuses on the "whole" youth being served, as opposed to resolving an individual problem that a young person may exhibit.

Coalitions of local youth-serving organisations, including local governments, could compete to receive these funds or be invited to apply as "priority areas". In either case, distributions would be made in accordance with local plans for fund use that best demonstrate how youth would receive integrated, wrap-around services that incorporate the YDSA principles.

Such a demonstration project would change the focus of funding by providing incentives to incorporate youth development policy and practice across youth-serving systems. Central government departments would collaborate on the development and administration of the funds, and local groups would collaborate on the design and delivery of youth services. It also would incorporate an opportunity for youth development evaluation. The demonstration must include a predictable funding commitment over at least five years in order to ensure sufficient time for the project to evolve and measurable impacts to occur.

This philosophy of focusing on local collaboration is supported by recent policy findings published by the State Services Commission and Ministry of Social

Development (Dovey, 2003; Ministry of Social Development, 2003b). These papers discuss how to improve social outcomes in New Zealand through greater collaboration among central government, local government, and community-based organisations. These papers highlight the importance of power-sharing, joint accountability, and greater flexibility, and acknowledge that groups outside government may be better placed to undertake certain efforts to achieve outcomes. They also underscore the importance of a government role in facilitating local innovation by investing in local collaborative efforts.

A noteworthy example of such community-level strategic planning in New Zealand recently occurred in Christchurch. An interagency, central and local government collaboration supported by the Ministry of Social Development conducted a strategic planning process to address youth issues in the city. MSD may support similar collaborations in other areas.

Application to the United States

The YDSA was born out of a process that involved analysing, adapting, and applying concepts of youth development and resiliency, many of which were drawn from US literature, however the result is a model for government planning from which the US can learn. New Zealand's experience in designing and implementing the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa offers transferable lessons despite the differences between the two countries in scale, culture, and laws. It provides an experiential basis for policymakers in the US as they consider national, state, or regional planning to promote youth development and suggests several themes for programme design and government policy in the US. These brief ideas present areas for continued exploration among US policymakers and youth service providers.

The identification of a perfect youth development programme that can be replicated across communities is impossible. The diversity of young people, their particular needs, and surrounding environments make it unrealistic for a single programme to fit all situations. There also is an aspect to working with young people that is an art, not a science, and programme success often is dependent on intangible variables such as the personality of the youth worker or the interpersonal relationships within a particular group of young people (McLaughlin, 2000).

Yet the YDSA demonstrates that a consensus document outlining a strategy for youth development can:

- assure a consistent framework for effective youth programme design
- provide a tangible vehicle for political commitment and rationale to generate organisational change
- guide alignment of intergovernmental and interagency resource commitments.

In addition, the New Zealand experience makes clear that an endorsed strategy is not enough to generate systems change. It should be followed by an implementation plan with clear action steps for funding and operational modifications, along with identification of the necessary resources and the parties accountable for achieving them.

Considering the sources of youth programme funding in New Zealand, the appropriate scale for a strategy and implementation effort in the US may not be at the national level. Most funding for US youth programming comes from state and local governments, community and corporate foundations, and private donations. Public sector youth-serving functions are primarily operated by entities that are controlled or funded principally by states.

Because the purpose of the strategy is to frame the actions of those delivering resources for youth activities and make them relevant to local conditions, the greatest potential for influence is at the state level. This still allows for the creation of more locally relevant implementation plans through interagency and intergovernmental partnerships and demonstration projects. The approach appears consistent with, and affirms, the nascent efforts underway in the US.

In both its successes and challenges, the development and preliminary implementation of New Zealand's youth development strategy clearly represents a significant first step toward delivering more appropriate and effective youth supports. These efforts afford both conceptual and operational lessons for youth development programming.

APPENDIX A

Interviewees and Discussants

The following people provided interviews or participated in discussions that were instrumental to this project:

Merv Aoake	Wakatipu Youth Trust
Kerry Austen	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Susan Bagshaw	198 Youth Health Centre, Christchurch
Susan Baragwanath	He Huarahi Tamariki
Stephen Bell	Youthline
Usha Bird	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps Programme
Florence Brady	HYPE Unlimited Trust, Healthy Youth Positive Experiences
Rob Brown	Ministry of Social Development
Manu Caddie	Te Ora Hou – Te Tairawhiti Inc.
Anne Carter	Ministry of Women's Affairs / Ministry of Youth Affairs
Maria Teni Chan-Foon	Taupo Conservation Corps
Steve Christian	Office of the Commissioner, New Zealand Police
Wayne Clayton	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Amy Collins	Wanaka Youth Worker
Adam Cook	Student, Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Lorraine Coulston	Hutt Valley Youth Health Service
Simon Denney	Centre for Youth Health / University of Auckland
Dilys Dawai	West Coast Youth Workers Collective
Sue Dodds	Waitakere City Council
Peter Doone	Project K
Nicolette Edgar	Ministry of Social Development
Pare Eru	Turangi Conservation Corps
Ben Filiata	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Terry Fleming	Centre for Youth Health
Wendy Fraser	Southland YMCA Education Ltd Specialist Youth Service Corps Programme
Agnes Grace	Turangi Conservation Corps
Catherine Graham	Alexandra Youth Worker
Patricia Hadfield	Taupo Conservation Corps
Simon Harger-Forde	Hutt Valley District Health Board
John Harrington	Canterbury Youth Workers Collective

Brenda Hegarty	Ministry of Social Development
Peter Hill	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Iain Hines	JR McKenzie Trust
Donna Horne	Turangi Conservation Corps
Malcolm Ingliss	State Services Commission
Leysa Ivory	Taupo Conservation Corps
Ivan Jacobson	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Malcolm Judd	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Dawn Kakahi	Turangi Conservation Corps
Kevin Kakahi	Turangi Conservation Corps and Taupo Conservation Corps
Josie Keelan	Auckland University of Technology
Anne Kelly	Ministry of Justice
Choyce Maere	Ministry for Culture and Heritage
Lloyd Martin	Praxis
Brendon McRae	Cromwell Youth Worker
Clare Millar	Community Youth Action Trust
David Mulholland	Ministry of Internal Affairs
Dawn Perawiti	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Andrew Philips	Milton Youth Worker
Anthony Poni-Whakam	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Selwyn Ponga-Davis	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Johannah Puha	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Kara Puketapu	Te Runanganui o Taranaki Whanui
Titia Rameka	Taupo Conservation Corps
Mary Rangi	Turangi Conservation Corps
Mereana Ruri	Commission on Children
Emma Ryan	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Lynlee Sanders	Southland REAP
Karen Schomaker	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Tyrone Smith	Taupo Conservation Corps
Inia Stewart	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Fati Tagoai	Hutt Valley Youth Health Service
Edi Tanaki	Hutt Valley Youth Health Service
Shelley Taylor	Community Youth Action Trust
Jim de Thierry	Alexandra Youth Worker
Lawrence Toetoe	Taupo Conservation Corps
Sarah Turner	Ministry of Health

Linda Va'atu'itu'I	Salvation Army Wellington Conservation Corps
Pirihima Waaka	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Dean Waiariki	Taupo Conservation Corps
Hinemoa Waitoa	Taupo Conservation Corps
Ricki-Lee Wanena	Turangi Conservation Corps
Peter Watson	Centre for Youth Health
Zac Weston	Palmerston North Specialist Youth Service Corps
Jon White	Office of the Commissioner, New Zealand Police
Shaz Williams	Tamaiti Whangai

Ministry of Youth Development

Staff at the Ministry of Youth Development provided valuable policy, programme, and administrative support to this project.

Alanna Barnao	Lois Markland
Ross Bucklar	Sandra Meredith
Ebony Collins	Christl McMillan
Wayne Curtin	Erica McPherson
Kyssiah Duncan	Diana Kessler
John Emery	Tim Penney
David Hanlon	Meliors Simms
Anne Hartley	Rebecca Thomson
Denis Hulston	Sue van Daatselaar
Fiona Kirk	Stefan Weir
Monique Leerschool	Felicity Wilton
Wiki Malton	David Wood

APPENDIX B

Glossary of Terms

Hapu	Sub-tribe
Iwi	Tribe
Maori	Indigenous people of New Zealand
Marae	Traditional Maori gathering place
Pakeha	New Zealand white European
Rangatahi	Youth
Taiohi	Young person, youth
Taitamariki	Youth
Taonga	Treasured setting
Tupulaga talavou	Youth (Samoan term)
Whanau	Extended family

Whakamanawa te Hou Ora o nga Rangatahi

Promoting Youth Development

CITATIONS

Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (2003) *Toward a Blueprint for Youth: Making Positive Youth Development a National Priority*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services. Available online at www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/fysb/youthinfo/blueprint.htm.

Adolescent Health Research Group (2003) *New Zealand Youth, A Profile of Their Health and Wellbeing: Early Findings of Youth 2000, A National Secondary School Youth Health Survey*. Auckland: University of Auckland, University of Auckland.

ASH New Zealand (2002) *Tobacco Statistics 2002*. Auckland: ASH New Zealand. Available online at www.ash.org.nz/go/0000570h.html.

Becroft, A (2003) *Youth Offending: Putting the Headlines in Context*. Wellington: Principal Youth Court.

Blum, RW and PM Rinehart (1997) *Reducing the Risk: Connections That Make a Difference in the Lives of Youth*. Minneapolis, MN: Division of General Pediatrics and Adolescent Health, University of Minnesota.

Blum, RW, T Beuring, and PM Rinehart (2000) *Protecting Teens: Beyond Race, Income, and Family Structure*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Adolescent Health, University of Minnesota.

Campbell, JR, CM Hombo, and J Mazzeo (2000) *NAEP Trends in Academic Progress: Three Decades of Student Performance*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2002) *Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS)*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available online at www.cdc.gov/ncipc/wisqars.

Christchurch Social Policy Interagency Network (2003) *A Collaborative Plan for Christchurch Youth: 2003-2006*. Christchurch: Christchurch Social Policy Interagency Network. Available online at www.msd.govt.nz/work-areas/cross-sectoral-work/collaborative-plan-for-christchurch-youth.html.

Department of Internal Affairs (2003) *Community Grants Schemes*. Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs. Available online at www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf.

Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (2003) *Sustainable Development for New Zealand: Programme of Action*. Wellington: Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. Available online at www.beehive.govt.nz.

Dovey, L (2003) *Achieving Better Social Outcomes in New Zealand Through Collaboration: Perspectives from the United States*. Working Paper 16. Wellington: State Services Commission. Available online at www.ssc.govt.nz/display/document.asp?docid=3468.

Eccles, JS, C Midgeley, CM Buchanan, A Wigfield, D Reuman, and D Maclver (1993) Development During Adolescence: The Impact of Stage/Environment Fit. *American Psychologist*. 48:90-101.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (2003) *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well Being*. Washington, DC: Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, US Government Printing Office. Available online at www.childstats.gov/americaschildren.

Ferber, T and K Pittman with T Marshall (2002) *State Youth Policy: Helping All Youth to Grow Up Fully Prepared and Fully Engaged*. Takoma Park, MD: The Forum for Youth Investment. Available online at www.forumforyouthinvestment.org/issues/policyresources.htm

Govt.nz (2003) *About New Zealand*. Available at www.govt.nz/en/aboutnz.

Hanna, D and R Whitfield (in press) *Public Policies and Holistic Youth Development – The New Zealand Experience*. New Visions for Education, Chapter 2.

Hill, Martha (2002) *Assessing the Merits of a New Zealand Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Hong, B (2003) *The Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa Baseline Information Research: Knowledge and Application by Government Agencies*. Prepared for the Ministry of Youth Affairs. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited (2001) *Sexually Transmitted Infections in New Zealand: Surveillance Report 2000*. Wellington: Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited.

Jencks C and M Phillips, eds (1998) *The Black-White Test Score Gap*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Joshi, Health (2002) *Benefits and Costs of Longitudinal Data: British Lessons for New Zealand*. London: University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies.

Keelan, J (2002) *E Tipu Rea*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.youthaffairs.govt.nz/pag.cfm?i=330.

Kirby, D (1998) *HIV Prevention Among Adolescents*. San Francisco, CA: University of California, San Francisco, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, AIDS Resource Institute.

Krishnan, V, J Jenson, and S Ballantyne (2002) *New Zealand Living Standards 2000*. Wellington: Centre for Social Research and Evaluation, Ministry of Social Development.

Local Government New Zealand (2003) *The Local Government Act 2002: An Overview*. Wellington: Local Government New Zealand.

Lopez, Hugo (2002) *Youth Demographics*. College Park, MD: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. Available online at www.civicyouth.org.

Martin, Lloyd (2002) *The Invisible Table: Perspectives on Youth and Youthwork in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press Ltd.

McGachie, C and K Smith (2003) *Youth Participation Case Studies*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.youthaffairs.govt.nz/media/pdf/yp_casestudies.pdf.

McLaren, K (2000) *Tough is Not Enough – Getting Smart About Youth Crime: A Review of Research on What Works to Reduce Offending by Young People*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.youthaffairs.govt.nz/pag.cfm?i=89.

McLaughlin, M (2000) *Community Counts: How Youth Organizations Matter for Youth Development*. Washington, DC: Public Education Network.

Ministry of Economic Development (2003) *New Zealand's Strengths and Weaknesses*. Wellington: Ministry of Economic Development. Available online at www.med.govt.nz/irdev/elcom/strategy/strategy-04.html.

Ministry of Education (2001) *School Leavers (2001)* Wellington: Ministry of Education. Available online at www.minedu.govt.nz.

Ministry of Health (2002a) *Tobacco Facts 2002*. Wellington: Ministry of Health. Available online at www.moh.govt.nz.

Ministry of Health (2002b) *Youth Health: A Guide to Action*. Wellington: Ministry of Health. Available online at www.moh.govt.nz.

Ministry of Health (2002c) *Youth Health Status Report 2002*. Wellington: Ministry of Health. Available online at www.moh.govt.nz.

Ministry of Health (2002d) *Youth Suicide Facts Provisional 2000 Statistics (15-24 year olds)*. Wellington: Ministry of Health. Available online at www.moh.govt.nz.

Ministry of Social Development (2002a) *New Zealand's Agenda for Children*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development. Available online at www.msd.govt.nz.

Ministry of Social Development (2002b) *The Social Report 2003: Paid Work*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development. Available online at <http://socialreport.msd.govt.nz/2003/paid-work/paid-work.shtml>.

Ministry of Social Development (2002c) *Towards a Longitudinal Study of New Zealand Children and Young People: A Discussion Paper*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Ministry of Social Development (2003a) *Care and Protection Blueprint 2003: Families, Communities, and Government Working Together for the Safety and Wellbeing of Children, Young People and Their Families*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development. Available online at www.msd.govt.nz/publications/care-protection-blueprint-2003.

Ministry of Social Development (2003b) *Mosaics: Whakaahua Papariki*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.msd.govt.nz/work-areas/cross-sectoral-work/mosaics.html.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (1994) *15 to 24 – A Youth Statistical Profile*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (1996) *A Guide to Realising the Potential for Government Departments and Agencies: Development and Analysing Government Policies in New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2001a) *Summary Analysis of Responses from Agencies and Adults*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2001b) *Summary Analysis of Responses from Secondary School-Aged Young People*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2001c) *Supporting the Positive Development of Young People in New Zealand – A Discussion Document on a Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2002a) *Building Resilience: Briefing to the Incoming Minister*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2002b) *Building Strength: Youth Development Literature Review*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.youthaffairs.govt.nz/pag.cfm?i=296.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2002c) *Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa: Action for Child and Youth Development*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.youthaffairs.govt.nz/pag.cfm?i=234.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2003a) *12 to 24: Young People in New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2003b) *Keepin' It Real*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs. Available online at www.youthaffairs.govt.nz.

Ministry of Youth Affairs (2003c) *Statement of Intent of the Ministry of Youth Affairs for the Year Ending 30 June 2003*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

National Adolescent Health Information Center (2000) *Fact Sheet on Demographics: Children and Adolescents*. San Francisco, CA: University of California, San Francisco.

National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy (2003). *General Facts and Stats*. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. Available online at www.teenpregnancy.org/resources/data/genlfact.asp.

National Center for Education Statistics (2002) *Digest of Education Statistics, 2002*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Available online at http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/digest02/list_tables2.asp#c2_5.

National Center for Education Statistics (2003) *Student Effort and Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Available online at <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2003/section3/indicator17.asp>.

National Center for Health Statistics (2000) *2000 With Adolescent Health Chartbook*. Hyattsville, MD: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Available online at www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus00cht.pdf.

National Center for Health Statistics (2003a) *Health, United States, 2003*. Hyattsville, MD: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Available online at www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus.htm.

National Center for Health Statistics (2003b) *US Pregnancy Rate Down from Peak; Births and Abortions on the Decline*. Hyattsville, MD: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.

National Institute on Drug Abuse (2003) *NIDA Info Facts: High School and Youth Trends*. Bethesda, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Health, National Institute on Drug Abuse. Available online at www.nida.nih.gov/Infobox/HSYouthtrends.html.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2002) *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth. J Eccles and JA Gootman, eds. Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Behavioural and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy of Press. Available online at <http://books.nap.edu/catalog/10022.html>.

NZHIS (New Zealand Health Information Service) (2001) *New Zealand Drug Statistics*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Philanthropy New Zealand (2003) *Objectives of Philanthropy New Zealand*. Wellington: Philanthropy New Zealand. Available online at www.philanthropy.org.nz

Pittman, K, T Ferber, and M Irby (2000) *Unfinished Business: Further Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development*. Takoma Park, MD: International Youth Foundation. Available online at www.forumforyouthinvestment.org/respapers.htm.

Quinn, J (1999) Where Need Meets Opportunity: Youth Development Programs for Early Teens in *The Future of Children: When School is Out*, R Behrman, ed. Palo Alto, CA: The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Rennie, R and J Fletcher (2003) *The Collaborative Plan for Christchurch Youth 2003-2006: What We Learned in the Process*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Singh, D and C White (2000) *Rapua Te Huarahi Tika – Searching for Solutions: A Review of Research About Effective Interventions for Reducing Offending by Indigenous and Ethnic Minority Youth*. Wellington: Ministry of Youth Affairs.

State Services Commission (2003a) *Doing the Right Things and Doing Them Right: Improving Evaluative Activity in the New Zealand State Sector*. Wellington: State Services Commission. Available online at www.ssc.govt.nz/display/document.asp?docid=3506.

State Services Commission (2003b) *Young People Get Better Value From New Ministry*. Media Statement from Hon Trevor Mallard, Hon Steve Maharey, Hon John Tamihere. Wellington: State Services Commission.

Statistics New Zealand (2001) *2001 Census of Population and Dwellings*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand. Available online at www.stats.govt.nz/census.htm.

Statistics New Zealand and Ministry of Women's Affairs (2001) *Around the Clock – Findings from the New Zealand Time Use Survey, 1998-99 – Reference Report*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand and Ministry of Women's Affairs.

Statistics New Zealand (2001) *School Leavers With No Qualifications*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand. Available online at www.stats.govt.nz.

UNICEF (1998) *State of Pacific Youth 1998*. UNICEF Interagency Task Force on Youth.

US Census Bureau (1999) *Current Population Reports: Series P60-206, Money and Income in the US: 1998*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau, US Government Printing Office.

US Census Bureau (2000a) *Population Projections*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau Populations Divisions Branch. Available online at www.census.gov.

US Census Bureau (2000b) *Poverty in the United States: Historical Poverty Tables, People, Table 3*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau. Available online at www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/faqs/faq6.htm.

US Department of Health and Human Services (2002) *Towards a Blueprint for Youth: Making Positive Youth Development a National Priority*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Family and Youth Services Bureau. Available online at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/youthinfo/blueprint.htm>.

US Department of Health and Human Services (1999) *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children and Youth*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services. Available online at: www.aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/99/trends/index.htm.

Wilkins, C, S Casswell, K Bhatta, and M Pledger (2002) *Drug Use in New Zealand: National Surveys Comparison 1998 & 2001*. Auckland: University of Auckland, Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit.