Combating youth homelessness
CSEYHP

A comparative Report on Youth Homelessness and Social Exclusion in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Portugal and the UK

A preliminary study for the European research project '*Combating Social Exclusion among Young Homeless People (CSEYHP)*'

Date   27th July 2009

Table of Contents

Section 1: The national context of our study

Section 2: Youth at risk of social exclusion and homelessness

Section 3: Youth Homelessness

Section 4: Provision of services for the young homeless and methodologies of work

Objective 3

- *To identify issues for the European social model and values;*

Section 5: Issues for the European social model and values

Selected Bibliography

Introduction

This report is on the welfare and social situation for young people at risk of homelessness and social exclusion in four European countries including young people born outside the country and/or unaccompanied minors. This paper reports the conclusions reached at the end of the first stage of the European Commission Framework 7 funded project, 'Combating Social Exclusion among Young Homeless Populations', (CSEYHP). MOVISIE (Netherlands) is the lead partner for this study, working with London Metropolitan University (UK), Charles University (Czech Republic) and CIES (Portugal). This paper is based on four national reports submitted by each national team, using an agreed format to collect relevant data at the national level, but designed to highlight the issues experienced in each country.

The objectives of CSEYHP are as follows:
1. *to understand the life trajectories of different homeless youth populations in different national contexts;*
2. *to develop the concepts of risk and social exclusion in relation to the experience of young homeless people and to the reinsertion process;*
3. *to test how different methods of working contribute to the reinsertion process for young people; how do care providers (both in the voluntary and the statutory sectors) work with young homeless people and with unaccompanied minors and young refugees?*
4. *to investigate the roles of and relationships between the young people, trusted adults, lead professionals, peer mentors and family members in the delivery of these programmes across all four countries.*

CSEYHP focuses on three groups of homeless youth populations: young people native born of white ethnic groups; young people native born of black, Asian and national minorities and young migrants. Consequently, this report reviews the ethnic background of young people in all four countries as well as focussing on issues of welfare, social exclusion and homelessness. It reviews the general policy framework for young people in each country and considers specific measures with regard to young people in state care and unaccompanied minors. It considers the policy area for young homeless people as articulated on the general youth policy area.

The objective of this report is to provide information and an insight into high-risk situations for young (homeless) people and unaccompanied minors/ refugees in four European countries. Each partner has carried out their own national literature study on social exclusion, homelessness and youth and this is placed in context by means of statistical comparison derived from OECD, Eurostat and other pan European data sets. Although OECD and Eurostat report at one decimal place, their figures have been rounded up to full percentages (.5 and above up, .4 and below down) because this report is concerned with very broad trends across the four countries.

As part of the work for this review of the situation in each of the four countries each team has also carried out interviews with professionals, managers and key workers who work with young homeless people. Using a common list of topics all

interviewees were asked to express their opinions on high-risk situations for young people, issues of social exclusion, any changes in the profile of young homeless people, the transition from under to over 18, the value of social support, early intervention and prevention strategies and their method of working with young people. In addition, selected interviewees discussed specific case studies and their responses show the options available to professionals to tackle specific problems. These are discussed where appropriate.

The report is also concerned with the issues that are raised by the four preliminary studies for the development of the European social model among different youth populations in the EU-27 countries.

Reader's guide
Section 1 compares the composition of the four populations of the Netherlands, the UK, the Czech Republic, and Portugal, the main routes into adulthood and national policies in the field of youth. Section 2 explains the various concepts of importance in the national context including that of transitions, risk, vulnerability and social exclusion and contains a description of high-risk situations for children and young people in relation to social exclusion and the role of youth and young homeless people in public opinion. Section 3 details the definition of young homeless people, their profile and subgroups among them. Section 4 compares the range of assistance options to young homeless people, and types of applied methods and interventions. Finally, section 5 discusses the issues raised by this interim report for European social policy in relation to youth and considers the next stage in our work.

Following convention in relation to reported statistics, the Czech Republic will be referred to as CZ, the Netherlands as NL, Portugal as PT and the United Kingdom as UK except where the statistics refer to only three of the countries of the UK; England, Scotland, Wales are together known as GB. It is important to note that the term UK refers to four countries with distinct legal and administrative frameworks. Scotland has always had a different legal system to England and Wales but following devolution in 1997 there has been considerable transfers for domestic powers to the Scottish Parliament leading to different policies in relation to housing, homelessness, education, social care and youth. Increasingly Wales is also diverging as its National Assembly creates new legislation. Much of the future work for this project will be based in London as nearly half (45%) of all people born outside the UK live in London and therefore the legislation referred to in this report is that of England.

The European Partners:

MOVISIE Knowledge and advice for social development, Utrecht, Netherlands

MOVISIE is the Netherlands centre for social development. It's mission is to promote the participation and independence of citizens. MOVISIE does this by supporting and advising professional organisations, volunteer organisations and government institutions in the field of welfare, care and social development. Five themes are central to its work: Informal Care, Vulnerable Groups, Volunteer Effort, Domestic and Sexual Violence, Social Cohesion.

For further information www.movisie.nl or go to
http://www.movisie.nl/homelessyouth/ for 'Combating Youth Homelessness'.

FHS-KSOS Department of Civil Society Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

The master's programme of Civil Sector Studies at the Faculty of Humanities was established in 2000. It focuses on civil society both in its theoretical and practical dimension. Students and graduates are typically NGO professionals and state administration employees. The Department is involved in a number of national and international research programmes and its professors publish in national and international publications on virtually all issues related to civil society.
For further information www.fhs.cuni/kos
Information on the project "Combating Youth Homelessness" can be found at:
http://www.fhs.cuni.cz/kos/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=41&Itemid=65

CIES-ISCTE, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Established in 1985, CIES-ISCTE is a university research centre associated to ISCTE (University Institute for Social Sciences, Business Studies and Technologies) and accredited by FCT – the Foundation for Science and Technology of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. The centre's main strategic benchmarks are scientific quality, social relevance and internationalization. Since 1986 it has published the scientific journal Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas (Sociology, Problems and Practices). The centre develops scientific research projects in sociology, political science, education studies, communication studies and urban anthropology. Researchers also carry out applied research projects many of which are public policy oriented. The centre's main lines of research are: Processes of social recomposition and cultural reconfiguration (1), Knowledge society and patterns of competences (II); Ways of life and public policies (III), Politics and citizenship, institutions, cultures and behaviour (IV), Work, occupations and organisations (V). CIES-ISCTE is involved in the Europe/Latin America Research Program (ELARP). For further information www.cies.iscte.pt

CITIES INSTITUTE, London Metropolitan University, UK

Cities Institute is a multi-disciplinary institute bringing together geographers, town planners, architects, sociologists, anthropologists and statisticians, to undertake research into urban society in its human, physical and economic dimensions. The Institute is committed to studying the culture of cities and socio-economic trends and research follows particular themes: sustainable development, quality of life, social inclusion, urban design quality, cultural diversity and cosmopolitan cities. CHCR is a research unit within the Cities Institute and has been in existence since 1989, first at Staffordshire University and now at London Metropolitan University. Research studies include homelessness, deprived local authority housing estates, youth and community services in both urban and rural areas, social care/community care, probation services, and drug/alcohol misuse. For further information www.citiesinstitute.org

Section 1. The national context of our study

1.1   Country profiles for the Czech Republic, Netherlands, Portugal and the UK.

Country profile and proportions of young people

In 2007 the total population of EU-27 countries was 495 million including the UK 61m, the Netherlands (NL) 16.4m, Portugal (PT) 10.6m, and the Czech Republic (CZ) 10.3m. The UK has the highest average annual growth rate of population and a higher than average fertility rate. NL has the most urban population, followed by the UK and then PT; only the CZ has a higher proportion of its population living in 'intermediate' areas rather than urban. PT and the CZ have higher ratios of inactive elderly populations (aged over 65 years) to the labour force than the OECD average whilst the UK and NL have lower ratios than the OECD average (OECD Fact book, 2009: 14-25). In 2006 the proportion of youth aged 15-24 years in each population was 13% for CZ and the UK, 12% for PT and NL (Eurostat, 2008).

The number of children born to women aged 15-49 in 2006 was higher in the UK and NL (1.84; 1.72) compared to CZ and PT (1.33; 1.36) (OECD, 2009:15). In the UK the rate is raised by foreign-born residents; between 1996 and 2006 the proportion of children born to foreign-born residents in the UK rose from 13% to 23%. Although the age of childbearing is rising in the UK there is still concern about the high rate of pregnancy among young women in the UK.

The legal definition of youth in each country is 18 years but other ages e.g. age of criminal responsibility, school leaving age, entitlement to benefits and entitlement to adult minimum wage varies (see below page 18).

1.2   Ethnic minorities, foreign-born residents, asylum seekers and unaccompanied minors

This study compares the situation of homeless young people in each of the four countries according to their origins: white native born, ethnic minority native born and born outside the country. Therefore it is important to quantify as far as possible the separate proportions within each population of a) ethnic minorities, b) foreign born residents, c) asylum seekers and d) unaccompanied minors.

In NL, PT and the UK the prevalence of different ethnic minorities in their countries reflects both their different colonial pasts as well as labour migration patterns across Europe during decades of economic expansion post Second World War. National minorities in CZ reflect both its place in the centre of Europe and its history as one of the CEE countries. Discrimination against Roma, although widespread across Europe, is an issue of particular importance in CZ as in other CEE countries.

Within the EU-27 there are different definitions of 'foreign born'. NL (like some other European countries) have an expanded definition of foreign born which includes people who have one parent born outside the country. Therefore the proportion of foreign born in NL according to their official statistics is different from that reported by the OECD which uses the definition of the person themselves being born outside the country. The OECD provides two estimates:

that of foreign-born populations (born outside the country) and that of foreign populations (i.e. those that have not been naturalised).

The OECD estimate for 2007 of the proportion of foreign-born population within each country in our study was: 10.6% NL (the Netherlands national estimate was 19%); 10.1% UK; 6.1% PT; and 5.5% CZ. Apart from NL national estimates vary to a greater or lesser extent: the UK national estimate is higher at 10.6%. The national estimate for PT is lower at 3.8% and for CZ it is 4.2% for those with a regular residency permit. Again there may be some variation over who is counted because naturalisation of those born outside a country reduces the proportion of foreign persons in OECD estimates to: 4.2% NL; 5.8% UK; 4.1% PT; 3.1% CZ (OECD, 2009:27).[1]

The country of origin of asylum seekers in each of the four countries can be very different from that of established ethnic minorities. The current world situation has led to asylum applications from parts of the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa (particularly Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea). Both the UK and NL receive asylum applications and unaccompanied minors applications from young people who have travelled from these countries. For CZ, asylum and unaccompanied minor applications in CZ are from China and Vietnam. There are only approximately two hundred asylum applications in Portugal and only a few are successful.

Below we describe the situation in each of the four countries in relation to: a) ethnic minorities, b) foreign born residents, c) asylum seekers and d) unaccompanied minors.

Czech Republic: In the 2001 census the CZ population was 94% Czech, Moravian or Silesian. The most numerous national minorities living in CZ were Slovaks (3%) followed by Poles, Germans and Hungarians. The most discriminated against minority are Roma: in the 2001 Census only 12000 persons declared themselves Roma (0.1% of the population) but it is believed that a more accurate figure would be between 150-300,000 people (1.5-3%). The EU-Midis survey conducted by FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights: (http://fra.europa.eu) found that 83% of CZ Roma thought discrimination was widespread in CZ; similar proportions were found in six CEE countries and Greece, the seven countries investigated for discrimination against Roma.[2]

---

1 The meaning of second generation migrants differs from country to country; in NL it is important because of their definition of foreign born, in PT 2nd generation are often referred to as migrants. In the UK it was a term that had historical importance in the 1960s and 70s but is used less now that ethnic minorities are established as British Asians, Black British etc. Some countries use the term second generation in order to discuss ethnic minorities in their country as their legislation does not allow them to collect information on ethnic minorities. In general we are avoiding the use of this term as far as possible.

2 The EU-Midis survey was based on asking key respondents to nominate the most discriminated groups in each country and over 25,000 people from the most discriminated groups were interviewed. Therefore Roma were interviewed in CZ but not in NL, PT or UK. Similarly Somalis were interviewed in NL but not in the UK.

The foreign born population of CZ with regular residence permits was 4.2% (420,000 people) in December 2008 (vs. OECD estimate of 5.5% for 2007). Of these 30% were from Ukraine, 17% Slovakia, 14% Vietnam and 5% Poland. Of the foreign born population 16% were aged 15-24 years: Ukraine 33%, Slovakia 16%, Vietnam 20%, Russia 7%, Poland 2%, Germany 2%, Moldavia 3%, Mongolia 2%, Bulgaria 1%, China 1%. The foreign born population has largely settled in Prague and Central Bohemia.

There were 1585 asylum seekers in CZ in 2007; 2,280 applications of previous and current applicants were processed and 69% were rejected (Eurostat, 2009).

The number of unaccompanied minors is decreasing in the Czech Republic; in 2004 there were 95, half the number of 2003. Of all unaccompanied minors 37% were from China and 16% from Vietnam, 47% were 17 years old, and 32% 16 years old. They are placed in to specialised facilities in Prague and Pribram.

The Netherlands: The main colonial dependencies of the Netherlands were Indonesia, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles (still an independent part of the Netherlands). In the 1960s workers were recruited from Turkey, Morocco, Spain and Italy; workers from the first two countries settled and brought their families under the 1974 Family Reunification Act whilst people from the latter two countries largely returned. The ethnic composition of the Netherlands reflects this history.

As reported the definition of foreign born in the Netherlands is one parent of foreign birth; this equates to 19% of the population of NL rather than 10.6% under the definition of the OECD. Therefore a large proportion of the Netherlands population is considered foreign born that would be considered nationally born ethnic minority members in some other European countries including the UK. However, in the Netherlands information is available on second-generation immigrants i.e. those who are born in the Netherlands of non-Dutch parents. Although these figures do not give us information on 3rd and 4th generation people of different ethnic groups they do give a strong indication of the comparative proportions of different ethnic groups within the Netherlands.

In 2007 there were 1,566,292 second generation immigrants born to non-Dutch parents, 9.55% of the population. Of these over half (5.15% of all second generation immigrants) were born to parents who had moved to the Netherlands from other European countries and less than half, 4.4% born to non-European immigrants. (This is quite different from the situation in the UK.) Of the total number of just over one and a half million second-generation immigrants one third are from unspecified countries in the European Union (504,459) and another 340,777 are from other European countries.

Second generation immigrants whose parents were born in countries outside of Europe are as follows: Indonesia (263,892); Turkey (173,487); Morocco (161,600); Surinam (147,479); Netherlands Antilles (51,058); followed by other Middle East and North African countries.

The Dutch authorities also provide information on a further 116,816 foreign born living in the Netherlands in 2007 and the pattern of country of origin among this

group is different: China, then Netherlands Antilles, Turkey, Iraq, Surinam, Morocco, Somalia, Indonesia and others.

The EU-Midis survey conducted by FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) surveyed North Africans, Turks and Surinamese living in NL. In the NL sample 67% Surinamese, 66% North African and 61% Turkish reported discrimination in at least one of nine areas.

Amongst those who are foreign born are those who arrived as refugees and asylum seekers. In 2007 there were 7,100 asylum seekers and 14,180 applications were processed of previous and current applications; 53% were rejected (Eurostat, 2009).

The number of unaccompanied minors aged under 18 years were 12,000 in 2008; there are a further 16,000 aged 18-21 years seeking asylum. Unaccompanied minors declined in numbers from 3,654 in 2001 to 739 in 2008. 2008: 25% Somalia, 18% Iraq, 13% Afghan, 7% Guinea and 6% Angola.

Portugal: Official Portuguese figures place the foreign born population as 3.8% of the resident population (vs. OECD estimate 6.1%).

The main colonial dependencies for Portugal were Cape Verde, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau. Brazil is also a Portuguese speaking country. In 2007 of the 401,600 foreign born 15% were from Cape Verde, 14% Brazil, 9% Ukraine, 8% Angola, 6% UK, 6% Guinea-Bissau, 5% Spain, 4% Romania, 4% Germany and 3% Moldavia. The EU-Midis survey found that 74% of Brazilians and 60% of Sub-Saharans Africans thought that discrimination was widespread in Portugal.

Portugal had been a country of emigration up until 2000. After 2001 people from African countries whose official language was Portuguese (PALOP countries) were more likely to immigrate to Portugal as were people from CEE countries (including from Ukraine, Romania, Moldavia and Russia) following changes to the legal code. However people from the latter countries have not settled. From 2006 there was increasing immigration into Portugal following liberalisation of immigration laws that reduced visas to two types, temporary and residence. People of foreign birth are concentrated in the Centre and South of the country particularly Lisbon.

Portugal also has a large Roma population, which is highly segregated and impoverished: 3.8% of families claiming Social Reinsertion Income (135,428) are Roma. Moreover Roma children leave school earlier than the general population, around 10 years of age; this removal from school particularly applies to young girls for cultural reasons at the onset of puberty.

There were 225 asylum requests in 2007 and 110 were processed; 77% were rejected (Eurostat, 2009). The number of unaccompanied minors is unknown although key workers report that they see only 1 or 2 occasionally.

UK: 12% of the UK population comprises ethnic groups other than white British. The percentage of foreign born is 10.6% (UK estimate vs. 10.1% OECD).

The main colonial dependencies for the UK were on the Indian Sub-Continent (now India, Pakistan, Bangladesh), in the Caribbean, in Africa (Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya and others) and Ireland. Post Second World War it was possible for people from the British Commonwealth to migrate to the UK as workers and British nationals. Therefore the major ethnic groups within the UK at the 2001 census (including those born UK and not born UK) were: white British, 88%, white Irish, 1%; Indian, 2%; Pakistani, 1%; Bangladeshi, 0.5%; Black Caribbean, 1%; Black African, 1%; Chinese, 0.4%; mixed heritage, 1.2%. The majority members of ethnic minorities in the UK view themselves as British: 75-88% of all ethnic minority groups except for Black Africans (52%) and Chinese (53%).

The majority of ethnic minority young people under 16 years of age are born in the UK; 85-98% of all ethnic groups other than Black Africans (66%) and White Irish (79%). But among ethnic minority young people aged 16-24 years the proportion born in the UK drops to 47% for those from Bangladesh, 33% from Ireland and China, and 29% Black African. The 2007 Annual Population Survey reported 6.3 million not born in the UK (10.6%) and from 2004-7 there was an increase of 1.1 million not born in the UK. In 2007 nearly 2 million people from other European countries were in the UK: Eire 420,000, EU13 832,000 (including 233,000 from Germany) and A83, 538,000.

The main means of entry for those not born in the UK who are not EU citizens are family reunification, student visas and work permits. The country origins of foreign born residents in 2007 were: India 10%, Republic of Ireland 7%, Poland 6%, Pakistan 6%, Germany 4% (70% of whom were British nationals).4 Within the EU 13 nationals there also appears to be onward migration e.g. Dutch Somalis settling in Leicester. The EU-Midis survey only surveyed CEE migrants living in the UK in 2008, as this group was believed to be most discriminated against; 35% reported discrimination in one of nine areas.

In 2007 the UK Borders and Immigration Agency reported 23,430 applications for asylum of which 14,375 were granted settlement. This represents a major fall from the peak of around 83,000 a year just prior to the 2002 Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act which reinforced the procedure that applications should be made within the country of origin rather than at a UK port. In 2007 there were 27,905 applications for asylum and 27,630 were processed; 70% were rejected (Eurostat, 2009). There were 3,500 unaccompanied asylum seeking children in March 2008 being looked after by local authority social services departments: 31% were of Asian backgrounds, 24% Black African.

There is a backlog of 250,000 'legacy cases' of people who applied for asylum before April 2006 which will be settled by 2011-2012. Amongst these applicants those with children in school are largely being allowed to settle under article 12 of the European Declaration of Human Rights which gives the right to family life whilst other applicants are more likely to be rejected.

3 the Central and Eastern European countries that joined the EU in May 2004
4 In Appendix 3 there is a table on ethnic minorities in the UK, the proportion born within the UK, religious affiliation, the proportion that are lone parents and the proportion of women who work.

Accommodation and support from homeless agencies can only be offered to people 'with recourse to public funds'. This includes unaccompanied minors, refugees with right to remain and all British nationals. It excludes A8 nationals, and those without leave to remain and 'illegals'. There is believed to be around half a million 'irregular' migrants in UK; failed asylum seekers without leave to remain, smuggled and trafficked people.

1.3   Government policies towards youth

All four countries have core legislation that protects children and young people up to the age of adulthood at 18 years of age. The purposes of legislation are generally the same: protection of the child/young person from abuse or neglect or exploitation as child labour, protection for those at risk from family poverty and support for raising the child, promotion of health, promotion of educational attainment and regulation of schools and school attendance, and regulations about the behaviour of the child and criminal proceedings. All countries have core legislation codifying duties on the welfare of the child up to the age of 18 and the establishment of protective institutions.

Each country has **protective legislation** for children and young people. In CZ new laws were passed following the transformation of that society in 1989. In 1991 CZ ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child which defined children as human beings under 18 years of age, and passed the Act on Social and Legal Protection of Children in which parents had both the right but also the responsibility for raising their children. Minors up to 18 years have the right to live with parents or close persons unless a separation is ordered by the court in the interests of the child. The Act defines the circumstances of a young person being in danger if a child's parents are dead, or they do not fulfil parental duties (neglect) or abuse the child, or the child is endangered by not attending school, or the child is committing crimes that would be classed as criminal acts if they were over 15 years of age, or if the child is in danger of becoming a victim of a criminal acts. The scope of the act has led to an extensive use of state care and foster care (see Section 2 below).

In NL the core protective legislation for children and young persons is the Youth Care Act (2005). In relation to young people at risk within families a Ministry for Youth and Families has recently been established to support families, prevent problems, and enforce the responsibilities of the youth and family. Family and Youth Centres (CJG) are being established in urban and local areas by 2011 under the control of municipalities within which local care and advice teams from all statutory agencies (police, education, youth care and social work) make needs assessments and guide 'youth at risk' into different paths and also refer to the Youth Care Agency. It is intended that all agencies will share a common risk assessment and a common electronic children's dossier.

In PT the 1911 Law for Child Protection is still the cornerstone of the protection of minors and the establishment of courts for young delinquents. In 1991 the first Commissions for the protection of minors were established, later in 1999 renamed Commissions for the Protection of Children and Young People. These municipal council Commissions bring together all agencies connected with children and young people (health, education, police, neighbourhoods and local

citizens). The Commission can only intervene with the consent of the parents or other guardian of the child/young person unless they go through a court proceeding; this differs from the situation in the UK. The circumstances under which intervention is possible are: abandonment/neglect; physical, emotional or sexual abuse; lack or care and affection; forced into work or other inappropriate activities to own development; exposed to at risk behaviours; themselves developing at risk behaviour or at risk consumptions without parental/guardian intervention. The Commissions can, with parent consent or court order, offer several types of intervention. The most common cause of intervention is neglect (36%) followed by physical and emotional abuse (21%), school leaving (14%), exposure to deviant models of behaviour (14%), abandonment (3%), sexual abuse (3%), criminal activity (2%) and other causes; 90% of 54,101 cases in 2006 were resolved with the child/young person staying in the family home or with near family. Of the one tenth placed in institutions 57% have experienced hunger, 19% lived as homeless, and 15% street begging.

In the UK the Children Acts of 1989, 2000 and 2004 establish the framework for child and youth protection. This framework places a duty on local authorities to intervene over the same issues as are reported for PT above. However the UK government has not operated a rights agenda as the CZ government has (based on UNCR, 1989, Article 19) but placed a duty on local authorities to assess need and provide intervention; children and young people do not have legal rights to protection similar to those in CZ.

During 2003-5, following an Inquiry into a death of a child not placed in care, the UK government developed the *'Every Child Matters'* (ECM) strategy followed by the 'Youth Matters' strategy. These strategies set out five key targets for all children and young people: being healthy, making a positive contribution, staying safe, enjoying and achieving and achieving economic well being. All outcomes for children and young people interventions, including those living in supported accommodation for homeless young people, are being recorded and assessed on these five criteria. Moreover, as in NL, there is now a Common Assessment Form (CAF) which assesses the needs of each child/young person for each case and these are shared between statutory and some voluntary agencies brought together at the local authority level. ECM includes a database for every child in England named ContactPoint. There are now Integrated Children's Systems (ICS) for working with children in need and their families. The whole system is now called the Change for Children Programme and the basis was laid down in the 2004 legislation. Children can be under a statutory Children and Young Person's Plan (CYPPs) and Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCBs) have replaced the previous boards. In 2007 a further government initiative, Every Parent Matters, developed a programme for parents including general advice, targeted support on families in difficulties, active school intervention, and children's centres and extended schools.

A huge area of risk for young people is to fall out of education. **In NL** there was an inter-government department initiative *'Operation Young'*, between all ministries to improve the integration of youth policies, to reduce youth unemployment to below twice the average level, to reduce the number of early school leavers by half by 2010, and to reduce educational disadvantage among 2-6 year olds by provide early childhood programmes.

In the UK there were parallel, albeit less joined up, initiatives as in NL, aimed at reducing educational disadvantage. The '*Sure Start'* programme for children in deprived areas provided pre-school playgroups and education for parents. For young people aged 13-19 years a *Connexions* service was established in schools to provide personal support for young people at risk of educational failure through a system of Personal Advisors; the funding for this was transferred to local authorities in 2008. *New Deal for Youth* worked with young people claiming unemployment benefit and offer them additional support for training and job seeking. One difference is that in NL there are Regional Training Centres which offer central access to secondary vocational education programmes, whilst in UK there are a multitude of training providers. The UK introduced Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMAs) for young people of low-income families.

In PT the key objective of all youth policies is to promote education and training and enhanced qualifications among youth. The '*Escolhas Programme'* is focussed on those aged 6-18 years from vulnerable socio-economic backgrounds, particularly the descendents of immigrants and ethnic minorities. The 'New Opportunities Initiative' (*Novas Oportunidades*) targets youths aged 15 years or older, or adults aged 18 years or older who do not have 4th, 6th, or 9th year of school. This programme allows young people to certificate the competencies they have acquired through work and thus open opportunities to enter more vocational training alternatives. However, these training alternatives may not lead to greater inclusion into the labour market, as they are not directly linked. The Institute for Employment and Vocational Training offers three kinds of measures: employment, vocational training and professional rehabilitation. Nearly 190,000 persons followed the employment programme at the end of 2008, and nearly 80,000 were involved in vocational training.

In CZ a high proportion of young people participate in secondary and tertiary education. Policies to prevent educational failure include programmes of the Ministry of Education for allocation of financial means for the support for education of the socially disadvantaged children. Although the title of the grant programme is general, the propositions clearly state that it predominantly focuses on Roma children as members of socio-culturally disadvantaged communities.

In relation to the criminal activity of young people countries are more or less punitive towards young people with higher or lower ages of criminal responsibility. The UK has the lowest age of criminal responsibility (England and Wales, 10 years of age) and imprisons more young people and CZ also appears punitive. However both NL and PT have less punitive approaches. NL has sought to develop early intervention strategies, personalised action plans, and effective sentences. Each local area has established its own version of 'Safety Houses' which work with perpetrators and victims. One problem however is that young people with a criminal past may not be offered the same training opportunities as other young people. In NL juvenile criminal law applies to young people aged 12-17. However, 16-to17 year olds may be subject to adult law if the Court decides this is appropriate.

In PT the prison population aged 16 years and up is small, at 12,636 and it includes 1% aged 16-18 and a further 14% aged 19-24; in all 1905 of the prison

population are aged 16-24. Those aged 16-18 are all Portuguese but amongst the 19-24 prison population, 254 are from African countries, 93 from Latin American countries and 90 from Europe. For young people aged 16 up to 21 there are particular procedures through the Social Reinsertion Institute which manages 21,924 cases a year of which the majority had civil (community) sentences (16,525), or educative placements (5,132) and only a small minority were institutionalisation at educative centres (267).

In CZ the proportion of children aged under 15yrs committing crimes was 2% in 2007 and 5% for those aged 15-18 years. There was an increase in violent crimes amongst youths. Overall 2,949 youths were convicted and were mostly paroled or given alternative sentences but 247 went to prison. It is believed that a higher than expected proportion were youths from institutional care. One problem is that young people who runaway from institutional care and offend whilst running then find themselves imprisoned at 18 years as an adult. Offending behaviour and a criminal record presents a problem for young people because they cannot get employment without a clean criminal record.

The UK imprisons more children than other countries in the EU-27 and the age of criminal responsibility in England is the lowest, 10 years of age. The cornerstone legislation is the Crime and Disorder Act, 1988. Youth Offending Teams work with children/ young people from 10 to 17, and young people aged 15-20 are in custody in Young Offender Institutions, or secure training centres or secure children's homes. In 2006 3,030 young people aged up to 19 years were in custody in England and Wales, 84% were in Young Offender Institutions although in separated wings. Over half of these young people have been in care and 41% have been excluded from school, a quarter have the educational level of a 7 year old and 10% show signs of serious mental illness (psychotic). It is reported that 3,337 children assessed as vulnerable were sent to young offender institutions.

In the UK the highest rate of offending by age group amongst males was 17 years of age, 6,116 offenders per 10,000 population of that age; amongst females it was 15 years of age, 2,168 per 10,000 population of that age. There has been a significant increase in crimes by young women, a quarter more offences were reported to Youth Offending Teams between 2003-4 to 2007; including a 50% increase in violent attacks, increased thefts, public order offences and criminal damage. A major issue that has developed in the UK has been that of territorial gangs in particular city areas. As in CZ a criminal conviction in the UK means that young people find it difficult to get any employment until that sentence is removed from public record after 5 years; *'that's five years of your life gone'* as one young man put it.

Parenting orders have been introduced for parents of young people, who truant, offender, are the subject of an ASBO (anti-social behaviour order) or a child safety order. Parents may have to attend counselling for 3 months, or be subject to an order for 12 months and non-compliance can result in prosecution.

There are therefore both supportive and punitive approaches towards young people and parents adopted across the four countries in our study. However, what is apparent is that the level of intervention in family life and in the trajectories of youth, particularly 'troubled' youth, has risen greatly. Some of

these policies reflect the difficulties that have arisen in the late 20th and 21st centuries for young people inserting themselves into adult life. The next section reviews the major difficulties reported for the four countries in our study.

1.4   Youth insertion into adult life

Some young people will have more difficulties moving into adult life than others. It is important to put these difficulties into context. What are the particular difficulties facing some young people in the separate countries?

One way to conceptualise the period of youth between childhood and adulthood has been to consider youth as a transition state rather than a life stage in itself. It has been common to consider the different 'tasks' of youth: the successful attainment of education and vocational training, entry into employment, the transition from the parental home or other childhood home to independent accommodation, and the establishment of their own family, which may include children. However this transition to independence was always subject to the conditions of each country: it was more common for young people in Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon countries to move out of home before they married compared with those from Southern Europe. Even in these societies it could be a model applied for only a specific time. In the UK in the 1960s/70s it was possible for young people from all social classes to achieve successful independence in parallel ways; whilst a small minority moved away from home by going to university, young people from working class families could find employment and social housing and establish young families. This period ended quite brutally in the crisis of the early 1980s. At the end of the 1980s a similar brutal shake-up affected young people's prospects for housing and employment in CZ. NL still has a larger social housing section and more generous welfare support and there the transformation has been more gradual. In Portugal it has always been difficult for young people to leave home.

The trends in the situation facing youth across the EU-27, and our four countries, are well documented:
-    Years spent in education have been extended across EU-27 except for the most discriminated against groups. Although the official school leaving age is 15 years in CZ, Education Eurostat reported that 92% complete Secondary Higher School. Similarly in the UK the official school leaving age is 16 (to be raised to 18 years by 2014) but 80% complete secondary education. However in the UK 16% of 16-19 year olds are not in education, employment or training. There is a large difference in the proportion completing secondary education in PT compared with the other three countries (59%).

-    In all four countries the rewards of completing tertiary level education compared with higher secondary school level or post-secondary non-tertiary education are high; but it was highest in PT and CZ compared with the UK and NL in 2007. In the UK and the Netherlands the rewards were higher for women than men; whist in PT and the CZ the rewards were higher for men than women (OECD, 2009: 209).

16

-    It is difficult for young people to establish permanent employment until their mid 20s. In 2007 the employment rate among youth aged 15-24 years was highest in NL at 65%, then 56% for the UK, 35% PT and 29% CZ; for the EU 27 the average was 37% (OECD 2009: 139). In all four countries rates reflect the proportion staying on to gain further educational qualifications and an extended stay in education for CZ (OECD 2009: 139). For the prime employment age of 25-54 years all four countries had employment rates of between 80-84% (OECD 2009: 140).

-    Housing options for young people have become more limited with many young people staying with their parents until an older age and delaying forming independent households. IN EU-27 only the most generous Scandinavian welfare regimes have adequate or near adequate supplies of social housing for young families or young individuals. The Netherlands can be placed in between Scandinavia and other European countries. Social housing offers opportunities for those leaving home. In the UK the predominant tenure is home ownership but the majority of poor households live in social housing and increasingly local authorities place poor and/or homeless households in private rented housing. In PT the predominant tenure is home ownership, and three quarters of poor households live in private rented market; 'owners' or 'excluded' is how the choice is described. In CZ there is an absence of social housing and municipal authorities are hostile to this provision.

-    It is therefore increasingly difficult for young people to live outside their parental home. In PT 84% of women and 89% of men aged 18-24 years were living in their parents' home; 7% were living independently.

-    Parenthood has been delayed for women until mid 30s in many countries although in the UK there are quite different patterns according to social class with some young people becoming teenage parents. Creating a family life has become a more fractured process.

-    Young people who do leave home before the age of 25 years face poverty in all countries including NL.

Table 1.1. Summarises information on these areas for our four countries.

Table 1.1 Routes into adult life in the four countries

Country	CZ	NL	PT	UK	Source
POPULATION					
Total Population	10.3m	16.4m	10.6m	61m	OECD, 2009
% Population under 15	14%	18%	16%	18%	WHO
%15-24 years	13%	12%	12%	13%	Eurostat 2008. for 2006
Age adulthood	18	18	18	18	
EDUCATION					
Minimum School leaving age in years	15	18	15	16	National Reports
*Early school leaving % male vs. female	6% m6% v f5%	13% m15% v f11%	39% m46% v f31%	13% m15% v f11%	Ed Eurostat 2008. Chpt 2 For 2006
Age adulthood	18	18	18	18	
Secondary Higher education Completed %	92%	80%	59%	80%	Ed Eurostat 2008, Chpt 2 for 2006
18 year olds in education %	88%	80%	66%	60%	Ed Eurostat 2008, Chpt 2 for 2006
Tertiary Higher education % at typical age of graduation	29% age 23-25yrs	43% age 21-23yrs	33% age 22-24 yr	39% age 20-25yrs	OECD Factbook 2009:201
EMPLOYMENT					
Employment% persons aged 15-24 yrs	28%	66%	36%	53%	Eurostat 2008: Chpt 5, 2006
Unemployment% persons under 25 years	18%	7%	16%	14%	Eurostat 2008: Chpt 5, 2006
Minimum wage (Euros)	329	1357 at age 23	497	1148	Eurostat 2006
LEAVING HOME					
% young people living independently (alone or in couples) 18-24yrs	15%	33%	7%	46%	1st European Quality of Life Survey, 2006, data 2003
PARENTHOOD (women)					
Av age mothers	28.9yr	30.6yr	29.5yr	29.2yr**	Eurostat Pop 2008
Adolescent fertility rate; live births per 1000 women aged 15-19yrs	11	5	17	26	UN Economic Commission for Europe 2009
% live births outside marriage	35%	40%	34%	45%**	Eurostat 2008

Notes: *Early school leaving defined as % 18-24 year olds with lower secondary education and not in further education (Education Eurostat 2008).
** UK figures 2006, other figures in this row are from 2007.

1.5   Issues with insertion into adult life – youth/ key worker interviews

The national reports put the above figures into context; indicating important difficulties facing young people seeking to establish an independent life in each of the four countries. The brief summaries given below are accompanied by quotations from one or two key respondents interviewed by each team.

Czech Republic: A much higher proportion of young people are staying in education than ever before and gaining secondary education and tertiary education qualifications. There is a steep fall in the proportion of young people who are unqualified. Therefore the ones at risk of not finding employment are those without educational qualifications, with incomplete elementary education and/or educated at practical schools in which young people fail to gain experience, practice and qualification. Roma are particularly at risk; 35% face recurring unemployment and 39% repeated and long term unemployment. There is also a large regional disparity in employment, the average rate is 16%, 10% in the Prague area but 33% in the worst area of CZ.

One third of young people live with their parents up to the age of 29 years and there is a lack of affordable housing which creates a crisis point for young people, particularly those leaving state care without family support, and Roma. Municipalities do not provide social services for some groups such as Roma; some prefer to encourage them to move on to areas that then become ghettoised. The 2005 Housing Act was introduced to increase the supply of housing. There has also been a major change in the age at which young women give birth; in the 1980s young women typically gave birth at 20-24 years, now it has increased to their late 20s and many families are lone parents.

Employment is generally not seen as the most problematic issue for young people, at least in Prague. The main issues facing young people are the quality of jobs, their ability to keep their job and their lack of qualifications. Housing is a major problem.

Box 1. Issues with insertion into adult life - CZ

> *"I think that issue of housing in general is highly problematic and relates to the whole society but even more for the socially vulnerable and also for the young people. One of the factors influencing ending up in the street is lack of adequate housing especially in Prague, which is very expensive. But the issue of employment in this region (Prague) is not such a big problem, maybe in some other parts of the Republic. In Prague the employment is high and I think a young person can find work if s/he wants to. But there is a problem with qualification and lower salaries therefore we return to the housing problem."*
>
> *"The problem with housing is more complicated. The worst thing is that they (the homeless) with their financial possibilities can afford only hostels. But we all know what these hostels look like, people drink there the drugs are also around…There are no continuous services such as housing training."*

Netherlands: The Dutch team also reports an increasing proportion of young people studying for longer periods of time as the labour market demanded greater levels of qualifications. Statistics Netherlands (2008) reported that 14.5%

of young people had a level of education that did not qualify them for the labour market whilst over half (54%) of 18-25yr olds were still studying and attendance in higher education has risen by 4% in six years. As with CZ, PT and UK a higher proportion of women attend higher education. Young people of foreign origin in the Netherlands were less likely to be in higher education: 15% Turks to 27% from the Antilles. Young people in school can apply for study costs allowance.

A large majority of young people aged 15-18 live with their parents, 97%; an increasing proportion of young people live with parents who are single parent families. The proportion living with parents falls to 57% for those aged 18-25; at 18-25, 21% live alone and 16% cohabit. Many young people aged 19-24 move regularly, either moving to or within the city.

Young people are allowed to work from 16 years and to claim social assistance from 18 years. The Netherlands report indicates that a major problem for young people is the break in social support at age 18 years and the abrupt transition to adulthood demanded by the Dutch social system.

Box 2. Issues with insertion into adult life - Netherlands

Project coordinator of Kamers met Kansen The Hague:
"The transition of youth care to adult care is enormous. When you turn 18, your responsibilities shoot up as a young person, expectations are high."

Project leader Youth Intervention Team The Hague:
"When youngsters turn 18, there's in fact nothing for them. After their 18th birthday they don't qualify for anything, whereas there's a mountain of development tasks. The young person becomes of age and needs help to become independent. So after youth care, there's a gap. Another regular feature is that young people 'drop out' after an intake with other organisations. The problem is that youngsters are unable to formulate a request for help, whereas they're expected to do just that. They are faced by an enormous task on 'how to get through the bureaucracy of the Netherlands…"

Guardian region Arnhem of Nidos Foundation:
"We guide minor asylum seekers until they reach the age of 18, separate from the asylum procedure. Should the young people need guidance after their 18th birthday, we engage the Dutch Refugee Council or the regular welfare services. Minor asylum seekers who have exhausted their appeals are allowed to stay in the Netherlands until they are 18."

Assistant at the information centre for pregnant girls and young mothers:
"These days you're given a work placement allowance when you are under 27 years of age, but you must sign up to a programme straight away as you're obliged to find work or study. It's not clear yet whether your benefit will be cut; we're still investigating this as the arrangement is very new. These girls are often not stable enough as yet and there's a shortage in childcare facilities. So that generates the necessary problems. …"

"Access to work is difficult, as you need child care for that and there are waiting lists. School is often also difficult, as schools are generally not very flexible and don't take this group into account. On the other hand, these girls often don't know what they're entitled to, as they don't have the (right) information."

Portugal: Portugal has the lowest proportion of young people with secondary qualifications and the highest proportion of young people leaving school early. Young men in particular are poorly qualification; 41% young men completed secondary education compared with 59% women, although a higher proportion of young men had vocational qualifications.

There has been increasing unemployment from 2000 to 2005 amongst youth aged 15-24yrs from 9.4% to 16.1%. (The general rate in 2005 was just under 8%.) This situation has been worse for young women than young men; young women have been seeking employment in agriculture and services and young men in industry.

A large majority of young people (80-90%) aged up to 25 years live with their parents. The options of moving out of home are very limited. The Portuguese housing market is three quarters home ownership and 11% private rented. Social housing is 16% of the rental market and 3.3% of all housing. Three quarters of poor households are in the private rental market vs. 45% in the rest of Europe. A further issue is 11% empty homes, related to second homes. The Portuguese describe the alternatives in the housing market as being between 'owners' and 'excluded'.

A third (34%) of young people aged 15-19yrs were supported by their families, 28% from a range of benefits, 14% social support and 3% from work. Amongst those aged 20-24 years 18% are supported by their families, 32% from different benefits, 11% social support and 10% in work.

Box 3. Issues with insertion into adult life - Portugal

> *Projecto Sementes – Médicos do Mundo*
> *"In the city of Lisbon we have 140.000 persons in social housing, without considering the historical areas with similar diagnosis. In these neighbourhoods, 50% have less than 30 years, many four years of school, early juridical problems and the future is here, on this isolated ghettos located at the city centre. Some say school is important, yes. But this young people have lived in self-management since early ages and with a total institutional disconnection. What they respect are their peers. It is essential to adapt the school to the circumstances of social exclusion"*

UK: Traditionally, in the 1960s and 1970s, the majority of young people moved into work at age 16 years. Unemployment in the early 1980s and dead-end youth training schemes for young people who were unemployment encouraged more young people to stay longer in education when family circumstances and ability permitted. By 1988 only 15% of young people aged 16 years moved directly into work and now the proportion is 8%. This has resulted in two separate tendencies in the UK. On the one hand the proportion of young people who complete secondary education is similar to the Netherlands (80%), on the other hand the rate of young people not in employment, education or training is the highest in this study. The proportion of young people growing up in workless households is also the highest in Europe and the highest of these four countries. This polarisation of opportunities is marked in all areas of life for young people.

The age of leaving home has risen sharply in the UK from the early 1990s. In 1991 half of the men aged 20-24 lived with their parents but this had risen to

three fifths by 2003; for women the proportion increased from a third to two fifths. The options in the housing market for young people up to the age of 25 are also polarised. Like Portugal 70% of dwellings are owner-occupied, but unlike Portugal 18% of housing units are social rent (down from a third in the 1970s due to a right to buy and a lack of new build social housing). There has been a growth in the private rental market following the 1996 Housing Act. The Office of National Statistics reported that in 2000-1 for households where the reference person was under the age of 25, 40% were private renters, 38% were social renters and 20% were owner-occupiers. By comparison households where the reference person was aged 25-34, only 20% were private renters, and 22% were social renters. Amongst those who are most likely to rent their property are lone parents of whom 50% rented from the social sector, 15% rented privately and 36% were owner-occupiers. By contrast 80% of couples with dependent children were owner-occupiers. The lack of social housing has led many local authorities to encourage young people who require housing to take private rentals rather than seek a social tenancy.

There is also a polarisation in relation to family building. The average age of parenthood has risen as it has across Europe but despite this UK has a high rate of conception amongst disadvantaged younger women. Cohabitation has also increased compared with marriage whilst lone parenthood has remained stable. One manager in the predominantly UK born white ethnic group area of the Medway towns identified the problem of engaging with young people whose family background is that of a workless household and who live in areas of predominantly social housing with many workless households.

Box 4. Issues with insertion into adult life. UK

> *Manager, Medway Town Foyer – female, white UK*
> *"I left school at 15, I didn't go to college or anything, I became a comptometer operator and that was that but there were still expectations all the way through. I've got 4 brothers who are older than me and all of them left school and each of them had an apprenticeship, they all had to have a trade. There was a transition where young men would come up, they'd come to 15, they had to start thinking about what they want to do and then they leave school and do it…. They didn't even have to think about whether they should be on benefits, it was never an option, it was never going to happen… I think also that we were still very poor and the money that was coming into our house then was less than what people would be living on, on benefits now. education was very, very important, employment was very important, so to my mind, it's got nothing to do with money. The 60s changed it to a certain extent, and when we lost all the industry in the 70s and 80s. There were those traditional roles that people just knew they were going to go into and there was a security there and it didn't matter that you had to work really hard …they had their standards, they had their families, they had their things that they used to look forward to. … I think the whole of this social structure has just gone…there is a mindset that is instilled from birth...there are no expectations of these youngsters so if you are a youngster and you are growing up in a family where the mindset is that anybody who goes out to work is a mug, and then there are no expectations of you either to do well at school, do well in the family or anything else, where does the motivation come from?"*

Section 2 Young People at Risk of Social Exclusion and Homelessness

2.1   Concepts of importance in understanding the 'at risk' and excluded youth populations.

The NL report discussed three concepts central to the CSEYHP study in relation to how they are used in the field in the Netherlands: risk, vulnerability and social exclusion. The concept of risk is used in the meaning of young people 'at risk' and in practice defining risk is based on professional judgement and particularly related to young people at risk of sliding into criminal behaviour. 'Vulnerability', as used by workers in the field in the Netherlands, refers to the Social Support Act definition where people are seen as less self-sufficient and have limited participation through physical, psychological or mental restrictions. Vulnerability and risk are seen as circular in terms of cause and consequence.

The UK report discusses the three concepts referred to in the NL report and also the concept of 'transitions'. All of these concepts are used in UK government documents in relation to young people and each have a particular meaning. The concept of 'transitions' has been adopted by the UK government to discuss the issue of problematic transitions for a large minority of young people (up to 30% of each youth cohort). Similarly the concept of 'at risk' was important to the development of the Connexions service for young people aged 13-19. Connexions replaced a general careers service in schools with an agency charged to work specifically with multi-disadvantaged young people (up to 5% of the youth population) and with those 'at risk' of becoming multi-disadvantaged through failing at school (a further 15%).
'Vulnerability' has a specific meaning in UK homeless legislation, as under the Social Support Act of the Netherlands, being used to describe applicants for housing that have a specific individual need either through physical or mental health needs or learning difficulties.

The concept of social exclusion has been central to the agenda of UK Labour Governments since they came into office in 1997. A Social Exclusion Unit was attached to the Cabinet Office charged with investigating all forms of social exclusion. It defined social exclusion as *a short-hand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environment, bad health and family breakdown* (Social Exclusion Unit 2001: 10). At its onset the SEU particularly focussed on youth exclusion in all its forms and neighbourhood deprivation.

In CZ the concept of social exclusion has been used in relation to unemployment and ethnicity (75% of the CZ Roma population are long term unemployed) and mental health problems. **In PT** social exclusion is related to ethnic origin and immigration status, intergenerational poverty, low levels of educational attainment, family rupture and conflict, institutional state care including prisons and psychiatric hospitals, a lack of relational attachment and social support and disability both organic and non organic (through trauma and neglect).

At the theoretical level it is necessary to unpick the relationship between the concepts of risk, social exclusion, vulnerability and transitions although risk and

social exclusion are especially difficult to separate. Beck's work on risk (1986, 1992) centres on the idea of the individual having to negotiate their own biography in a situation where community and family are changing and the world is a more difficult place. In our four countries the concept of social exclusion can be understood differently: in the UK it has remained closely allied with concepts of poverty and income inequality, social class and ethnic group disadvantage although some writers have also considered the lack of social participation. Elsewhere social exclusion is also considered to be multidimensional incorporating social and material deprivation (in the NL this is caused not only by low income, but also and sometimes even more through debt); rights limitations in terms of education, housing, health care and safety; lack of social participation and social support; lack of normative integration including observing dominant cultural norms, values and laws (Jehoel-Gijsbers 2004).

However, in the field, workers with homeless young people may have more practical understandings of these concepts. Some UK workers used the concepts of 'at risk' or 'vulnerability' in a way similar to workers in the Netherlands although they did not identify young refugees as being more 'at risk' than local young people. The young people who were identified as being 'at risk' in the UK were young women who were involved with young men with substance misuse problems and/or criminal records, or young men who were involved with a group of criminal peers. Workers in the field in the UK had the most difficulty with the idea of 'social exclusion'. They described how young people were socially excluded through poverty but also argued that some excluded themselves through lack of confidence and self-esteem. Moreover some did not want to be included; two workers in different project said, *'You have to want to be included.'* referring to young people without motivation, raised in workless households.

2.2   Risk of poverty associated with leaving home and becoming independent in our four countries

One of the central issues for our study of four countries is to identify the differences in situation for young people who must leave home early. Much of the work on differences between countries is based on data sets derived from the period when the EU did not include the New Member States (NMS). Therefore we have a good picture of the differences between the Netherlands, Portugal and the UK but less information about the Czech Republic.

According to the 2004 EU social panorama (Eurostat, The Social Situation in the European Union, 2004), certain household types are more susceptible to being "low income" including single-parents with dependent children (35%), young people living alone (32%), old people living alone (29%), women living alone (28%) and two-adult households with three or more dependent children (27%). But there are differences between European countries in relation to outcomes for youth attempting to support themselves through their own economic activity, family and social transfers they are eligible to receive.
In 1999 the IARD project (ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/doc/studies/iard/) reviewed education and training, youth and the labour market, well being, health and values, organisations and political participation and young people's awareness of Europe across 15 member states. IARD identified the youth situation in relation to three groups of countries: (1) those where the labour market is the main source of income, followed by family support and social

transfers (Austria, Germany, France, Ireland, Luxemburg, Portugal, Sweden); (2) those where the labour market is the most important followed by social transfers and then the family (Denmark, UK); (3) those where the family is the most important source of support followed by the labour market and social transfers (Belgium, Spain, Greece and Italy).

In 2005 an examination of EC Household Panel data provided evidence of the different ages at which young people leave home in EU-13 and EU-15 countries and their increased risk of becoming poor. Research by the team of Aassve, Davia, Iacovou, Mazzuco, and Mencarini (Aassve et al, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c at www.iser.essex.ac.uk/research/misoc/research) identified that the age by which 50% of young people live independently varies greatly between EU-13 countries: in Finland, Denmark, Netherlands and the UK the age varies between 22-24 years; in France, Belgium, Austria and Germany the age varies between 25-26 years; in Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Greece and Italy it varies between 28-30 years. Table 1.1 (previous section) reports data from the first European Quality of Life survey in which the rates of living independently at age 18-24 years amongst the four countries in this study were 7% PT, 15% CZ, 33% NL and 46% UK. Second, rates of poverty (measured as 60% of median income) for young people who have left home are higher than those who have not left home in all EU-13 countries. The highest probabilities of being poor among those who have left home are to be found in Finland, Netherlands, Italy and the UK (35-30%) followed by Denmark, Germany and France and Ireland (25%). The highest probabilities of being poor amongst those who remain at home are to be found in Italy (17%) and Spain, Greece, Portugal and France (10-14%) (ibid, Figure 2a).

Third, the team compared a sample of young people's poverty rates whilst living in the parental home with their situation one year later, after they moved out of the parental home or remained within it. "The differences are quite striking, with the increased probability of becoming poor on leaving home being much higher in the Southern European countries than the Northern European countries, and particularly the Scandinavian countries".(ibid page 5 and Figure 2b).

Moreover levels of income inequality vary greatly between countries and therefore quite rich countries may have a large group of poor people. Using one measure of income inequality (the Gini Coefficient) in the mid 2000s, the Czech Republic (5th most equal) and the Netherlands (8th) were among the least unequal amongst OECD countries and the UK (23rd) and Portugal (28th) amongst the most unequal. (OECD, 2009: 277). The trend in inequality for the four countries also differed; PT continually became more unequal through the mid 1980s to mid 2000s, the UK and NL became more unequal from the mid 1980s to mid 1990s and then reversed in the next decade; and CZ was positive for greater equality in both decades.

In the mid 2000s median income was highest in the Netherlands followed by the UK. Both these countries were above the OECD average whilst the median income in Portugal and the Czech Republic was similar and below the OECD average. In the mid 2000s (at exchange rates current then) the average income of the top decile in the UK was above that of the NL (80,000$ vs. 69,000$) and above the OECD average; the average income of the top decile in PT and CZ were c. 13,000$. Average income of the bottom decile was however higher in NL than in UK and higher in CZ than PT (OECD, 2009: 279). Poverty rates in the UK, NL and CZ measured at 50% median level was below OECD average but PT was above.

A particular issue in the UK is the proportion of children and young people who live in poor households and/or are at risk of poverty. In the UK, 3.8 million children live in poverty (Source: National Youth Agency). A 2007 report published by the Commission for Racial Equality states that rates of poverty are particularly high among children of African (56%), Pakistani (60%), and Bangladeshi (72%) origin, compared with a rate of 25% for white children.(Source: A lot done, a lot to do. Commission for Racial Equality, 2007). The experience continues into youth. In 2007, 30 per cent of 18-21-year-olds, living in households below 60 % of median income, were deemed at risk of being in poverty. In 2007, of the 1.5 million young adults aged 16-24 in low-income households, 1 million were single without children. (Source: Household Below Average Income, DWP, 2007).

The European network Up2Youth has, in 2008, compared the structure of welfare policies, of education and training systems, of labour markets, youth unemployment policies, gender relations and representations of youth across EU27 countries. They have identified five welfare regimes for young people: Liberal (Anglo-Saxon); Universalistic (Nordic); Sub-protective (Mediterranean); Employment-centred (Continental) and Post-socialist (Central and Eastern European). They have argued that the life course for young people is now de-standardised, fragmented, diversified, and that attaining adulthood and time of that attainment is more problematic. Many young people experience a reversible transition to adulthood where they may return to the parental home and become dependent once more (www.up2youth.org).

However our study is concerned with young people who must become independent at an early age and the option of returning to dependency within the family is very limited or non-existent. What are the individual risks factors involved in having to leave home in our four countries and what are the social risk factors?

2.3   Youth populations 'at risk': individual risk factors

If we look at youth populations at risk then we have to consider young people who are in care or leaving care, running away, the subject of criminal proceedings, the subject of abuse and exploitation, leaving school early, experience early motherhood (or early parenthood), leave home early and involvement in substance misuse; the risk factors identified in each country of our project (Table 2.1 and 2.2) Most of these populations relate to child poverty, jobless households, neighbourhood disintegration/ ghettoisation, ethnic disadvantage, as well as to lesser or greater access to social and cultural capital through the family and family networks.

This section considers youth populations at risk. Each team reported which groups of young people were particularly at risk of social exclusion and/or homelessness in their countries. Reports from CZ and PT were based on interviews with people in the field whilst NL and UK reported 'risk' studies that identified either particular circumstances or disadvantages that led to young people becoming homeless as well as interviews in the field.

CZ reported three particular groups of young people at risk: young people in care, unaccompanied minors and young people with a criminal record. However these risks are associated both with poverty and with ethnic identity (young Roma). PT reported young people from Portuguese former colonies (Cape Verde, Angola, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique and São Tomé and Príncipe) as well as Brazilians, Eastern Europeans, Chinese and other Asians, despite recent legal safeguards, still find they are constrained in terms of their ability to pursue higher levels of education and employment.

The NL report of 'at risk' groups was based on levels of unemployment, lower levels of education achieved, victims of abuse and violence with an estimate 160,700 victims per year, 40 – 80 die per year and among all 10–20 year olds 8% sexual abuse. Among domestic violence cases 58% had an impact on children. The UK reported particular studies of risk: Breugel and Smith (1998), based on interviews with young people living in hostels aged up to 20 years, and Pleace (2008), based on a representative sample of 16-17 year olds accepted as homeless by local authority housing departments. These studies identified risk in relation to family background and school/education exclusion.

Table 2.1 Young Person Risk Factors identified in the National Reports for each country

	CZ	NL	PT	UK
Disorganised families	*	*	*	*
Family Ruptures		*	*	*
No family network support		*	*	
Household living on benefits		*	*	*
YP in state care	*		*	*
Refugees	*	*	*	*
Learning difficulties	*	*	*	*
Emotional attachment		*	*	
Criminal records	*	*	*	*
Low education level	*	*		*
Debt	*	*		
Begging			*	
Lack of skills		*		*
Substance abuse	*	*		*
Unemployment		*		*
Abuse	*	*	*	*
Sexual exploitation	*		*	*

A risk factor particular to young women is teenage pregnancy. Although young homeless men can also be parents at a young age they frequently do not have dependent children whereas young women do. The rates in the UK of women aged 15-19 years becoming mothers are higher than other countries: 26 per 1,000 compared with 17 PT, 11 CZ and 5 NL (Table 1.1, Section 1).

2.4   Young people 'at risk': social exclusion factors

Similar risk factors can be considered in different ways. It was apparent in the national reports that there were different rates of young people being taken into care, of workless households, of early school leaving and of young people not in employment, education or training. All of these are social exclusion factors.

Table 2.2   Youth populations at risk prior to being homeless

Country	CZ	NL	PT	UK	Source
Population					
%15-24 years	13	12	12	13	Eurostat, 2008, for 2006
Family circumstances					
Young people in social care.	7250 (2003)	4591 plus those under a family supervision order c. 13000	9,561 (1999)	c.70000	National reports
YP up to 17 yrs living in workless households%	8%	6%	5%	16%	Welfare Eurostat 2008 for 2006, EU-7 av. 10%
Education					
*Early school leaving % male vs. female	6% m6% v f5%	13% m15% v f11%	39% m46% v f31%	13% m15% v f11%	Ed Eurostat 2008. Chpt 2 For 2006
Not in education, or employment training 16-19 **Young men**	4.7%	3.3%	7.8%	11.5%	OECD, 2009:259
NEET 16-19 yrs Young Women	4.3%	2.6%	7.7%	10.6%	OECD, 2009:259

OECD Fact book 2009 (2009:259) reported the proportion of young people aged 15-19 years who are neither in education nor employment in each country for the year 2006 and these are given in Table 2.2. The proportions for young men and young women were much higher in the UK than in any other country followed by PT then CZ and NL. Across OECD countries only Italy had slightly higher rates than the UK and the issue of Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) young people is especially important in UK youth policy (OECD, 2009: 259).

Unemployment rates for foreign born men and women were higher than the native born in all four countries in 2006. The greatest difference in 2006 unemployment rates was found in NL: native men 3.3% vs. 10.4% foreign born men; native women 4.3% vs. 11% foreign born women. In the other three countries native rates for men vs. foreign-born men were closer to the OECD averages: 5.5% vs. 7.4% (UK), 6.9% vs. 8.2% (PT), 5.8% vs. 8.4% (CZ). For women the native unemployment rates vs. foreign born unemployment rates were: 4.5% vs. 7.9% (UK); PT 9.3% vs. 11.4%; and CZ 8.8% vs. 15.3%. (OECD, 2009)

The following quotes from the national reports illustrate some of the issues relating to working with young people who have little education and who are in supported accommodation in NL, PT and the UK

Box 2.1. Encouraging work and education

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px">

_NL_
"At the [project] we notice that unaccompanied minor aliens from a Dutch foster family find it easier to move on to higher vocational education. But how things work out for young people still depends on the basic qualification. There is illiteracy, so in that case it's difficult to move on to an education or job. The youngsters receive language tuition and often focus on a vocational education, provided their future perspective is to 'stay here'. If not, we concentrate on the best way of returning to the country of origin."

_PT_
"...the data shows that young people are still leaving the school system with low educational levels or even with no school education, arriving at the labour market in a disadvantaged situation. This trend contributes to the reproduction of the low qualified generations – with low wages, from qualified jobs, and in case of unemployment with significant difficulties in terms of labour market insertion.... A significant part of the young Portuguese population shows difficulty in using new technologies because of low school levels and weak participation in training courses." (NAPIncl 2006-2008).

_UK_
"A lot come from families that have always been on benefit and here we say to them 'yeah, you're on benefit, but that's only while you're studying or looking for work. You've got to try and get yourself out of that benefit trap' and that's a very difficult cycle to break. A lot of them do come from the local area where there is some unemployment and people have been on benefit all their lives and 'why should we work? We'll claim this and we'll claim that'. We do have some success stories. It's not always successful."

_CZ_
"The problem with housing is more complicated. The worst thing is that they (the homeless) with their financial possibilities can afford only hostels. But we all know what these hostels look like, people drink there the drugs are also around…There are no continuous services such as housing training."

</div>

2.5 The representation of young people in the media

Reports from the Netherlands and the CZ show there is no real media focus on youth homelessness apart from the impact of cuts in public funding and in the difficulties in their daily lives today and in CZ where sexual exploitation is featured. The representation of youth in the media in PT is concerned with school violence, Internet child pornography and crime perpetrated by Portuguese Roma community. In the UK youth homelessness appears to feature more prominently in the media and there has been a sympathetic coverage, however in relation to youth in general there is a preponderance of negative report that tends to demonise young people in relation to gangs, criminal behaviour and substance misuse. There appears to be a dual attitude in the UK towards those young people homeless in hostels and supported accommodation and young people on the streets.

Section 3 Youth Homelessness

3.1   The responsibility of local services

In all four countries the responsibility for working with, and providing for, homeless people attaches to a local authority/ municipal authority. However the degree of uniformity of response across local authorities towards the homeless varies. In NL, there is local variation on the definition of homelessness across municipalities and therefore variations in the provision of services. In CZ and PT there is large disparity in relation to the provision of services between the capital cities and other areas. In the UK legislation places a duty on all local authorities to assist homeless households that fulfil particular criteria of 'priority need' and this has led to a more uniform approach. However variation does exist between UK nations, between local authorities and particularly between urban and rural areas.

3.2   Definitions of homelessness and youth homelessness in four countries.

The UK has had homelessness legislation spanning three decades: major Acts were passed in 1977, 1985, 1996 for GB and 2002 for England and other countries separately. The definition of homelessness contained within the UK legislation is broad encompassing all those without a dwelling in which they have the right to remain. Within this broad definition particular groups of people are then identified as in 'priority need' including, from 2002, young people aged 16-17 years, young people who had lived in social care and those who had lived in institutions (hospital or prison) or were ex-armed services.

The broad UK definition is quite different from the ETHOS system suggested by FEANTSA. The **ETHOS categorisation of homelessness and housing exclusion** has replaced an earlier FEANTSA definition of homelessness which was closer to that used across the UK. In ETHOS 13 operational categories are grouped into four main categories
Roofless: those living rough or in emergency accommodation (night shelter).
Houseless: living in accommodation for the homeless, in women's shelters, immigrant accommodation, institutions, longer-term supported homeless accommodation.
Insecure: those living temporarily with family and friends, without legal sub-tenancy or illegally occupying land, or under the threat of eviction or violence.
Inadequate: those living in temporary structures (mobile homes), unfit housing or extreme over-crowding.

The ETHOS 'roofless/houseless' definitions have been adopted by CZ and PT as a working definition of homelessness as an advance on their own situation in which homelessness had not been defined. The definitions adopted by NL have been varied: in relation to youth the 'roofless/houseless' definition from ETHOS was expanded to include the category of young people with multiple needs. Recently, the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport installed a commission to design a fitting definition for youth homelessness. ETHOS categories are particularly problematic in relation to youth homelessness as well as homelessness among women. Many fewer young people are found among rough sleepers, particularly young homeless women, and in countries without dedicated youth homeless

services, many young people will not be found in emergency or other accommodation dominated by men aged 25-40 years. However for those EU states without any definition of homelessness the ETHOS categorisation has been used as a starting point as in CZ and PT.

In CZ homelessness was invisible before 1989 and, although it became a problem in the 1990s, the Czech government did not develop a political strategy towards homelessness until joining the EU in 2004. The CZ government report on *Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion for 2006-8* defined homelessness as people 'without any roof over their heads and finding temporary shelter in various charity organisations.' The 2006 Social Services Act defined the homeless both as people without shelter and those unfavourably situated due to housing loss.

Currently NGOs in CZ are working with the ETHOS 13 categories of homeless and housing exclusion but the 'houseless' category has had to be extended in order encompass homelessness among young people leaving children's institutions. In CZ the generic definition 6.3 on Children's Institutions was supplemented within the ETHOS typology as follows:
6.3.1 Persons due to be released from children's institutions
There are people leaving educational institutions for institutional upbringing or compulsory care or for preventative educational care:
-    children's home
-    children's home with a school
-    penitentiary
-    diagnostic institution
6.3.2 People due to be released from foster care
There are people who, after coming of age, leave
-    special institutions for foster care
-    individual foster care.

However, there is no specific law guaranteeing the right to housing in CZ and housing support is provided through municipalities. There is still an antipathy to the provision of social housing.

In PT early definitions of homelessness were broad, based on the work of local agencies. In 2005, a national survey used the two ETHOS categories of roofless and houseless to define homelessness, but with some categories of persons/situations excluded. Many agencies viewed this definition as narrower than the ones they had previously used as it failed to capture the situation of young homeless people except for drug users who were also rough sleepers but more generally classed as young drug users rather than young homeless.

The Constitutional Law of 1976 first established the right to housing as a fundamental right. In 2008 Portugal published a national strategy for the integration of homeless people (2009-15). In this strategy the definition of homelessness was a person who is 'roofless' (living in public spaces, emergency shelters, or places such as cars, stairs, building entrances) or 'homeless' (temporary housing centres for the homeless). But this definition excludes temporary facilities and specific structures for children and youth, the elderly, handicapped persons, drug addicted, HIV/Aids, and domestic violence.

Under 18 years the PT state has to take young homeless people into care whatever their circumstances. In relation to homeless persons older than 18 years the ETHOS definition has been reformulated to fit the PT situation. Homeless people include persons without conventional housing: sleeping on the streets, shelter, barracks, abandoned cars and houses. This is to prevent organisations only identifying those sleeping on the streets as homeless. It is possible for an agency to identify a young person over 18 years as being homeless if they are sleeping rough or if they are using an emergency shelter.

In NL homelessness amongst young people emerged in the mid 1980s as a serious issue, related to multiple needs. The majority were from broken families. After being institutionalised they dropped out and often became criminalized in the street. Substance abuse became a problem too. Unemployment was a big problem at that time, so work did not offer an easy escape from the street.

In 2004 the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (the overarching Ministry with the remit on young people and welfare), together with consulted organisations working or researching in the field of youth homelessness, formulated a definition of youth homelessness. This definition partially fits the ETHOS categorisation of rooflessness and houselessness but also includes a specific category of youth with 'multiple problems': '*Young homeless people are young people up to 25 years of age with multiple problems, without fixed abode or who reside in shelter accommodation without their parents'*. Within this definition NL municipalities apply different ages and different definitions: in some municipalities young people at risk are included as young homeless, in others not; some municipalities only register young people as homeless after they have been living in shelter accommodation for three months, others will register earlier; and some do not include young people aged under 18 years but some municipalities will.

However, the three-fold definition of homelessness (multiple needs, without fixed abode or shelter accommodated) does not fit the situation of young people in NL completely. Very few young people are roofless. Those living in emergency 24-hour accommodation or registered as 'imminently' homeless do not cover all young homeless people. Young people are more likely to be 'hidden homeless' moving between friends, other family, squats. This might be partly solved by adding young people with multiple problems. Certainly, the group of hidden homeless is difficult to catch in a definition. Nevertheless, the Ministry of HWS has instructed a research agency to produce a uniform definition that can apply in 2009.

As well as the definition of the Ministry of HWS, from the 1980s onwards researchers often used a definition of homelessness based on whether a person moved from place to place, with no right to stay, within a certain time-period (mostly three months).

The Shelter for Young Homeless People 2008 report from the Audit Court in NL identified major inadequacies in relation to policy, registration and assistance for young homeless people. It reported municipalities as having intentions without concrete proposals, not including young people aged under 18 in their plans, and using the definition from the Ministry of HWS (roofless and living in shelter

accommodation) in a narrow way and not adequately registering all young people living in a range of homeless situations. The Audit Court report has proposed that municipal and provisional authorities must provide accurate registers of young people who are homeless, and invest not only in accommodation provision but in a full range of prevention, monitoring, shelter, guidance and aftercare services. The report notes that developing a coherent approach has been hindered by the transfer of responsibility that takes place at 18 years of age from the Province to the Municipality; this transfer requires a joined-up approach between Province and Municipality.

UK homelessness legislation was the first and is the most extensive homeless legislation in EU-27. The first Act was passed in 1977 following social agitation on the poverty and inadequate housing situation of several categories of disadvantaged people: single parents (essentially lone mothers), women fleeing domestic violence, the elderly and the vulnerable (mental health patients in particular). The definition of homelessness in the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 is that the person is homeless if he (and those who reside with him) has no accommodation that he is entitled to occupy through an interest in it or has a licence to occupy or is occupying by virtue of a rule of law giving him the right to occupy.5 He is also homeless if he cannot secure entry to his property or that the occupation of that property will lead to violence from some other person residing in it or threats of violence. This act also applied to moveable property (caravans, boats without mooring rights).

The second paragraph of the 1977 Act identifies which homeless people local authorities have a duty to give assistance to by providing accommodation. It gives a homeless person 'priority need' for assistance if he (or she) had dependent children residing with him or who might be expected to reside with him, if he was homeless through an emergency (fire, flood or disaster) or if he was vulnerable due to old age, mental illness, handicap or physical disability. The priority also applied to pregnant women and whoever normally resided with her.

The third paragraph of the Act gives local authorities the right to make 'appropriate inquiries' into the person's circumstances and to also assess whether the person had a local connection in that area (through work, residence, birth) and therefore it was the duty of that local authority to assist. The fourth paragraph requires the housing authority, following the inquiry, to have a duty to offer accommodation.

Following the passing of the 1977 Act responsibility for homeless people moved from Social Work Departments to Housing Departments. Under UK homelessness legislation the principal beneficiaries have not been single people sleeping rough or living in hostels ('non-statutory homeless') but families with children, the elderly and the vulnerable ('statutory homeless' i.e. in priority need under the Act). In 1996 the Act was strengthened in relation to support for those facing violence in relation to race, as well as domestic violence. In 2002 priority need groups were extended to include young people aged 16-17 years, young people who had been in state care up to the age of 21 years, and those leaving institutions including hospitals and prisons, and leaving the armed services.

---

5 Throughout the 1977 Act the term he refers to both he and she.

Currently under the legislation any local authority has to inquire whether the persons are eligible (nationality and immigration status), homeless, are in a priority need category, do they have a local connection (through work or family) and are they unintentionally homeless. Intentionally homeless people include those who failed to pay their rent and who have sold a property they had a right to reside in.

The CSEYHP UK report details the proportions of different types of households accepted as statutory homeless. In 2007/8, 6,3170 households were accepted as homeless in England and in priority need: 59% were households with dependent children, 12% households with a pregnant woman, 2% old age, 5% physical disability, 7% mental ill-health, 8% young person, 3% domestic violence, 5% other, and 1% homeless in an emergency. As is evident the UK definition would include most of the operational categories in the first three groups of ETHOS and some of the fourth as 'homeless' before inquiring into the priority need circumstances. In particular the threat of violence is not considered an 'insecure' situation but a homeless situation as a violent situation is as dangerous or more dangerous for those not yet moved out of their home (domestic violence is specified in the legislation as is racial violence).

3.3   Amount and profile of young homeless people

It is apparent from the CZ and PT reports that using the ETHOS 'roofless' and 'houseless' categories to investigate homeless populations produces very low estimates of the number of young homeless people in countries without specific youth services. Most young people and women are not found sleeping rough or in emergency accommodation, two situations dominated by men aged 25-40 years. Similarly young people will avoid non-emergency accommodation that is not specifically for youth. However in the case of CZ there is evidence of the number of young people living in 'uninhabitable accommodation'.

The CZ national report for CSEYHP reports estimates for homeless people in each of the ETHOS categories where available. In order to estimate the number of homeless people in categories 1-4 (roofless, emergency accommodation, homeless accommodation and women's shelters) it was necessary to take the numbers reported by NGOs in their grant applications to the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and European Structural Funds; using this method the number was estimated at 35,000 in 1996. In 2004 the number of roofless persons ('visible homeless') in Prague was found through a field count to be 3,096; two years later a similar field count identified 1,179 in Brno. The problem of using the ETHOS definition for homeless young people is similar in Prague as any capital city: only 14% of those found in Prague were young people under 25 years and only 14% were women, overall the proportion of young women in the homeless population as defined this way was 3.3%.

In relation to other ETHOS categories (5, 8, 11, 12, 13) nearly 45,000 people were living in dwellings unfit for habitation at the 2001 Census, 12,500 in weekend houses and 222 in mobile homes not usually used for residential accommodation. There were 9,000 young people aged 15-24 living in these circumstances, most (84%) living in dwellings unfit for habitation.

Prague has the most services but these are less than required. The 2004 Census of the homeless in Prague found some people very hard to reach: those living in sewers, airshafts, or underground corridors. Of the 100 young people who were identified only 37% used emergency accommodation and the others could not have used it as the accommodation was full. In 2006 the Prague temporary winter crisis shelter had places for 160 people, although 230 applied, including young people from social care, people from prison and unemployed from outside Prague. On one day 227 people were in the shelter, 10% of whom were women and 9% aged 18-25 years. Of the 227 33% were from Prague, 48% from the rest of CZ, and 19% were from other nationalities including from Slovakia, Lithuania and Ukraine.

There are very few facilities open for families, couples or single women. The proportion of women aged under 25 years looking for appropriate accommodation is 23%, out of the whole number of women (434) in Census 2004, compared with 13% of young men, out of the whole number of men (2,662) in Census 2004. The proportion of homeless clients who are young was 14% in Census 2004, mostly with low educational qualifications, limited family support, vulnerable mentally or physically or emotionally and with low social skills. Their limited social skills present difficulties when looking for work and the numbers with some kind of mental illness diagnosis are increasing. Agencies describe two predominant groups of young homeless people in Prague: first, squatters seeking an independent free life style, who are users of soft drugs with disrupted but not completely broken family relationships, and who occasionally work; second, hard drug users with broken family relationships, living by odd jobs and petty theft.

Estimates of homeless people in PT made from the 1980s to 2000s were based on service provision; they therefore included rough sleepers, people accessing night centres and people living in deprived housing conditions. However, the youth homeless populations remained hidden because of a lack of specific services for young people, the mobility of young people and the type of homeless situations they were living in. Moreover in the case of PT young people who are homeless with a homeless parent (usually a mother) are not separately identified. In general young people are only identified as being an independent householder who is homeless around the age of 30 years. No studies have been undertaken of hidden homelessness in relation to staying with friends and relatives, or the risks of insecure renting.

Two studies of homelessness in Lisbon produced homeless estimates for that city. In 2000 from January to May, 1,366 homeless people were identified using night shelters, rough sleeping and those potentially in these two circumstances. The majority were Portuguese men aged between 20 and 40 years; a similar finding to a previous study that found rough sleepers to be aged between 20 and 60 years and on average sleeping rough for 4.7 years.

The first phase of the national study conducted by the ISS (2005) at the national level aimed to reach the cases known by several agents at three distinct levels of local action (city council, region and the NGOs). There were 137 agencies in the survey and their responses gave a broad understanding of the needs of the homeless and service provision but not the number of homeless people because

double counting of service users was not filtered. NGOs identified the most cases: 1,111 in dormitories, 1,334 in shelters, 2,173 "persons that have housing but sporadically sleep on the street/shelter", 1,855 on the streets, 1,270 that have housing (pension or house) associated with social support and 736 "that have a house but sleep sporadically on the streets/in shelters due to family tensions".

The second phase of the national study consisted on a point in time survey (7pm 19th October till 3am 20th October) on rough sleeping situations. However, only 467 cases were identified (249 Lisbon, 109 Porto, 26 Setúbal, 23 Faro), partly due to the difficulties of reaching rough sleepers under bad weather conditions. The socio-demographic profile of the 467 cases is similar to rough-sleeping studies in the UK and elsewhere: most were men aged 25-34 years, single, with limited education (up to 9th grade), predominantly Portuguese but including a substantial group of migrants (Africans from Angola and Cape Verde, and Ukrainians). A quarter had been homeless for less than six month, 34% between 1-5 years and 30% more than 5 years. The important causes are similar to those for rough sleepers in the UK: relationship breakdown, health problems, unemployment and housing problems. A study of contacts of outreach teams in Lisbon found that one third of 1,100 contacts were immigrants.

In NL there have been both regional and national estimates of young homeless people. The total estimate of young homeless people in NL is 6,090, 0.12% of the population aged between 16 and 25 years**.** This count is based on information from the municipalities given to the Dutch Audit Court. This information is partly based on figures and partly on estimates. Municipalities did research on the actual situation on youth homelessness because of their participation in the Social Shelter Action Plan. It is of interest for the municipalities not to underestimate the counts of young homeless. So it is plausible that 6,090 is a realistic number.

On the other hand the Audit Court noted there are problems with any estimate due to inadequate registration. Different municipalities have used different definitions of homelessness and also different age categories because the legal frameworks for young people in NL has significant breaks at age 18 and 23 years. Some municipalities count young people who are at risk of homelessness as homeless, and others do not. Some only record young people as homeless if they have lived in a shelter for more than three months. A further problem is that the distinction used for adult homeless people between imminent homelessness, actual homelessness (on the streets) and residential homelessness (24 hour emergency accommodation) does not produce proper estimates for young homeless people.

In general one can say that it is very difficult to count or estimate those young homeless who are living in an inadequate housing situation. Whatever definition one develops this will always be the case, because part of this group is hidden per definition. Part of this group will become visible homeless, another part won't. So as well as in the UK those young homeless who are in priority need can be estimated, those who are in need, but not actual priority need stay hidden.
In the near future homeless youth will be part of the Social Shelter Plan. This means that municipalities have one counter from which further action is taken. This might be of help in estimating the group of young homeless.

Rough sleeping young homeless barely exist in The Netherlands. Street counts done in the period 1995-2003 in Amsterdam find very little rough sleeping homeless beneath the age of 25. In total less than 20 persons of the 350 rough sleeping are young and adult homeless on an average night.

Some municipalities have undertaken local studies that have led to specific categorisations of homeless young people in their area. The municipality of Rotterdam study described four categories of young homeless people: 'bandits (young criminals), runaways, dissidents and outcasts'. The existence of these four categories was then investigated in The Hague and only the 'bandits' profile was found to be similar. A study in Amsterdam identified three categories of young homeless people with particular support needs: those with learning difficulties, those with psychiatric symptoms and pregnant young women/ teenage mothers.

In 2006 a study of young homeless immigrants in Amsterdam identified two groups. First, there were young legal immigrants: they included children of homeless migrants, victims of sexual exploitation and violence, teenage mothers, runaways and young people aged over 18 years who need to leave home for household economic reasons, those with learning difficulties and young newcomers from Antilles. Second, there were young irregular or undocumented immigrants: they included children of asylum seekers whose appeals had failed, children of unregulated family reunification, children of less than five years' marriage, young people for whom no asylum application had been made and 'trafficked' young people.

Using police records it was possible to identify 11,340 irregular migrants living in Amsterdam between the years 1997-2003; 80% were male and 50% younger than 30 years. The majority were from North Africa, other African countries and Central and Eastern Europe. These migrants cannot receive help because of their status. Some other young people cannot receive help even though they are documented because their only needs are housing needs: they are not criminal, do not have psychiatric problems or learning difficulties, and are not addicted. These young people are 'invisibly' homeless within their own ethnic community.

A national report found that two thirds of young homeless people are male, a quarter has learning difficulties and just under half are second-generation migrants. The proportion of young second generation migrants (born in the Netherlands or Netherlands Antilles but with one parent born abroad) varied between 35% and 53% in three studies of homeless youth. A study of younger homeless people of 16-20 years found that alcohol and drug abuse played a significant role as did psychological problems, 40% had some criminal record and few had completed their education.

In the UK estimates of the number of young homeless people are based on local authority acceptances of young people as homeless and on information gathered on numbers of young people living in supported accommodation. Each government in the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) collects information from local authorities on the numbers and types of people those authorities have accepted a homeless duty towards in the previous year. Separately, a centralised monitoring system collects client records on every person living in supported accommodation. It is therefore possible to estimate

numbers of young homeless people accepted by local authorities as homeless, or living in supported accommodation for each year.

However, it is not possible to know the numbers of hidden homeless young people. The UK estimates provide good estimates of young people who are in priority need and therefore accepted as homeless or housed in supported accommodation, but much less accurate estimates for young people who are not priority need: young men and young women without children; young people for whom the local authority does not have a duty towards because they were not previously under state care nor were they an unaccompanied minor, nor were they 16-17 years old, nor were they vulnerable, nor had they proved they had no other accommodation.

The most recent estimate has used figures for 2006-7 based on both the number of homeless acceptances of young people and at the number of young people living in supported accommodation. In 2006/07 approximately 75,000 young people were identified as homeless in England, Scotland and Wales: 43,000 young people were accepted as statutory homeless by local authorities, 31,000 were living in supported accommodation and a small number of rough sleepers were also included in this estimate. It is important to stress that the figures include households where the reference head was aged under 25 years and children were in the household - young mothers and young couples with children. It does not include young people who were not accepted as homeless by their local authority or did not find supported accommodation.

Although this method of estimating youth homelessness is preferable because it includes young women, young mothers, and other young people who were not rough sleeping or living in a hostel, it is dependent on the rate at which local authorities make homeless acceptances. In 2005 a major prevention agenda was launched which reduced the number of homeless acceptances from 134,000 in 2003/4 to 64,000 in 2006/7. If a similar exercise in relation to estimating youth homeless had been conducted in 2003/4 rather than 2006/7 one could expect that the figures for statutory homelessness would have been much higher and the overall estimate for young homeless people over 100,000.

3.4   Youth at risk of homelessness and patterns of youth homelessness
Youth homelessness emerged as an issue in both NL and UK in the mid to late 1980s. **In the UK** it led to the expansion of voluntary sector agencies that provided specialised services for young homeless people, separate from those for the older homeless: YMCAs (which take young people up to 30 years old or above), Foyers, DePaul UK, St. Basils and other voluntary homeless services. The provision of supported accommodation has expanded whilst move-on accommodation into social housing has contracted due to the 'right to buy' given to existing tenants of social housing and a lack of new build social housing. Social housing is now only 18% of all housing units and is largely located in deprived areas; but as described previously 38% of households headed by young people aged under 25 years live in social rented accommodation. The route into social renting for young people has largely been through the homeless legislation and being in 'priority need' i.e. young mothers, young couples with children, from social care, and young refugees without family (unaccompanied minors).

A recent survey undertaken by the Department of Communities and Local Government of 350 16 to 17 year old single young people in priority housing need, (statutory homeless) found them to have experienced one or more of the following identified risk factors.

Table 3.1 Risk factors among young people aged 16-17 years statutorily homeless

Parents separated or divorced during childhood	67%
Missed a lot of school	58%
Was suspended or excluded from school at least once	54%
Has ever experienced anxiety, depression or other mental health problems	52%
A step-parent moved into the family home during childhood	51%
Never had a settled home as an adult	
Ran away from home and stayed away more than one night during childhood	47%
Family had financial difficulties during childhood	45%
Parents were violent towards each other during childhood	40%
Experienced domestic violence as child	39%
Has been involved in crime/anti-social behaviour	18%
Has had a drug, solvent or alcohol problem	37%
Family moved house a lot during childhood	35%
Has been in a violent relationship (as abused)	28%
Spent time in care	19%
Was sexually abused as child	17%
Family spent some time homeless during childhood	15%
Has been sexually assaulted as an adult	12%
One or both parents died	12%
Has been on the Child Protection Register	12%
Has been in prison or young offender institution	9%
Has lived as a 'Traveller'	3%
Has had sex in exchange for money, food, drugs, shelter	3%

Source: Pleace et al, 2008: p286

However these risk factors reflect the pattern for this age group nationally, and would be correct for young nationals in London and other cities, but not necessarily for young refugees whose family backgrounds are very different.

There were three main groups of single young people who were homeless in the late 1980s in the UK: young unemployed people whose benefits were removed in 1988 and who came to London for work; young people from social care (16% came straight from care but up to 30% had spent some time in care during their lives); and young people who had left their parental home due to bad relationships with their parent and/or, most usually, a step-parent. All of these young people had issues in their background of poor or disrupted family backgrounds and poor schooling.

By end of the 1990s, however, young refugees became strongly represented among those living in supported accommodation in London and, to a lesser

extent, in other large cities. Whilst some refugees carry some of the same issues as young UK born (white and black and Asian minority ethnic) most refugees do not have the same disrupted, damaged family backgrounds. (UK national report, statistics from London and Birmingham supported housing providers). This is a major reason why key workers find it easier to engage with them in the UK.

Amongst the UK born, young people from Black Caribbean and Black African background are more likely to be homeless in supported accommodation than young people from White and Asian ethnic backgrounds. Young women are more likely to be found statutory homeless whilst young men are more likely to be non-statutory homeless (homeless without a statutory duty from local authority). Currently, key workers also report that they have identified a particular group of young people who are homeless from workless households.

In NL youth homelessness also emerged as an issue in 1980s. It was the first time people realised the problem of young runaways living in squats or in the street, mainly in the big cities. The history of the emergence of youth homelessness is still unwritten. The first publications in the late 80's and early 90's mention some general characteristics of the young homeless. Biggest problems were broken families, dropping out from institutions and criminalization. One in five at that time was addicted to hard drugs. In the 80's economic crises caused huge unemployment amongst young people leaving school. This might have been a reason for homelessness too. But no clear proof is available. At the time youth homelessness emerged no specific services were available for this group. Some of the young people who became homeless at that time have become adult homeless later on. The growth of homelessness among ethnic minority youth occurred in later generations.

In general however the numbers of young homeless people in the Netherlands is proportionately lower than the UK partly because the lack of social housing is not as acute. In the Netherlands 34% of housing units are social. When young people go to college they can register for student housing (although this involves paying an enrolment fee). Young people who leave home, and want to rent a place can register themselves at a housing corporation in the village or city where they want to live but for most cities they must meet the criteria of being local or having work in the area. They are placed on a waiting list, which can take years.

In general groups of young people in NL in danger of becoming homeless are those that have alcohol and drug problems and those who had not completed their education. Specifically, four groups of young people were identified in the NL report: young people with learning difficulties (IQ to 84), teenage mothers, young migrants who were unaccompanied minors but who have been refused leave to stay, and young criminals. A new study is about to be conducted into the circumstances of unaccompanied minors living illegally and issues in relation to 'trafficking' and sex work. A recent study of 315 underage sex workers found that 63% had been trafficked.

In CZ the problem of youth homelessness emerged in the 1990s following the end of communism. Both before and after 1989 parents were legally obliged to care for their children according to the Act on Family and therefore could not evict them to the street. But young people whose parents cannot care for them,

including young migrants with residence permits remain in the care of the state until they are 18 years old. Presently 20,000 young people are in state care, under the Agency for Social and Legal Protection in each municipality. Under-age foreign nationals, with or without residence permits, have temporary protection within CZ under the same arrangements. Young people running away from home and from care, and young people leaving care, also come under the remit of the Curator for Youth who has the responsibility of liaising with other responsible departments for the support of young people into employment and education. However each Curator for Youth has several hundred cases to deal with and individual casework suffers.

Young people leaving state care are able to claim special support but this support is ad hoc in relation to the institution and the young person. One thousand young people leave state care each year and there are places for about one half of them in halfway homes, hostels, municipal social flats, and move-on accommodation within children's institutions. In institutional care there were 44 underage mothers and 18 underage pregnant girls in 2006.

Homelessness became a policy issue in CZ in 2004 as part of the preparations for EU accession. Within the Conception of Housing Policy (2005), under the Ministry of Regional Development, two groups of people were specified as being able to claim special support. First, young people in special difficulties due either to their lack of education and work prospects, or due to being a young mother or father; and second, people with special needs due to their age or health condition or deteriorating social circumstances. These groups may claim supported housing and further support through state subsidies if they accept social work intervention.

During the development of new homeless policies specific problems facing the homeless and other excluded people in relation to particular services also emerged. First, health insurance is only paid by the state until 18 years and after that it becomes the responsibility of the individual unless they are students aged up to 26 years; therefore many homeless people have not paid their insurance or have health debts and cannot access health treatments; there is only one treatment centre for homeless people in CZ situated in Prague. Second, unemployment support is only for those who have worked in the past three years. Third, housing support is provided through municipalities and there is a lack of social housing provision for homeless people separate from voluntary sector provision. Fourth, social protection in relation to housing support is dependent on the person already owning or renting a flat in which s/he is permanently registered; the level at which the life minimum wage is set is very low, at 107 Euros for households and 70 Euros for individuals per month (2007 exchange rates).

Overall the services that are classified for the homeless under the Act on Social Services are easy-access day centres, dormitories, asylum homes and half way homes and in all cases the clients must be over the age of 18 years. Homeless people can also access counselling services, health services and drug and alcohol services. Street work is also undertaken with clients who don't access services. However all these services are also provided by municipalities and dependant on local decisions and provisions. Although a major issue identified by key

respondents in CZ is the inadequacy of services for young people leaving care, services for homeless people are still undifferentiated and without specific services accessible for young people aged under 25 years.

In PT young people in general do not leave their parental home until their thirties and it is only recently that family breakdown, divorce and reconstitution of families has led to young people leaving home earlier. Moreover, the numbers of young people in social care is proportionally small; in 1999 just under 10,000 were living in care compared with 20,000 in CZ, a country with a similar sized population. Most key-workers in existing institutions reported that they had no homeless persons aged around 16-25 years and even those who were homeless with a parent were not separately identified in administrative records. For this reason it is only at an older age that many young people are identified as homeless, because if they are still within their family only the person that asked for help (mother/father) will be administratively registered.

The presenting reasons for all homeless people in PT were associated with family problems (25%), health (23%), unemployment (22%) and housing problems (17%). A third had previously lived with their family (32%), a third in rented accommodation or hostels (31%), and 17% in an apartment they owned. Only 13% had never been in an institution: more than a third had been hospitalised, 18% were ex-prisoners, 17% had been in temporary accommodation or accommodation for those with drug and alcohol addiction. An outreach team in Lisbon found that one third of 1,100 contacts were immigrants.

Agencies identified three groups of young people with specific need for homeless support: young women, children leaving care, and young people of second-generation immigrants and Roma with low qualifications. Portuguese Roma are rarely found in institutions as their family networks and solidarity are very strong. Most young people in state care are white nationals and Plan DOM aims to create an action plan for each young person leaving care in the future.

Box 3.1. Changes in youth homeless population: PT

António Luís Oliveira (institution for children and youth):
"We have passed from the paradigm of families without economic resources to disorganized families Families cannot identify the problems and act in conformity"

IAC - Institute Children Support
"This is a very difficult universe to tackle, namely for their constant mobility and the fact that it does not any longer assume the previous shape of street begging, including presenting signs of neglect, poor cloths, bare foot. The characteristics of the children have changed as well, increasing the difficulties to tackle and reach this universe. Previously, the "street animators" approached a child aiming to establish a good, affectionate, proximate relationship and was easier to involve them using a game with a ball as a first step for proximity. Now their preferences are around consumption goods and they can be wearing named brand cloths. During the late eighties, what we see today for the adult rough sleeping population was also visible for children. However, meanwhile several strategies have been developed, which in parallel with the improvement of social policies to children and youth, have taken to a lower visibility of the phenomenon."

The groups that are seen as particularly socially vulnerable to youth homelessness or youth exclusion in PT include: Portuguese Roma whose family life has been disrupted through a parent's time in prison, or involvement in drugs, or early death; migrants with problems of language and a lack of legal documentation; refugees who have housing support and benefits for up to 18 months to help with integration but face difficulties in getting their qualifications recognised: young adults, whose family cannot deal with their behaviour, or who have low education or low vocational qualifications; unaccompanied minors for whom there are few specialist agencies; and young pregnant women.

Table 3.2 Definition of homelessness, prevalence and young people at risk

Country	Czech Republic	Netherlands	Portugal	UK
Definition of homelessness	ETHOS cats 1-4 Plus ETHOS categories for inadequately housed	Definition of the Ministry of Health, Welfare, Sport, 2004	ETHOS 1-x	Homeless legislation: those without secure accom or a right to secure accom
Who is included?	Street and shelter homeless Other categories reported	Counts of young homeless known to services. Estimates of street young homeless (roofless) and hidden homeless	Street and shelter homeless	Estimate includes yp not in hostels or street but no estimate of those not presenting to local authorities
Prevalence	Limited evidence for young people 1,000 leaving institutional care each year. 9,000 living in accom unfit for human habitation	6,090	Limited evidence for young people	75,000 for those presenting to local authorities or in supported accommodation
Groups of young people at risk	- YP from institutional care - Roma	- YP involved in alcohol and drug abuse - teenage mothers - unaccompanied minors without permit to stay - young criminals	- YP with low education - Roma	- YP from care - Disrupted families - Poor social areas - Refugees
Individual risk factors	- Disrupted families, - Poor families	- disrupted family - Without family - learning difficulty - poor level of education	- Poor levels of education	- Workless families - No family - Violent famies - Education

				excluded
Area risk factors	Workless and deprived areas	No clear information on area risk factors		Workless and deprived areas
Services locality specific	Services in Prague and ?	Services vary between municipalities	Services in Lisbon and ?	Varies between LAs but urban cover good and rural worse.

3.5   Changes in the youth homeless populations in the four countries: youth/ key worker interviews

We asked our interviewees working with young homeless people or homeless people in each country to discuss the changes they had seen among young in the time they had worked in the field.

Some key workers had worked with young homeless people for a long time in the field in NL and UK. In both NL and UK key respondents discussed the way that young people who presented at shelters had become younger and more refugees. In the UK this partly related to the change in referral systems into supported accommodation, from self-referral to local authority decision on who was homeless and required supported accommodation paid through the local authority (see Section 4). Both also thought that mental health problems and learning difficulties had increased.

Box 3.5a) Changes in youth homeless populations in NL

Departmental coordinator crisis relief for young people Zandbergen (Utrecht):
"I can see a change compared to 5-10 years ago in our crisis shelter. The group has become younger, there are fewer refugees. The use of alcohol used to be proportionally higher, but now the problems mainly involve the use of cannabis or the problems that stem from that."

Housing coordinator at-risk youths, Special Accommodation for Young People (Rotterdam):
'I can see an increase in the number of young people with a mental disability, particularly the group with a psychological impairment, young psychosocially, traumatised or psychiatrically impaired young people. This group is large, but it remains to be seen whether this group is really growing. It could also be the case that we now focus on them more or that we can find them sooner thanks to improved cooperation. Another cause could be that the closure of a number of mental healthcare institutes leads to an increase from this group. Another factor can be immigration from a country where their conditions were poor and they have developed traumas due to war or violence.'

Crisis coordinator and social worker at Kwadrant-Emaus:
"Around 50% with us is foreign; nothing much has changed in that respect. Most young foreign people are of Surinamese, Antillean or Moroccan origin. Their problems are similar to those of the young Dutch native people, but you need to take into account cultural differences when providing support. There used to be more problems with drugs, aggression and oppositional, obstinate behavioural disturbances, whereas now psychiatric problems, playing truant, sexually inappropriate behaviour and lover boy type of problems are more dominant. We used to deal with tough youngsters more, now they are the weaker types, of lower intellect. Young people come from secured institutions, they were in trouble with the judicial system at an early age."

Although in the **UK** key workers reported an increase in the number of younger people, young refugees and young people with mental health and learning difficulties as in NL, they also reported an increase in the prevalence of young people from disadvantaged/ workless households and those with criminal records. This was more similar to the experience in CZ. But in the UK one manager also reported that front-line staff were saying that amongst their young people (mostly under 20 years) cannabis use had created mental ability issues.

Box 3.5b) Changes in youth homeless population: UK

Support Manager, Centrepoint Services
RESP   *Yes. So they (local authorities) now have a responsibility for under-18s. So for us, there's not really been lots of changes in terms of the number of beds we've been managing or the number of people that we can house because it's one of their strategic priorities, to house under-18s and young people*

INT   *So local authorities been giving you their 16 and 17-year olds. That's how they've discharged their statutory duty*

RESP   *Yes so the number of under-18s in our service has rocketed.*

RESP   *And there is a massive increase in young refugees as well.*

Manager, West London Young Men's Christian Association
"We have a very high Somalian population and in fact we have a Somalian support worker because we have so many Somalians. Our first Somalian support worker, who we employed several years ago, just everything improved, because we couldn't understand, so we do all things like Ramadan and so on. I have more Muslim residents than any other religion."

Senior Manager, DePaul UK
"Front-line workers are saying that memory loss, short-term memory and young people's inability to retain just basic information is becoming more and more challenging for the group that we're working with. I'm not that au fait with how the market for drugs has changed in terms of - I know it's just increased in strength over the years … front line staff are saying to me, much more nowadays, that the issue around cannabis use is so challenging and getting people to change their behaviour – we have to almost take a harm-reduction approach with it. We're just trying to get people to manage that, manage their use and say to them 'don't go out of the hostel, go down the road and smoke one in the street at 8 o'clock in the morning when you get up', try and manage it in that way."

In CZ interviewees identified a specific problem with criminalized young people who will not be employed (this was also reported in the UK). Other changes they had observed were an increase in young people from dysfunctional families, and specific problems such as gambling and drugs attached to the swift advance of consumer society. Moreover some young people who are sex workers or illegal migrants are not visibly homeless in CZ.

Box 3.5c) Changes in youth homeless populations: CZ

Dom

"*We need to focus more on potentially vulnerable persons, which means family environment. A lot of such family are registered with the Offices of the Social and Legal Protection. Children grow up in such families and if the family is not functional they leave home when they are 18, sometimes even earlier and then they just hang out.*"

Naděje

"*I see homelessness as externality of economic development, market economy, a new trend. One of the trends is a social welfare state reduction. Deinstitutionalization of mental health facilities brought increase in mentally ill people in the streets. One of our clients wanted to burn himself in a psychiatric hospital but they didn't want to admit him anyway because they told him he was faking…We need to change the system of social services financing…We also need prevention because the communist state trained people to be dependant…The state calls all the time for people to behave responsibly, behave responsibly or else it is your problem if you become homeless. At the same time we are under constant attack of advertising push us to behave irresponsibly…and then what happens with those young people who do not resist this pressure? What about the poor ones who told me they didn't want to play (the gambling machines) but before they reach our facility they come across 50 places loaded with the gambling machines? That's a serious addiction, a person starts shaking physically at the sound of them…In such cases the state should not behave democratically but paternalistically…Our biggest problem, of majority of social worker and employees is desperation, sheer desperation that we have no possibility to help those people…When someone is released from prison, he lost his family, where do you find him? In the street. The criminal record means that he is absolutely unemployable…Therefore he is punished for the second time. He wants to work but he can't. What is he supposed to do? Start stealing again and the society will pay again for his prison sentence…The other group are people released from hospitals…They are not dangerous to themselves or others but they are chronically ill. Therefore the person is released but he is released to what if he doesn't have a family or they don't care? Where is he? In the street…the medical emergency called us to tell us they have a homeless and they will ship him to us. When they hear a word homeless, we have to take care of him…we need facilities with a special regime for those who are addicted to gambling or drugs.*"

In PT it was more difficult to discuss changes in the youth homeless population because so few could be found in the services that were provided for homeless people. However agencies reported two issues specifically: the need of young women for homeless support and the problems of young people without education.

3.6 Working with young people from different youth homeless populations to aid their social inclusion

We asked all our interviewees about differences they had found in working with young people from different youth homeless populations: young people from social care, refugees, young men and young women, and young people from white ethnic groups and black and Asian minority ethnic groups born in the country. Our interest was whether key workers in agencies had observed that

some populations of homeless young people find more difficulty in achieving social inclusion than others.

- *3.6.1 Young people from social care*

In relation to young people from social care the story was the same for CZ and the UK. If a young person had lived in social care then their ability to rebuild their lives was affected by this experience

Box 3.6.1a) Young people from social care: CZ

Armáda spásy
"I think there are two levels of this problem, one is related to young minors the other to young adults. In the former case it is about social policy and the social system of the state. The system is fiddly. It's a system of anonymous huge childcare institutions, since we also see in our work that people coming from such institutions find themselves often in the street and they are absolutely unprepared for regular life. They have no social contacts, no social habits…."

DOM
"The absolutely crucial thing is to change the social policy so that children don't grow up in the institutions. If this happened we would not need to exist, it would be empty here. The developed countries abolished such institutions 30 years ago, these "containers" for children. In essence we have to save the problem produced by the society itself. It is different with adults, people can fall out because of addictions, divorces, poverty and some instruments are there to help them. But we provide care to people whom the state wrecked, because it couldn't take care of them in any other way but by putting them into the institutions."

In the UK, as in CZ, not all young people from social care enter supported accommodation for the homeless. In Birmingham in 2000, about a quarter of all young people from social care were identified as homeless over a six months period using the UK broad definition of homeless. Moreover, because of homelessness legislation local authorities have a specific accommodation duty to any young person leaving care who is liable to be homeless, or any young person who is homeless and has been in care up to the age of 21 years. Local authorities refer some young people directly from social care to supported accommodation in order to fulfil their duty towards them; sometimes this means that young people leave care before the age of 18 years and are placed in supported accommodation for young homeless people or leave at 18 years.

Box 3.6.1b) Young people from social care: UK

Project manager, male hostel, St Basils Birmingham
"The one's who've been in care tend to have very little in the way of life skills, have no concept of how to communicate. What my mum would call home training, which is general manners, please, thank you. …It's 'give me my post' – 'sorry, who are you talking to?' and they get quite upset when you challenge that. … Sometimes the way you hear them speak to people on the phone as well, you're just like 'Oh! You can't honestly think if you're ringing the Job Centre and you're screaming at them down the phone that they're going to put your file on the top because I would put it straight to the bottom."

Social care was a less widespread experience **in PT** than in CZ, being about half the prevalence. One of the main problems amongst the predominantly white Portuguese youth from care was that of learning difficulties and/or low educational attainment.

Box 3.6.1c) Young people from social care: PT

In NL a homeless service and a housing corporation can enter agreements about aiding young homeless people (including those from social care) to move into social housing. During their stay in a shelter home they can be placed on a waiting list and at the point of leaving a housing corporation offers them social

housing on the condition that they accept professional support. The first year the house is in the name of the shelter home, in the second year the professional and young person try to reduce the necessary support and in the third year the house is placed in the name of the young person, with no or a little support. Moreover the municipality will offer young people under 27 years, receiving support, work or education.

- *3.6.2 Young refugees, legal and with recourse to public funds:*

There were two groups of young migrants that were discussed with interviewees: the legal and the irregular or undocumented. In the UK only the former were discussed with interviewees in supported accommodation because agencies are dependent on local authorities for their funding and those who have 'no recourse to public funds' (nrpf) are unable to access supported accommodation.

In relation to refugees, young people with a legal right to remain, there was a contrast between the experience of our interviewees in NL and the UK. In the UK interviewees reported they found young migrants/ refugees had more cultural capital than British white and black youth living in their projects. Young refugees were more likely to be focussed on education, on work and on the type of services they required despite some refugees having language difficulties. However they also reported that young refugees had different needs for support in relation to trauma and social inclusion.

Box 6.3.a) Young refugees in homeless agencies: UK

<div style="border:1px solid">

Education support worker, West London YMCA.
"It goes from the refugees that have lost their family, they've lost everything, so they want to change their life, to better themselves. You cans see a more positive outlook from them than from people who feel they have someone and can always go back."

Organisation Manager, St Basil Projects, Birmingham,
"We've found – not in all cases, but in some – we've been on new territory. Things around trauma, that whole mental health and trauma side. …The whole thing of how do you deal with trauma is something we probably never experienced. Issues around bereavement but to a different level – of the mass killings. They have different needs around inclusion more than anything, around breaking down barriers."

Manager, Mother and Baby Unit, St Basils Projects, Birmingham,
"Other than the language barrier, they seem to be a lot more focused on education. They're more clued up about what type of services they can access, what they're entitled to. One of the things I found recently is trying to resettle them – without making sweeping generalisations – the young people who are born here tend to want newer flats, red-brick, pretty inside and want to go and live in nice surroundings, whereas the refugees tend to want council tenancies only, so they can buy them. I'm like 'how do you know?'"

Housing support worker, Foyer, St Basil Projects, Birmingham,
"Very much more focused, very much more focused than young people in this country - they seem to have a goal, an aim from day one and work towards that. The majority have this mission that their next move is going to be a flat of their own. To be truthful, they usually show the better skills for that to be happening. But definitely more focused on things and more realistic."

</div>

In NL the discussion of refugee issues is more complicated because of the definition of foreign born i.e. born in the Netherlands but with one parent not Dutch. There are therefore two groups who are sometimes discussed together. First the unaccompanied minors as discussed by the worker from the Nidos foundation, below, and second young people from second-generation immigrants who are discussed in the next section.

Box 6.3.b) Young refugees in homeless agencies: NL

> *Guardian region Arnhem of Nidos Foundation:*
> *"Children are registered here from a variety of backgrounds: Unaccompanied minor asylum seekers (AMAs), children from Eastern Europe who would like to earn something here, drug mule children, 'child families' (brothers and sisters together), teenage mothers, children who have been given a family supervision order (OTS) and children who have been detained for the purpose of deportation. A highly diverse group."*

In CZ social and legal protection of underage foreigners is provided for those with permanent residence permits or who have authorized residency in the CZ no less than 90 days or have applied for asylum and therefore have the right to stay permanently or to reside with a parent who has applied for temporary protection or received such protection. But the same protection is provided to any foreign child found on the Czech territory with our without right to reside or stay. Therefore a young person under the age of 18 years cannot be asked to leave the country. This is also true in the UK.

In PT the lack of documents affected both those with a potentially legal right to remain and those people who would not achieve a legal right to remain. Moreover it also affected young people born in Portugal but with a foreign parent.

Box 6.3. c) Young refugees and homeless agencies: PT

> *CEPAC - Irregular immigrants and health protocols*
> *"People with physical handicaps have more difficulties in terms of finding insertion options, namely employment, and not mentioning the problems of having a job accident while on an illegal status."*
>
> *CEPAC – immigrants*
> *"The question of being irregular, the issue of no successes… the issue of being alone… the lack of social support… being alone, is unemployment… I think that as an immediate answer the difference from the other populations is having no documents. The pressure at the point of leaving their country is so much that they come without making the calculus of having/getting … they are homeless for the lack of documents, and is a serious thing. At the documentation level, and is good that you mention this: the law demands for permanent authorization a criminal record from the country of origin. This is a hell for many people and many ends up falling into the irregularity due to this document. … We have an attorney to work these issues…But also there are many people… I remember a person from São Tomé, that the criminal record was suppose to arrive by mail – we have a net connection there – but he didn't have anyone there to take the record for him. If it was not us no one would take care of that. Or, and what also happened often, people send money to a friend and afterwards the paper never arrives…these are questions of vulnerability… But (if the person) has more than a one-year sentence the SEF will not give the right to remain. I have a worrying case of a man from Cape Verde that has had a 1 year and 3 months sentence and the SEF is sending him away and he has no one there. "*

> *The criminal record is also demanded from the children of immigrants who were born in Portugal and have never been to their parents' countries."*
>
> *CNAI – immigrants*
> *"… Without documents a person gets his hands and feet tied. After the documents situation, it is obvious that an immigrant citizen that doesn't have adequate language skills finds it harder to communicate, understand, and search for a job. After, the fact of not having family support because many came here alone or see themselves alone from a moment to another, if they are not working, live on what they earn from work and, sometimes, don't have work, don't have a family to ask for help, without work can't pay the rent and end up staying at the streets."*

- *3.6.3 Young asylum seekers, unaccompanied minors without rights to remain and without recourse to public funds.*

This group of young migrants has become important in many European countries. Unaccompanied minors who have exhausted their appeals do not fall within the scope of the CSEYHP interviews as in most cases public funds are not available to accommodate this group of young people or to work with them to prevent homelessness but some issues overlap with that of youth homelessness.

In NL the Ministry of Justice has instructed a literature study to be conducted into irregular unaccompanied minors in the Netherlands; particularly in relation to exploitation (including irregular adoptions) and education. This will be followed up by a field study into the living status of undocumented migrants, former AMVs. This group of youngsters does not receive any living allowance, which constitutes an additional risk. It is expected that the results of this study will be relevant to our study.

A study conducted in 1998 into the nature and scope of sex work among underage girls shows that the number of 'missing' AMVs ending up in sex work is unknown. There are a number of cases known of girls with AMV status who are of a Nigerian or Liberian background. Of the 315 underage prostitutes who had been contacted, 63% ended up in the asylum procedure as an AMV, either before or after having worked as sex workers. Research shows that the Immigration and Naturalisation Service (IND) does not always consider being a victim of human trafficking a reason to stay in the Netherlands, if assistance is available in the country of origin.

In the UK unaccompanied young people who have exhausted their appeal and are aged over 18 years have no recourse to public funds and this is also true in other countries. In both **CZ** and the **UK** they were outside the discourse of the homeless agencies because without recourse to public funds it was difficult for agencies to create an inclusion strategy for young people in this situation. Prior to 18 years of age in the UK and CZ they were covered under the respective national Children Acts. In the UK some agencies had, in the past, used their funds to support some young people in this situation but this has become increasingly difficult.

Box 3.6.3a) Migrants and homeless agencies: CZ

"I think it is crucial to observe groups, which are not so visible and we don't talk about them. We work with such groups but we name them differently than the homeless and then they are not part of the homeless discourse, which means they don't get the services. The street work is focused on one subculture and omits others such as sex workers in the streets. Therefore you don't find them in the National Plan for Social Inclusion. We forget migrants and migrants without documents. They should receive at least counselling."

In PT even young people who had been born in Portugal could find themselves undocumented if they could not provide a criminal record from their parents' home country where they themselves had not been born.

- *3.6.4 Young people from white ethnic groups and black and Asian minority ethnic groups born in each country.*

In the UK young people of different ethnic origins were not seen as having different issues in relation to social inclusion. Most staff (black, Asian, white) simply said they didn't notice anymore so they couldn't say without reviewing their records; the only issue they thought might be different was the problem of gangs and the targeting of some black youth. In the UK young people born in the UK with parents who are legally living in the country of whatever origin, all take the same status with regard to UK citizenship and therefore issues in relation to documentation are the same for all young people: did they leave home with any proof of identity e.g. medical care or birth certificate. The overwhelming difference for the UK was whether the young person had lived in social care and whether they were from workless households with a benefit culture and in that respect they could be from white households or mixed ethnic group households depending on the area.

Box 3.a6.4a. Young people from white and BAME ethnic backgrounds: UK

Manager, Chatham-Medway Foyer, female, white UK
"A lot come from families that have always been on benefit and here we say to them 'yeah, you're on benefit, but that's only while you're studying or looking for work. You've got to try and get yourself out of that benefit trap' and that's a very difficult cycle to break. A lot of them do come from the local area where there is some unemployment and people have been on benefit all their lives and 'why should we work? We'll claim this and we'll claim that'. We do have some success stories. It's not always successful."

"None of their workers thought that their young people felt socially excluded because they felt included in their area and 'you have to want to be included'"

Deputy Manager, Chatham-Medway Foyer, female, white UK
INT   "Would you say in general the young people are socially excluded?"

RESP   "No I wouldn't. They're not motivated but not socially excluded… They come from that sort of background and that's normal to them. People have different aspirations for their children. If their parents haven't aspired too much, they're not putting much on their children to aspire to."

In other countries the issue in relation to those born in the country but with a parent who was not can be different. **In NL** workers in agencies referred to them as immigrants without differentiation between those who were born Dutch and

those who were not. Partly this is because they identify similar problems of both groups integrating into Dutch society. The expert from the Salvation Army (quoted below) refers to cultural differences. Most of the young foreign girls are not 'free', while the Dutch girls are. There are a lot of understanding problems between the foreign youth and their parents (about boyfriends, pregnancy, sexuality etc).) For foreign boys there is the problem of being raised by single mothers and missing a father figure in their youth. They hang out on the streets a lot in the evening but do have much responsibility at a (too) young age. It is difficult to over bridge the gap between your background (family) and living in a Dutch society.

Box 3.6.4b. Young people from white and BAME ethnic backgrounds: NL

Crisis coordinator and social worker at Kwadrant-Emaus
"Around 50% with us is foreign; nothing much has changed in that respect. Most young foreign people are of Surinamese, Antillean or Moroccan origin. Their problems are similar to those of the young Dutch native people, but you need to take into account cultural differences when providing support. There used to be more problems with drugs, aggression and oppositional, obstinate behavioural disturbances, whereas now psychiatric problems, playing truant, sexually inappropriate behaviour and lover boy type of problems are more dominant. We used to deal with tough youngsters more, now they are the weaker types, of lower intellect. Young people come from secured institutions, they were in trouble with the judicial system at an early age."

In **PT** Portuguese born young people with a foreign parent had to get a certificate from their parent's home country in relation to criminal activity (see above). In PT the main group of young people who were affected were two: those from the PALOP countries and the Portuguese Roma.

Box 3.6c. Young people from white and BAME ethnic backgrounds: PT

CEPAC - Irregular immigrants and health protocols
"… racism, xenophobia, etc."

Refugee Jesuit Service - immigrant
"We have situations, for example, people saying: "on Friday I cannot work since my faith doesn't allow me to", and effectively is that way for some ethnic groups that in that sense may constrain their integration... how will I explain to the employer that that person works every day except that one because his religion doesn't allow...So there may be a problem here but I think that at the exclusion or discrimination level it is more the colour of the skin than any other aspect."

Projecto Sementes – Médicos do Mundo
"For the Portuguese Roma there are specificities even in relation with the African that follow an ancestral discourse around their cultural identity but that leaves doors to grasp and move on, but the Portuguese Roma there is a culture of putting themselves apart and don't want mixtures, are very closed. Regarding social benefits there is even an excess of initiative, meaning that almost all get the social insertion income even if they clearly have money. This is a way to legitimate themselves and usually they take the initiative."

"To manage capabilities and expectations is hard since the majority have 4 years of education, which is not enough to build on. Even if they have 6 years of school the vocational training is not very attractive: we are in Lisbon and people are minimally

cosmopolitan and gardening courses for 3 years, or others of the same kind, are not attractive. The essential, due to difficulties on keeping this young people on closed class environments, is to recognize formally the competences gained on informal working environments. As usually Portuguese Roma have children very early this is life stage of change and an opportunity since the wish for another try on a life project is reborn with the new family situation."

In **CZ** the main group of people affected by overall discrimination were the CZ Roma. In the case of homeless people, however, no agencies or NGOs collect data on ethnic or religious background of the clients. However, if a child of the Roma origin is abandoned and grows up in an institution, it is more likely to be affected by discrimination and/or risk of homelessness. In case of Roma it is necessary to take into account they are often reluctant to declare themselves as Roma due to the social stigma.

Box 3.6.4.d. Young people from white and BAME ethnic backgrounds: CZ

<u>Dom</u>
"When we take someone from a very bad family, our success rate is very high. They developed personality structures within the family, it is just necessary to bridge the period so that the kids are safe, finish school, get used to therapy, deal with the issues psychologically and then they live. The success rates are enormous. In case of the kids from institutions it is not the case. The luckier of them had a bad family, but grew up in a normal environment. The longer they are in the institutions, the success rate is lower. For example I don't remember a Roma baby who grew up in the institution to have ever been integrated."

- *3.6.5 Young men and young women*

In the UK interviewees reported that in general young women were more likely to be able to find a social inclusion route than young men. Managers and key workers raised several issues of difference: anger management issues among young men and increased levels of depression. There was more resentment of the benefits system among young men and they were more likely to give up a course if they felt they were not progressing well. Young men also had more problems with alcohol and drugs and violence but this was changing as girls develop 'ladettte' behaviour. Two interviewees reported a difference between how young men and young women were influenced: young men were led by their peers whilst young women were led by their boyfriend.

Box 3.6.5a. Young women compared with young men: UK

<u>Housing and Refugee support worker, West London YMCA, male, Iraqi Kurd, not born UK</u>
INT   "So the boys have got anger management stuff"

RESP   "Yes. Everything they like, they want to get, their attitude, because they are young people, they lack the experience of being mature, of assessing things before you react to them. They do behave a little bit difficult and you felt that sometimes, they are a bit of a risk to themselves and others. That's what's not available in most girls…"

INT   "What about the refugees – the difference between the young women and men?"

RESP *"They are different. Culturally they are different. Because I am from the same background, the same culture, I know the difference, I deal woman as woman and male as male. But they are less violent, they have less issues. So they are always busy with their life, their college, doing some part time work… Boys are much more confident in terms of going to work. Girls are more confident in overall management of their lives. They are good at budgeting. They don't fall into arrears. They do plan what they want to do and in my opinion, they do better."*

Project Manager, mother and baby accommodation, St Basil Projects, Birmingham, female, white UK
"Girls are much more violent these days than I ever remember and I find that very sad. But it's all this ladette sort of behaviour isn't it. They can drink as much as the lads, they'll fight as much as the lads, they sleep with as many boys as the boys were sleeping with the girls. Five (out of 11). . Because some of the parents are exactly the same. This is where it's all come from, when you see them you think 'no wonder, they didn't have a hope in hell from the word go, they didn't'. It's just your luck who you're born to, just your luck."

In PT there is also a rise in the number of young women who have been found asking for support because they are homeless and a problem of young women who choose motherhood as an alternative.

Box 3.6.5b) Young women compared with young men: PT

CVP – HOMELESS
"... there is a vulnerability of the feminine population that before we used to say "the feminine population is always less on the streets since they have other means of subsistence that men don't have", but what is true is that we start seeing more women asking for support in a homeless situation and rejecting prostitution and other ways of subsistence…"

Ajuda de Mãe - pregnant and mother teenagers
"Leaving on benefits becomes a principle inherent to their lives... young mothers is an example where being wrongly informed, or believing that being a mother will give them a right to housing, or "more children, more money", that attributing benefits is a solution… Many are on situations of school leaving and we must fight for their motivation and build rules… it starts with respecting schedules and not arriving always late."

António Luís Oliveira (institution for children and youth):
"Girls have more the tendency to hold on to relationships with older boys and try their autonomy that way. Boys are a bit different and they look for their autonomy by learning things to get along… For boys is easier to find jobs, even if part-time, girls have retail shops… but for boys it is easier that someone takes a chance on them."

In CZ the problem of single mothers was also reported by agencies, as was the problem of never having a settled home but move from partner to partner, or with partners.

Box 3.6.5c) Young women compared with young men: CZ

<u>La Strada</u>
"Very often our female clients upon leaving our services find some kind of accommodation but I would see them in a wider context as persons without home anyway, because they live in rented accommodation, with various partners or they have only temporary shelter. The conditions of such accommodation are heavily below standard, since they are poor and/or foreign origin."

<u>Naděje</u>
"More and more we see young women becoming single mothers in the street. Although we offer them services for accommodation of single mothers such cases usually end up with child adoptions."

<u>Naděje</u>
"I agree with the term episode type of homelessness for girls. They change partners, one moment they are in the street then they find a partner and they are not. Then the relation breaks and they are again in the street."

Section 4 Provision of services for young homeless people and methodologies of work.

4.1 Pattern of services

One of the rationales for the CSEYHP project is that teams from CZ and PT can study the type of services that are available for young homeless people in the UK and NL and compare these with the development of their own services. Both UK and NL have 20 years experience of services for young homeless people. However the UK shares some of the same issues facing service provision in CZ (state care of children) and PT (low educational attainment).

From the national reports it appears that the development of services in PT and CZ will not be in the same order as occurred in NL and UK. In the UK, and to some extent NL, the transformation of services was led by the voluntary sector who first observed young people arriving at services intended for older homeless people and created specialist accommodation for young people with guidance to age appropriate health, education and employment services. A further stage was to provide education and vocational training, and counselling within some of the projects. In the past ten years there has been an increasing emphasis on the involvement and empowerment of the client with large organisations appointing involvement officers to assist young people to share in the management of the agency.

In 2004-5 CZ also undertook a new approach to homelessness and housing need in the preparations for EU membership which emphasised reinsertion but without specialist accommodation. In CZ municipalities are still adverse to the provision of social housing.

From the PT report it is apparent that the types of services that exist are similar to those that existed for older homeless people in the UK in the 1980s: meals, clothing, counselling support, temporary night shelters. But alongside these services there is concentration on the reinsertion of families which emphasises the empowerment of the client, vocational training, professional insertion, information and occupational activities. However specialist accommodation for young homeless people is still lacking. PT mainly has a two-fold approach to homelessness: emergency and reinsertion. Reinsertion for hostel users requires them to have an insertion bond, through being employed or on vocational training and thereafter being provided with more long-term accommodation. For families there are local municipality support offices (SCML, NGO) but not much accommodation.

Changes in PT and CZ reflect the impact of cross-national learning that takes place within voluntary sector organisations through FEANTSA, within international agencies such as Foyers and DePaul, and the development of national services under the stimulus of the European Commission. Joining the European Union has had an impact through the Lisbon Treaty, discussion of national indices of social inclusion, national plans for social inclusion and the Open Co-ordination Method (OCM). These are discussed in Section 5. However, differences in provision also reflect the greater availability of social housing in NL (34% of all housing units) and UK (18%) compared with PT and CZ. In PT social housing has been a minor

development and in CZ attitudes towards the provision of social housing by municipalities remain antagonistic.

In all four countries funding for mainstream homeless services comes largely from government sources supplemented by individual donations and religious charities. However the provision of services for the homeless and the amount of government money spent on them, and on which services, is largely under the control of local authorities. There has been a trend in both NL and UK that central government withdraws from direct provision and hands over finance, tasks and powers to local authorities. In the UK local authority/ municipal authority provision is constrained by the requirements of the Homeless Persons Acts (provision must be made for those who are statutory homeless) but recent changes in funding streams and local authority control of funding have major consequences for access routes into supported accommodation and the funding of support work. Charities working with young people who are irregular immigrants without recourse to public funds (those aged over 18 years) and on behalf of trafficked children have more diverse funding streams.

This section deals with the methodologies of the agencies themselves. It is not organised in relation to the history of services in each country but in relation to the life trajectory of a young homeless person. At which points in their life are services available in the four countries? It therefore deals with:
- Early intervention and prevention of youth homelessness and sites and methodologies for this,
- Services for young people who appear on the streets,
- Provision of supported accommodation,
- Methodologies for working with young people whilst accommodated
- Referrals to other services such as health, drug and alcohol, counselling,
- Reinsertion services – housing
- Reinsertion services – employment and income support
- Reinsertion into family and communities
- Reinsertion through income support

In each section we discuss first the situation in CZ and PT and then in NL and the UK.

4.2 Early intervention and Prevention Services

Early intervention services are those that are available to a young person whilst they are still living in their family home or other carer home but at risk of homelessness - for example, a young person who is running away from home may be directed to an early intervention service. Prevention services are those that are provided at the point the young person presents as homeless either at a municipality or at an accommodation provider; for example, young persons who newly appeared on the streets, or arrive at a local municipal office saying that their parents have thrown them out. Obviously the services can overlap but the intervention methodologies can be very different. Early intervention has a longer time perspective compared with the immediate role of prevention. Early intervention services are more likely to be attached to a service provider that is not a homeless agency e.g. a children's service, an education service, or a local voluntary agency.

Early intervention:
Much early intervention is associated with other policies targeted at young people who are not attending school or not performing well there. However, in CZ there is little early intervention attached to schools because the rate of staying on in education is so high; early intervention is through the social care system which monitors family life for all children. The main early intervention services in CZ and PT are children's services until 18 years followed by specialist provision for young people who have been looked after through children's services.

In CZ the responsibility for child care for those under 18 lies with their parents. If they are unable to perform, then the state takes over within legal limits set by the Act on Family and the Act on Social and Legal Child Protection. Based on this legislation there is a system of bodies, which work with youth at risk. The Body for Social and Legal Child Protection at municipal offices provide field social work, social and legal counselling and social and legal protection of the children. They are supposed to actively look for children whose parents or other persons responsible for them do not fulfil duties given by the laws or are dangerous for the children's upbringing. They are supposed to work with such persons and try to help them remove causes and consequences of the problems and also deal with placing children in foster care. However they are so understaffed that it is difficult for them to achieve any family mediation or family therapy; institutional care is the service they can offer for children in danger.

The Curator for Youth works with children with problematic behaviour including children running away from home. S/he also works with children or youth released from institutional or compulsory care in order to help them to be admitted to schools or jobs. S/he cooperates with schools, job offices, employers etc. Again this service is understaffed and each Curator has several hundred cases.

Social activities are also provided for families with problems in deprived areas, particularly for Roma families, or those in rent arrears. Sometimes such services can be coupled with open access facilities for children and youth. Providing motivation programmes for education, school preparation, and homework as well as leisure time activities. Early intervention methodologies are not very developed in the work with clients. As mentioned before, the prevention policy for youth is in competency of the Ministry of Education. In the case of NGOs, the activities and services related to this field are focused mostly on organizing leisure time for youth in the areas defined as problematic. Such services comprise of providing space for the youth to gather, to use computers and Internet, to provide cultural content (films, theatre pieces) and sometimes to help with school homework or material taught at schools.

In PT early intervention methodologies are also not developed and there is less state care intervention. Therefore in the interviews with workers in agencies for the homeless and other marginalized groups the interviewees proposed a series of measures that should be instituted. Their proposals replicate some services that are or have been provided in NL and the UK:
-     Early intervention at the community/parish level for families and children;

- Parish/Borough level projects: open access facilities for day support centres (CV and job seeking support, cultural activities, etc.);
- Early Intervention Programmes within institutions: diagnostic instruments for preparing young people for independence and in cooperation with the young person (housing and employment integration) avoiding homelessness;
- School mediation: day-to-day counselling bridging student/school/families following a field participatory approach;
- Involving the community: so that all take the responsibility for reporting risk situations. This applies also to the associative type of organizations (cultural, leisure, sports) for youth that do appear less able to involve new generations;
- Empowering young people: the roles of "facilitators" and "peer mentors" in local initiatives are mentioned as very positive for bridging key-workers, families and young people in vulnerable situations.

Early intervention **in NL** is based on an extensive youth service. The Ministry for Youth and Families has been given the task of establishing Youth and Family Centres in larger towns and cities. The ministry also has the objective to encourage municipalities to set up local Care and Advice Teams. In these multidisciplinary teams, professionals from the fields of education, police, compulsory education, youth care and social work, work closely together. The ministry also strives to finalise the needs assessment of young people reported at the youth and family centres within nine weeks. In the case of at-risk youths, the ministry wants to take a tough stance in order to fight nuisance and to guide 'young people on the verge of going off the rails' to education and a job. The aim is to have Family and Youth Centres throughout the country by 2011 and to make sure that the money streams are brought together.

The Youth and Family Centres (CJG) must serve as low-threshold access for children and parents; preferably in a central location, close to other facilities. The central approach in these centres is: one family, one approach. The centre must anticipate risks to children whilst growing up and provide parents with information and advice. CJG plays a role in the case of debt problems, parenting issues, divorces/single-parent families and a family's network in the neighbourhood. The professionals of the CJG are also responsible for making proper referrals when issues are identified, and the CJG - as a gateway - has a transparent relationship with the Youth Care Agency. Professionals of the CJG use an electronic children's dossier and the reference index. These two systems must ensure that professionals can exchange information on a child, and that professionals share risk reports, both in and outside a municipality.

Operation Young (Youth Care Dossier) was a specific intervention that ended in 2007. All government departments collaborated in forming one youth policy the concrete goals of which were: 1) reducing youth unemployment to twice the average level of unemployment; 2) reducing the number of early school leavers by half in 2010 and to 30% in 2006. A further programme was to reduce educational disadvantages among 2 to 6-year-olds by providing language programmes (early childhood education) for half of these children; and to reduce language disadvantages among disadvantaged pupils.

Two methods and instruments for the prevention of homelessness among young people are based on at-risk monitors. A first example is the reference index At-risk Youths. This is a national digital monitoring system that assembles risk reports from social workers, both within the municipalities and across the municipal borders. Social workers can also use it to obtain information on colleagues involved with the youngsters. A second example is the Risk Monitor tool, which has been developed to prevent young people turning into young homeless people. The Youth Care Agency applies this monitor tool among youngsters aged 17, and again when they reach the age of 18. The monitor was set up by JSO in collaboration with the Haaglanden Youth Care Agency.

The Care and Advice teams are professionals who, in cooperation with schools, support children and young people and their parents (social services, youth health care or youth care, the school attendance officer and the police) in trying to solve the problems of these children and young people. Care and Advice Teams react to signals and arrange the right type of assistance when a teacher is unable to do so. The case history of the child or youngster is discussed in the Care and Advice Teams.

In the UK there have been several innovative voluntary sector projects providing early intervention services for youth at risk. St Basil Projects in Birmingham have had a family mediation service since 1993, which both supports family contacts and works with young people and their families.

The 'Safe in the City' programme worked with 13-18 year olds in eight London boroughs between 1998-2003. This programme funded a cluster of three projects and a co-ordinating project in each borough to provide three interventions for young people deemed at risk of becoming homeless: personal development (often through one to one session and group work); educational development; and family mediation. Young people who entered the programme were identified through having two or three of five risk factors: running away, family poverty, school exclusion/risk of school exclusion, problems at home, or disrupted family home. Some boroughs' programmes worked with a more limited range of young people who had many different risk factors whilst some worked with a broader range of young people with two of the risk factors. When 'Safe in the City' ended the idea of providing a cluster of services including personal support, employment/education support and family mediation has been taken up by the Foyers under the heading 'Safe Moves'.

A separate initiative for runaways was funded through the UK government's Children and Young Persons Unit (CYPU); 19 separate projects were funded and evaluated. However referrals to these projects were mostly through Police Missing Persons reports and most models of intervention were based on short-term crisis intervention, although extended into longer-term support in many cases. A major difference between projects was the extent to which they intended to engage with the families of young runaways: from the outset some agencies had a young person centred approach whilst others were orientated to engaging with the whole family.

In 2003 the UK government established the Connexions service in schools replacing the Careers services. Whereas the Careers Service had been a

work/education advisory service for all it was intended that the Connexions service should work specifically with the multi-deprived young people, 5% of the school population, and those at risk of exclusion, a further 15%. Personal Advisors work with young people at risk of failing in schools. Under the Youth Matters agenda the government invested £4.6 billion on young people's services - £2 billion on social services, £0.5 billion on Connexions (targeted at disadvantaged youth) and £0.3 billion on local authority youth services (targeted at all youth). The government has created Extended Schools; schools that offered supportive services to young people and their families.

Therefore early intervention services in the UK are now being provided through Connexions and extended schools, apart from young people who have been in trouble with the police where a range of voluntary sector agencies provide supportive projects. In our interviews agency workers report that there are insufficient services for young people prior to becoming homeless.

Prevention
Prevention services are essentially crisis services at the point at which a young person presents as homeless or becomes homeless.

In PT if a young person aged under 18 years appears as homeless locally they will be directed to an institution, but possibly first being placed in temporary accommodation if necessary. Several agencies may take responsibility: the policy, emergency social services, an NGO the young person has contacted, parish level public services, etc. Those that are already teenagers (15-18) have more difficulty being placed as institutions usually have a younger population and from 16 years the person can be legally authorised to work, but yet excluded from shelters (18 years old). If an adult, or over 18, the young person will be taken care of by NGO or public services that offer accommodation.
In PT early intervention and prevention should be before the crisis and the key sites of intervention should be schools, mediation and support with families, local day centres, etc. Many young people become homeless because prevention and early intervention have failed. Early intervention is also a way for designing an individual plan for each young person leaving care in order to avoid that he/she becomes homeless. This is a goal established by the Plan DOM for young people leaving care.

In NL the prevention of homelessness among young people has received a lot of attention during the past few years by, for instance, the prevention of dropping out of school, of debts and of house evictions. There are special arrangements to pay back debt over three years and some intermediary organisations can reach binding agreements with creditors. If rent arrears are involved the housing associations have to cooperate. However, monitoring and prevention go beyond professionals and the housing association. Family, friends and neighbours also play a major role in this. If people are worried, they can contact various information lines (Regional Reporting and Coordination function on early school leavers, domestic violence, multi-problem families, dirty households) and local neighbourhood and monitoring networks where social workers, the police and schools work together in the neighbourhood. In the case of at-risk children and youngsters, it is important for professionals from different sectors to be able to monitor and report facts (in ICT systems or to information lines).

An example of a specialised intervention is the Homeless' Teams (T Teams). In the early nineties, these teams were set up in a large number of cities to make it possible for young homeless people to find a place in society through short-term, but extremely intensive, ambulatory assistance. Social workers work with the young people during an intensive ten-week process. Each young person will be assigned one social worker. The wishes of the young person are in principle guiding, but they are put into a realistic perspective. All teams have received intensive training on how to apply the so-called Induction Method. Following a two-year period, this method is implemented as regular service. The teams focus on young homeless people aged up to 25 years.

Interviewees reported particular problems with provision for young people from non-White Dutch families and those not engaged in school and work.

Box 4.1: Interviewees on preventing homelessness NL

> *Team leader Streetcornerwork Amsterdam:*
> *"I think there should be something for Moroccan youngsters and Antillean boys, as they don't fit in the Dutch social services system. They've got conflicts at home, they don't want to stand out, but they do want to be independent. Some of them sleep in cars or with friends, but if there was something developed particularly for them, we can make sure nothing happens to them."*
>
> *"Project leader of Youth Intervention Team The Hague:*
> *"Classes in schools should be smaller, making it possible to give a pupil more personal attention. It's important to pay more attention to what young people are interested in, in terms of work for instance. Often they select a job for practical reasons, not because it takes their interest. School drop-out rates could be reduced if young people are supported in practical matters such as student finance."*
>
> *Guardian region Arnhem of Nidos Foundation:*
> *"At the Nidos we notice that unaccompanied minor aliens from a Dutch foster family find it easier to move on to higher vocational education. But how things work out for young people still depends on the basic qualification. There is illiteracy, so in that case it's difficult to move on to an education or job. The youngsters receive language tuition and often focus on a vocational education, provided their future perspective is to 'stay here'. If not, we concentrate on the best way of returning to the country of origin."*

In the UK, following the 2002 Homelessness Act that greatly expanded the priority need groups owed a duty of housing assistance by local authorities, the government produced a briefing that identified three stages of intervention to prevent homelessness: (1) early intervention amongst those identified at risk to support the person and their environment; (2) pre-crisis intervention through advice services, family mediation, landlord negotiation, or work with those leaving prison, care or the armed forces; (3) and prevention of recurrent homelessness through tenancy sustainment.

The government invested £200 million pounds in prevention (or 'pre-crisis intervention') and tenancy sustainment in order to prevent homelessness over a three-year period and pledged further investment. Local authorities have used

the money to provide rent deposits to help people obtain tenancies in the private sector, to provide mediation services to help people stay in their family home (principally young people), support victims of domestic violence, prison based services and to provide tenancy sustainment support for those who were vulnerable and with complex needs.

An evaluation of the prevention agenda for DCLG reported that a huge decline in the number of homeless acceptances by local authorities (from 135,340 in 2003/4 to 63,170 in 2007/8) has partly been the result of changing local authority procedures. In particular local authorities have stressed the 'housing options' routes to people who previously would have been accepted as priority homeless including helping them be placed in private rented accommodation or introducing a waiting time element in their prioritisation. Some local authorities have established a 'priority need' panel to review all decisions. If a household is helped to a private tenancy without going through a formal homeless acceptance there is no right to appeal.

The family mediation services offered by local authorities were largely targeted at young homeless people in order to negotiate remaining in their parental home except where they were at risk of abuse. Some local authorities insisted that young people engage with mediation over a set period despite, in some cases, family relationships having completely broken down. Most family mediation procedures have no measure of long term sustainability of the young person remaining in that home and leaving home safely. Two youth homeless projects that we interviewed had long-term family mediation attached to them and both were seeking to develop methods of registered outcomes.

Young people leaving prison or youth detention are at extreme risk of homelessness. DePaul UK have specialised in providing advice and supported accommodation for this group of young people in order to prevent them becoming street homeless. They work with young people in youth detention centres before they are released and direct them to the appropriate services. They also co-ordinate forty local 'Night-Stop' services.

4.3   Services for young people who appear on the streets

Within street counts young people are a minority of the homeless; young women even more so. Most street homeless situations and services are dominated by men aged 25 years through to 45 years and up. Young people find other public places to sleep or stay - buses, cars, train stations, tower blocks, parks – or they sofa surf. The young people who are picked up on the streets or in day centres are often directed to other services by outreach teams.

In CZ the Act on Social services includes fieldwork and an important service for the work with the street homeless are outreach programmes on the street. There are also emergency night shelters where clients stay one night and leave in the morning, and open access day centres. These provide temporary support, with some services of washing and laundry, food and basic medical help. Some organizations do not register their clients except by numbers.

In PT the new National Strategy for the Integration of the Homeless (2009-2015) establishes a proposed model of intervention and accompaniment in two phases: a) Emergency Intervention and b) Support after the Emergency. In the first instance a case manager is appointed and the person is taken to an emergency centre for one month for case assessment; these centres have yet to be created.

The second phase is based on the individual action plan prepared by the caseworker. The Individual Insertion Plan is created with the person and the caseworker mediates with different agencies that are required to provide assistance to the person through the lifetime of the insertion plan using existing resources. A system of information will register and update the clients' situation. This process will last up until the client achieves autonomy from the homeless situation, but those people that still require support will be directed to municipal/local authority social services. It is proposed that the initial caseworker will follow the case for three years, in order to avoid relapses into homeless situations. The risk groups named in the strategy are those leaving care, leaving prison and the ex-military. The strategy may lead to more transitional apartments for young people leaving care.

In NL a distinction is made between facilities for people who are 'actually' homeless (walk-in, day and night shelters, crisis centres) and for the 'residential' homeless (women's shelter, 24-hour provisions, social guest houses). There are some residential homeless shelters for young homeless people, although not always available in all central municipalities. Good life-support guidance during shelter (by professionals working in shelters or for example by T-teams and youth intervention teams) is essential to help people move on and move out. A stocktaking in 2003 of assistance provided to young homeless people in 2003 showed 67 facilities with a combined total of 787 beds. Most of these facilities concern residential shelter.

Shelter for unaccompanied minor aliens (AMVs) consists of the Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (COA) (children groups, small housing units, campus and protected shelter to reduce the risk of disappearance) and shelter by the NIDOS (minor asylum seekers - shelter and living in host families). Of course, there are also AMVs who drift about (called 'Zamas' – homeless, unaccompanied minor asylum seekers). SAMAH (Unaccompanied Minor Asylum Seekers, Humanitas Foundation) focuses attention on this group: 'Zamas have to drift about in a society with which they are not familiar. They are therefore not in a position to find the channels that offer assistance. For many, the lack of adequate crisis centre is a major problem in the field'. Undocumented young people can't live on the streets as they would be taken into custody by the police and expelled from the country.

In UK there has been rough sleepers' initiatives or strategies since 1991 in London; and in other cities from 1996. The numbers of rough sleepers has fallen dramatically because the old sites where many congregated were broken up by police and municipal action. An alarming tendency, reported by Homeless Link, is that many people from A8 countries, without recourse to public funds in the UK because they have not worked a sufficient length of time, have joined the rough sleepers.

In 2008 the SNAP survey covered three types of services: day centres, direct access hostels and second stage supported accommodation. Day centres worked with 10,000 people per day and there are at least 50,000 beds of which one fifth were direct access/emergency accommodation. The SNAP survey reported, based on Supporting People data, that there were 118,500 episodes of households or individuals accessing SP funded accommodation in the three homeless risk groups: single homeless people with support needs, young people at risk and rough sleepers. This includes some double counting and SP figures put the numbers closer to 75,000 whilst the real figure lies somewhere between.

Few young people are found among the street homeless or at day centres, unless they are older (20 years and above) who have a history of homelessness. For young people who are discovered on the streets by homeless persons' units or CATs (contact and assessment) teams in major cities, most local authorities or London boroughs will have separate procedures in order to provide emergency accommodation while the case is assessed. For example, West London YMCA now takes all its referrals from the local authority but still takes referrals from the street outreach team that works in the local borough of Ealing and West London. In most urban areas there will be some emergency beds available in supported housing. Centrepoint has one facility in the centre of London that provides a nine night stay for young people aged 16 years or over without local authority funding.

Another alternative is 'Night Stop'. These are volunteer hosts who will take a young person at risk of homelessness on the streets for up to three nights whilst suitable accommodation is provided. DePaul UK co-ordinates forty night stop organisations that work in different areas in the UK. They are especially useful, given DePaul UK's work in youth offender institutions, in supporting young people when they first come out of detention.

4.4 Access to other services: health, drug and alcohol, counselling,

In CZ other services for other target groups can also be used by homeless persons such as counselling centers, services for the persons with health disabilities, for the drug or alcohol addicts, etc.

In PT key workers find partnerships in order to support the family with the young person, or to support the young person. Some emergency level shelters also offer the methadon program. The outreach teams of the NGO "Comunidade Vida e Paz" also offer therapeutic apartments in farms or the public social services in communities outside Lisbon. The waiting lists are long and there are no services in the time of wait taking to dropouts from the applicants.

In NL anyone can go to a Wmo (established under the Social Support Act) counter in each local community for information, support, and counselling. The professionals at the Wmo counter must offer the person help or begin a programme of guidance. For addiction services there is internet counselling (free advice and support) or, for most people, a waiting list for mental health services or addiction programmes.

A key worker at a homeless service must be able to cooperate with organisations specialised in drugs or mental problems. It is important to create access to other services/places where the client can stay if their problems are too complex.

In general social workers are available for family problems, debts, housing or work/income problems and psychological problems without the intervention of a caseworker. But to access social work services a person must be part of the insurance system (+/- 100 Euro per month) and to access a doctor insurance is also needed.

In the UK, access to services depends on which type of facility the young person is in. If they are among the rare young people who are street homeless some health facilities will be available at a Day Centre as well as vocational training and drug and alcohol counselling. Or they can access one of the NHS walk-in centres in city centres.

Young people living in supported accommodation access health services through their General Practitioner (GP or local doctor) as any other UK citizen. As young people often stay more than three months in principle they are permanently registered with a local GP practice, unless they live close enough to their previous GP, and their access to health services is through the normal GP route. All health services are free and not dependant on insurance payments. For the mother and baby unit there was a weekly visit from the health visitor to check on the babies and talk about food and also visits from the Sure Start programme.

In general access to physical health services are good but access to mental health services inadequate. The Foyer Federation established a pilot 'Strong Minds' project to enable young people to gain access to Community Psychiatric Nurses and then to mental health support. This project demonstrated the unmet need within this group of young people. As already reported, two of the agencies that have been interviewed for this project run their own family mediation services – St Basils and DePaul Trust – and St Basil Projects has added a counselling service to their family mediation project.

Box 4.2. Access to health services, UK

> _Project manager, young mothers and babies, St Basil Projects, Birmingham._
> _"Stay and Play, we have every week, coming from Flying Start… And they don't think they need to talk to the babies because 'they're babies, they don't understand me'. If you've been in care an you haven't had any parenting as such…I say 'it doesn't matter if you read the newspaper to them, as long as you're talking to them'…So, it's really basic stuff you're getting back to. 'What's the point of it? She doesn't understand what I'm saying' or ' she can't answer me back'…And the Health Visitor also comes in."_
>
> _Project manager, young man's project, St Basils, Birmingham_
> _"Counselling, we've got a generic service at Prevention. From what I gather it's got quite a long waiting list now. It was really exciting when she first came in because everybody got access quite quickly. Though it's still the quickest route. There are other organisations that we can tap into - via the GP is going to be the quickest route. But it's always going to be dependant on whether they've got a GP and if they've seen them recently and then persuading the GP to make the referral in the first place."_

For drug and alcohol support projects may refer to their local drug and alcohol teams (DATS) but these also have long waiting lists.

4.5   Provision of supported accommodation,

The provision of supported accommodation varies across the four countries in relation to the amount of social housing available (little in CZ and PT, rationed in the UK, more extensive in NL), the extent of accommodation and support offered by the voluntary sector, and restrictions on access to those services.

In CZ The Act on Social Services names 33 types of concrete services for various target groups including social counselling (2 types of services), social care services (14) and social prevention services (17). The services for the homeless are classified by the law among the social prevention services and they are: easy-access daily centers, dormitories, asylum homes and halfway homes. The clients must be 18 for these services, otherwise they come under the social care system. Municipalities and districts are responsible for social services (subsidiarity principle) and this means that it is always up to the local politicians´ decision which social services they will financially support.

In the case of more permanent type of accommodation, the clients receive not only accommodation to up to a year but also legal, social and psychological help. Such a type of accommodation includes shared living spaces but also a degree of privacy (separate rooms with joint kitchen and/or bathroom). The so-called training or protected accommodation can sometimes be in the form of an individual flat in which clients learn how to manage their household. Most clients are referred only to temporary accommodation, of which there are an inadequate number of spaces in Prague (especially in winter): overnight shelters in CZ have 491 beds (2005), of which Prague has 267 beds (2004). If a client is seen as being motivated and with the potential to improve their situation, then s/he can be accommodated in various types of protected accommodation facilities. This is also possible for some mothers with children or a whole family,

Considering the high proportion of those who had to leave institutional care when they become 18 and the number in the general young homeless population, there is a lack of training or protected housing for young people where they would get a chance to learn how to manage a household. The same applies to young people returning fro prison (sometimes after institutional care) or homeless having lived in a dysfunctional family. For young care leavers there are less than 500 places nationally, after they have left care, but more than 1, 000 leave care each year.

In PT young homeless people are invisible in the administrative records of organisations and there is a lack of supported accommodation and a lack of accompanied key working. The services that exist for all homeless people (of a total of 70 private and public institutions at the national level) include: "meals" (56); "hygiene" (50); "clothing" (57); "health" (23); "psychosocial support" (54); "temporary night centre" (30); "Assisted housing" (5); "methadone" (11); "occupational activities" (20); "vocational training" (15); "professional insertion" (24) and "information" (33) (ISS, 2005).

In NL there are two types of supported accommodation. The availability of social housing has allowed some young people (particularly young mothers) who would be homeless to move into 'reversible' housing. Reversible housing is conditional. With the support of an (ambulant) social worker or volunteer the young care

leaver has to prove that he or she is able to live independently. After a certain period of time the house will be officially in the name of the young care leaver

Box 4.3. 'Reversible' Housing in NL

<table>
<tr><td>

Sheltered housing supervisor crisis relief for young people (Utrecht):
The Salvation Army has made arrangements with the housing association, as a result of which homes are available to young people on a regular basis. During the first year, the house will be in the name of the Salvation Army, and in the second year it will be in the name of the youngster. The support is finalised during the third year. This promotes the throughput of assistance and youngsters are able to retain their social networks."

Coordinator of the information centre for pregnant girls and young mothers:
"You have to prevent them from drifting by giving them something suitable, the 'reversible house': a house with one year of support. If all goes well, it is reversed into your name. That's one of the things that can prevent them from drifting. There's a lot to be gained from prevention. We've got to prevent them from going into care, because then they will be part of a group process, where a lot of things are done for you, and it's full of girls with all sorts of problems. It's not easy. It's better to let girls who are able to do so, try for themselves, first with intensive but later with less intensive ambulatory assistance. Giving all young mothers a house on the basis of urgency doesn't work, but as things stand right now, there aren't many options."

</td></tr>
</table>

The other type of supported accommodation is that of pensions, hostels or other forms of housing providing dedicated beds. The last stocktaking of provision of supported accommodation for young homeless people in the Netherlands was in 2003; 67 facilities provided 787 dedicated beds.

In NL young people are also found living in other facilities. Homeless shelters and women's shelters had 67,500 clients in 2006 at a ratio of 5:1 homeless: women's shelter beds. In women's shelters approximately 4,500 were children (aged under 16 years) and in homeless shelters approximately 3,200 were children. Nearly one fifth (18%) of the children who present at homeless shelters present on their own. Around 9-10% of clients of day centres (4,500 clients in total) and of emergency night shelters (3,300 in total) were young people aged between 16 and 23 years in 2004. Separately there are shelters for unaccompanied minors and also shelters for whole families who are seeking asylum

In UK the reduction of social housing to 18% of all housing units has led to a change in provision for young homeless people. Whereas some young people, including young couples and young mothers, could be directly placed in social housing in the past, currently this is less common. Local authorities are now more likely to discharge their homeless duties to priority need young people by placing them in voluntary sector supported accommodation, including young people from care, young mothers, and young refugees. Arrangements whereby hostels could then ask for reserved places in social housing for the young people that are living with them are coming to an end (see below Section 4.8).

The provision of supported accommodation through the voluntary sector is extensive in the UK. It began expanding twenty years ago following the rise in youth unemployment and ending of youth welfare benefits in 1988. Prior to this

only major cities had some provision; for example Centrepoint had provided shelters for young people who came to London. However, across the UK, as young people appeared at shelters intended for older people voluntary sector agencies created shelters specifically for them, YMCAs used their bed spaces for homeless young people (first a proportion and now almost entirely), some Foyers were newly built, and the DePaul Trust was established as well as other provision. As already reported 35,000 young people aged 16-25 lived in supported accommodation during one year in 2006-7. In the case of young homeless people their accommodation is funded separately through capital grants and rent payments through the Housing Benefit system (now Local Housing Allowance).

In 2003 a central government funding system was established to fund all support work in supported accommodation (for the elderly, the incapacitated, the homeless including young homeless amongst others) bringing together all funding streams from social services, local authorities, probation services etc. *Supporting People* as it is known provided £1.8 billion targeted at support for six vulnerable groups including young homeless people in the first year. Subsequent budgets have been lower than this but this level of funding has allowed the quality of supported accommodation, including the service offered to young people, to be raised considerably. Key worker support is funded through this pot of money as is the work of other support workers including move on or resettlement support.

However, from April 2009, all Supporting People funding has reverted to the general amount of money received from central government by each local authority and spent by them. NGOs working with young homeless people report quite different experiences of this transfer of funds; some have had no cut in their support work budget whilst others have been cut back to almost rent levels. Not all supported accommodation is in large single site hostels. Some foyers or hostels are very small (12, 20, 30 beds) and in some rural areas there are dispersed facilities (several small housing units developed across a local authority). SP funding and the Places for Change programme have also led to a change in the quality of accommodation; most young people have been accommodated in their own room in self-contained accommodation or at least accommodation where they have their own bathroom and share a kitchen.

Within supported accommodation there can be different facilities offering different lengths of stay. From our interviews first stage accommodation was generally smaller (less bed units) and worked more intensively on risk and needs assessment during their stay. One Project Manager of DePaul UK(most of whose supported housing units are under 20 beds) reported weekly meetings and even daily contact for up to six months before a young person moved into a foyer run by another agency where the key working sessions could be once a month.

4.6   Methodologies of key working in supported accommodation

There is a difference in methodology between one case worker following a client from entry to exit and those situations where different workers specialise on helping the client at different stages: whilst in supported accommodation and afterwards. There is also a difference in relation to the use of administrative records. In CZ, agencies are still sceptical about the use of forms whilst in the UK

they are embraced as a way of providing the value of the work and maintaining funding from the appropriate local authority.

In CZ some NGOs offer supported housing to young homeless people and most service providers in this field offer some kind of training such as computer skills development. They also provide help with re-training courses financed by the state or provide the possibility to finish high school or apprenticeship school. In terms of job provision, some have special contacts with job agencies that are trained to deal with their clients in a sensitive way and look for jobs appropriate or available for them. There are less than 500 places in halfway homes which offer supported housing and other services. Other organisations provide special services for specifically targeted groups.

Because of young people's experiences of institutional care and dysfunctional family backgrounds, life skills training services are very important, including the basic duties of everyday life such as obtaining documents, paying bills, applying for social benefits, etc. Institutional care tends to develop dependency pattern with young homeless people, which is reinforced partly by the system of care provided by the NGOs. Some clients spend entire days walking from one NGO to another at the time when they offer food or clothing. Some key-workers complained that the current system in which a client can use the same service within various organizations reinforces dependency in managing everyday life and even that it might be beneficial for some NGOs to keep the clients dependent.

Box 4.4. First contact, interview in CZ

La Strada
"The law or rather regulation directs standards in dealing with a potential client who is interested in obtaining a service and the method it directs is individual planning. It works in such a way that a person, who needs our service and satisfies criteria for its provision, gets his/her key worker. She maps his/her situation and based on what the person says, concludes a sort of contract, which is consensus between the demand of the person and supply of the organization. Then out of this we create a concrete goal. The contracts are typologized and they include housing, job, health condition, financial help, social contact with institutions and social environment, legal counselling, representation before institutions, etc. The debts are also included. We have no form or questionnaire."

La Strada
"We invite them to our office and analyse their situation through conversation. We have forms, but we use them rarely, usually it's conversation, consulting…We make records out of the conversation based on methodology of conducting an interview with a social worker…The first contact should show what a client needs, what s/he wants and some kind of agreement of what we can offer and if that's what s/he needs. If not, we try to direct him/her to some other NGOs or state sector."

Dom
"The idea that you can gather all information in one interview is very naïve. The interview has a certain structure, we want a person to describe his/her situation, what s/he needs, what s/he strives for. We discover their strong sides sometimes even for half a year. This type of discovering lasts for months and includes intensive work. I can't imagine any of our clients to open him/herself in one interview. These people are very confused when they turn to us. When someone comes from the institutional care, where he lived all his life, it's as if he came from another planet. They often think they are good in something and it

doesn't correspond with reality. We try to get their situation from them but they often come in such state that it is impossible. What they describe, what they tell us they miss and what they want from us – we take it all with reserve. Our clients are not good in self-reflection."

<u>*Projekt Šance*</u>
"A form is the worst way for our clients, together with in-depth analysis and taking photos. That's when anonymity disappears and such a child never comes back again. Everything is on voluntary basis, based on feeling of safety and prevention of hopelessness, which means no forms. I take a record but not in front of the client.."

In PT most of the work of support is targeted on families. The National Inclusion Plan for 2006-8 aims to rationalise the support that is given to each family who is assigned a professional caseworker. The strategy introduces a new social care professional that will be a bridge between several services where the client may have other direct social worker. The caseworker will also follow the client. This new intervention practice has been only just identified in the national strategy and not yet put into practice.

Box 4.5. A need for monitoring intervention, PT

<u>*CEPAC – Irregular Migrants and Health Protocols*</u>
"Lack of contract and monitoring: "The problem is at the contract and accompaniment; it is not only about creating human stock houses. It demands key workers. I cannot have 30 clients on my own because I will not be able…By the way, and you can publish what I am going to say, I see that they send here people for the labour market insertion that are under the RSI (minimum insertion income) and who are obliged to come here and search for work. But afterwards they don't put their feet here and nobody controls that. I am not against the workers because they cannot do everything. The problem is at the monitoring level. This is the key problem."

In NL universal methodologies of key working are most advanced of the four countries: two methods in particular are often employed in shelters for young homeless people.

In the first instance, the eight-phase model. This is a frequently used method for working systematically in social shelters. The method describes the eight different phases in the social assistance process – from reporting in to moving out. It helps social workers to elaborate eight practical areas systematically with clients. These practical areas are housing, finances, social and psychological functioning, purpose, physical and practical functioning and daily activities. NIZW (Netherlands Institute for Care and Welfare -now MOVISIE) introduced the method in 2004. In 2002 and 2003, prior to the introduction, there was an extensive practical survey undertaken at six social shelter organisations. Today, the eight-phase model is the most widely used method in social shelters, according to a survey ('What Works'?) among shelter organisations carried out by MOVISIE.

The hold-on intervention method (Altena, Brilleslijper-Kater & Luijtelaar 2009) was developed by UMC St. Radboud in cooperation with several facilities for young homeless people. The aim of the hold-on method is to increase the self-reliance, independence and quality of life of young homeless people. Various activities were introduced in the development of the intervention, including group interviews with young people, interviews with workers, an international literature study into interventions that had proved effective with young homeless people and working groups with young people and workers to discover the active ingredients in methodical treatment, along with the organisational conditions necessary (Academic Workplace, Shelter & Public Mental Health Care (OGGZ) Nijmegen).

In the UK methods of key working have developed across different agencies. Increased government funding has allowed workers to specialise on aspects of key working with the client rather than working the young person's case from beginning to end. The change particularly coincided with the development of services prior to Supporting People funding.

Box 4.6. Specialist working for key workers, UK

Emergency accommodation and advice worker, Link Services, St Basils, Birmingham, white male UK

"… when I was a key worker, you'd have to start from scratch, take them to the council interviews for the flats, and move them into the flats – it's all changed a lot now. I don't think you'd last very long without commitment in this.

…I did have a spell of nearly 4 months off work, just stressed and burnt out…That's back in 1997,98…Before, you're trying to do your job, you couldn't devote that amount of time you'd do the basics and …you'd do your best…I noticed the change [becoming more specialist] a couple of years after I moved over … (2002-3)."

Currently common methods of working are developing around two government initiatives: the introduction of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and emphasis on monitoring the five outcomes for young people under Every Child Matters. However, agencies also have their own methodologies built out of a mixture of motivational interviewing techniques and other training developed within the agency.

Now that local authorities are in control of the referral process once a vacancy occurs in supported accommodation a local authority may send two or three young people for interview by the agency. The first stage is an interview and a risk assessment based on the paper work that has been sent with the young person from the referral agency. The introduction of the CAF to be used by local Social Services and other providers will increasingly standardise this part of the process. Some who appear to be difficult or a potential risk to other young people will not necessarily be excluded; managers describe making an assessment as to whether it is possible for the project to manage the risk.

After a young person is admitted to the accommodation then the most common method of engagement is to provide a key worker who will undertake a holistic assessment of their needs. In one agency – the small Foyer – one worker did not

follow one young person all the way through but different workers took responsibility for organising different aspects of life with the young person – the first assessment was by the Deputy Manager, then employment/education/life skills were separately assessed with that worker, whilst another worker dealt with their benefits and welfare. The whole team of 11 worked with 27 young people. In the UK there has been little investigation of the different key working methodologies that different accommodation providers use. Amongst older homeless people one particular model of key working developed by St. Mungos (The Outcomes Star) has been taken up by Homeless Link and widely copied by other agencies working with older homeless people. However amongst young homeless people's agencies this model is less prevalent. In order to ascertain how widespread the use of this and other model is the CSEYHP UK team requested the Homeless Link /RIS (now amalgamated) team to include a question on key working in their latest SNAP telephone survey of agencies. The results of this survey will be available later in the year.

From the interviews the UK team have undertaken with project managers and agency workers in five different types of projects several themes have emerged about the different methodologies used, and the changing provision of key work or support work.

1.   All agencies have formal risk assessment procedures which are used to manage the risk an individual young person may present. Supported accommodation that have night staff cover are prepared to accept quite high risk young people, from prison and with drug and alcohol needs, whereas those without night staff cover cannot because of the risk to other residents.

2.   Routes into supported accommodation are now through referral from local authority housing departments (or homeless departments), social services, and sometimes the local rough sleeper team (Contact and Assessment team). If the local authority cannot fill a vacancy then the agency can fill that vacancy with another young person. It is increasingly difficult for young people to self refer – they must go through the local authority. No agency could take young people who had no recourse to public funds (asylum seekers) except Centrepoint which had one of its many hostels in London funded through private donations.

3.   Staff are currently being trained in the use of the Common Assessment Form that is being rolled out for the assessment of all children and young people.

4.   Because of the need to monitor outcomes for funding purposes including funding from local authorities, most agencies have developed their own databases alongside the information they must keep for Supporting People Client Records. St Basils has developed a database called Spectrum for spheres of intervention similar to those in the '8' steps model. DePaul UK has developed a database that tracks intervention with young people across the 5 outcomes of Every Child Matters: staying safe, being healthy, making a positive contribution, economic well-being and enjoying and achieving: 'Our Link database – we've aligned it with the Every Child Matters outcomes … We're now able to report back on how we're achieving and how young people are achieving in those 5 areas, as a way to prove what we do, value for money, return on investments'. (Regional Manager, DePaul UK). Centrepoint is also recreating its database in order to monitor outcomes.

5. The primary focus of the key working sessions is action planning – even quite small steps – in order to re-engage young people or to support those who are engaged and require to go further. Most key workers in larger agencies described action planning key working sessions being monthly in order that the young person could have progressed in the intervening time but actually meeting with the young person more frequently than this. All action plans are agreed with the young person. Almost all managers and key workers report that any action plan for a young person has to be personalised.

6. For Foyer residents engagement with a life-skill, education and/or employment action plan is a condition of the licence they have to remain in their accommodation. Some key workers have expressed the view that they would like that to be a common condition across all supported accommodation.

4.7   Reinsertion services – housing

As already reported the situation with respect to the availability of housing support is very different in the four countries.

In CZ a major problem for reinsertion of young people into social life lies in the lack of social housing for young people who, since they tend to be less educated, can expect worse paid jobs and can hardly afford commercial rents.

For people in danger of social exclusion the three most important Acts are: the Act on Social Services; the Act on Help in Material Emergency; and the Act on State Social Support. This latter Act enables people, depending on their income, to claim housing benefits. However, for a person to claim this benefit s/he must own or rent a flat in which s/he is permanently registered and whose housing expenses represent more than 30% of the family income (this also applies to those living in a room within facilities for permanent housing according to the Civil Code).

In PT there are the very few transition apartments for those leaving care that the National Strategy aims to develop. Also protected residences for those that have insertion limitations (like learning difficulties) are practically inexistent.
The existing social housing stock from the Re-housing Plan (PER) of the 1980s is managed in Lisbon by a city council enterprise called Gebalis. The Gebalis has local offices at the different boroughs that may offer some counseling and provide information on other available care services. These houses are fully occupied and the existing places to offer homeless persons will depend on vacancies through the death of the previous tenant. Portugal registered in 2000, 14 social houses per 1000 inhabitants (Social Housing European Observatory).
The social emergency service may contemplate a temporary support for hostels. The local government services should visit households at their homes but the general remark is that the social workers do not have the time and conditions to make domicile visits.

Box 4.7. Move-on and housing provision for young people in PT

> *SCML-DADIJ:*
> *"The existing residences of autonomy, in Lisbon, for young people that were institutionalised have spaces for 3 boys and 3 girls. According to the interviewee: "We have 21 young people above 18 years old" and the offer doesn't cover their needs. These cases are the ones that have, after social care, followed university studies and are not yet working."*
>
> *"Not all the young people have the capacity to be independent and self-sufficient and insert in the society, so of the 21 young people that we have, many have a learning or education difficulty and after the institution there is a difficulty of insertion. So, they are kids that will always need answers, namely of something that doesn't exist much, that are supported or sheltered accommodation."*
>
> *António Luís Oliveira - institution for children and youth:*
> *"Access to social housing is constrained by the number of houses available and also by the bureaucracy involved in the process, including for unfolds requests related to family enlargements."… This young girl has the house where she lives with her mother and still has her belongings there. She has the key. It would be possible for her to stay with the father of the child in that house… but the City Council says no… says that they must give back the house and afterwards another will be offered to them… when the passage could be direct. By other words, very bureaucratic processes that make people lose interest…"*
>
> *"For the transition apartments it is very, very complicated… it is hard, there are few places and the young persons are almost required to submit to selection and prove that are competent, autonomous and that they want… If he was 16 or 17 it is a gap – those years that they are becoming adults but are not yet legally adults."*

In NL, as mentioned, the availability of social housing has led to the possibility of 'reversible' housing for young people, placing them in the accommodation which they will eventually occupy; in the first year they have intensive support and from then may be independent.

There are also specialist interventions on the part of housing support for young people at risk. One example is the 'Take Off' project. This is part of the 'Give Shelter a Chance' project (Federatie Opvang, Aedes 2009), which endeavours to prevent evictions, offering a new future, besides housing, of learning, working and societal participation. Take Off is an initiative of Aedes, an umbrella organisation of housing associations, in cooperation with the Netherlands Foundation for Young Homeless People (SZN) and the Federation Shelter. The aim is that housing associations should not only provide suitable housing but also work-experience jobs in their own organisations or by business relations, possibly combined with a schooling trajectory. Take Off has been implemented at ten locations.

Another example is the Kamers met Kansen (Rooms with Opportunities) project, which strives to help young people become self-reliant within eighteen months, with educational qualifications or a job. The pillars of Rooms with Opportunities are based on housing: young people with different backgrounds live with their

peers, making joint use of available facilities. For this project safety and affordability are essential aspects of the provision.

In the UK the situation with respect to housing reinsertion has changed immensely since the 2002-5 'prevention' agenda and the growth of demand for social housing in the current situation of very high housing costs. In the past young women who were pregnant or about to become mothers might expect to move directly into social housing accommodation. Similarly if a young person was homeless living in a hostel then most would expect to be re-housed in social housing. This was less true in London than elsewhere but was still the norm for some hostels with good working arrangements with their local authority housing departments. With a decline in the availability of social housing and lack of new built social housing this option has become less available.

Box 4.8. A lack of move-on social housing, UK

> *Manager YMCA, West London, female*
> *"…. We are temporary accommodation here and unfortunately people think that once you're at the YMCA - in the past it probably was truer than it is now – that they just have to stay with us for a couple of years and then they get their council houses. This doesn't happen now – we have a terrible bottleneck. People are frightened of the private rented sector. Every council is trying encourage people to send clients to the private rented sector, but in Ealing they won't do a rent deposit scheme for under-25s. They haven't got the money. Because of the Housing Benefit variation, if you're under 25, landlords don't really want you because they can't charge what they want to charge. It's difficult changing the mindset. I think a lot of parents throw their children out, thinking they'll be on the streets a couple of days, then they'll go to the nice hostel, then they'll get their own place. But it doesn't work like that."*

An evaluation of the prevention agenda for DCLG reported that changing numbers of homeless acceptances (a fall of 50% from the peak in 2003/4 of 135,340 to 63,170 in 2007/8) has partly been the result of changing local authority procedures. In particular local authorities have stressed the 'housing options' routes to people who previously would have been accepted as priority homeless. 'Housing Options' includes placing people in private rented accommodation or introducing a waiting time element in their prioritisation. Some local authorities have established a 'priority need' panel to review all decisions. If a household is helped to a private tenancy without going through a formal homeless acceptance there is no right to appeal.

Even those households who have been accepted as 'priority need' under the Homeless Legislation are being placed in private rented accommodation with an assured short hold tenancies (which are renewable on a six month or other contract), sometimes with support through rent deposit schemes. Some managers of projects we spoke to thought that such placements meant that young people remained trapped in high rent accommodation that they could only afford by remaining on housing benefit; the lower rents of social housing allowed them to access employment more readily.

One issue raised by managers and key workers was how long young people should stay in a hostel. In Birmingham where move on possibilities were more

available than in London, one project manager working with young mothers and their babies thought young people should only stay up to a year in order to prevent institutionalisation. In London the length of stay is often two years because of the lack of move on accommodation. Supporting People funding set a time limit of 2 years for young homeless people being funded for their stay in supported accommodation, but some local authorities are setting lower time limits than this.

The other major transformation in the past nine years in the UK has been introduction of 'choice based lettings' (CBL) for those seeking social housing. Under CBL people have to bid for particular properties although their possibility of becoming the tenant of that property depended on their banding (broad bands of need e.g. priority, gold, silver, bronze in one particular authority), on their waiting time and who else made a bid for the same property. This was designed to give 'choice' and to develop a 'social market' in the sector and create a greater social mix on estates. But as one respondent says there is little possibility of young people achieving a home in a really nice neighbourhood.

Box 4.9. Bidding for social housing, UK

Project Manager, St Basils Projects, Birmingham
"They can go on [housing options] on a Wednesday and bid on properties. We've got 2 women who are on Solihull council's list, because they have links with Solihull and that's the only way you'll ever get a place in Solihull. If you're happy with inner city, you can bid on them. A lot of them, because they've come to live here, and it's a nice area, they want to stay here – they've got no chance. If there any council houses, people have bought them anyway. There's just no stock left. They're pulling down all the high rises, so they've got to re-house all those people out of the high rise …They come here."

"There aren't any flats to move them into. And they're not classed as having a baby until that baby's registered, either…It's their ruling now, Birmingham City Council."

The lack of move on accommodation for young people and of social housing for homeless households has led to a new development amongst supported accommodation providers. St Basils projects have developed 8 flats in association with a local housing association and West London YMCA is discussing the development of a similar provision.

Tenancy failure was more common prior to the establishment of floating support services. Supporting People funding allowed agencies to establish floating support services to work with young people up to six months after they had moved out of supported accommodation. St. Basils runs a city wide floating support service which grew out of their self funded resettlement service under Supporting People Funding although their two projects that work with young mothers also have their own resettlement and floating support workers. The focus of local authority floating support services has largely been on tenancy sustainment – helping young people manage their money and pay their bills; whilst agencies that have previously worked with the young person have focussed on a wider agenda of floating support, encouraging job involvement and training, engagement with other services.

4.8   Reinsertion services – employment and training

Each country has general employment and training services for its populations and income support but some have also specific services for young homeless people.

In CZ some NGOs providing social services for the homeless create job opportunities of their own very often with financial contributions of the Job Offices or of the European Social Fund (Hradecký 2006:15). However we can speak in these cases only of single projects. An example of a project directly dedicated for young homeless people is a project by Association of the Foster Care Families called "Together for Integration of the Clients of the Half-way homes to the Job Market" targeted at young people leaving institutional care after becoming adults and at socially disadvantaged young people in difficult life situations. The project is aimed at work and training program within ecological agriculture and should have as its deliverable a methodological guide on a complex approach to people from the target group from admittance of a client (description of conditions and process of admittance), his/her training and education (computer courses, social empathy and abilities courses, courses for improvement of working habits) up to his/her placement in the job market.

In PT the central measures of reinsertion in relation to employment and training is first, the "Escolhas Programme" addressed to children and youth between 6 and 18 years old – particularly from more vulnerable socio-economic contexts specifically the descendents of immigrants and ethnic minorities - facilitating their access to education, vocational training, civic participation and digital inclusion. Second, the "New Opportunities Initiative" ("Novas Oportunidades") has as target group people aged 15 or over and adults aged 18 or over who do not have 4th, 6th or 9th year of schooling. This program includes a Network for Recognition, Validation and Certification of Competences (RVCC) that allows young and adult people to certificate their competences acquired along their professional path, and through certification open more vocational training alternatives.

Our interviewees reported that the current available measures cover the major part of the population unlike the previous situation where academic qualifications and age disqualified many. Key workers have a positive response to the combination of the 'New Opportunities' and the RVCC programmes.

The reinsertion plan for homeless people combines partnerships with the Institute for Employment and Vocational Training and a young person taking a professional course will be entitled to an income support. One of the first goals of the key-workers is that the client, often without the necessary minimum qualifications for training, will first overcome this constrain by following one of these new routes into education or certification.

However there are some drawbacks to the programme: some young mothers are put off by the wait for a course, some young people find the areas of training offered to socially excluded young people unattractive and lacking in job insertion opportunities. IT is a favourite area but there are few training places. Therefore caseworkers have to balance capabilities and expectations within the design of each young person's action plan. Moreover, one interviewee highlighted also that

minimum compulsory education ends around 15 years old and vocational training is from 16 years old onwards, with a potential gap of a year.

In NL the work on social insertion through activity has been extensive. Most important is that the young people take part in regular activities. This might be volunteering as well as training or paid jobs. In the Kamers met Kansen projects (Rooms with Opportunities) it is intended that young people become self-reliant within eighteen months, with educational qualifications or a job. The pillars of Rooms with Opportunities are not just housing but support for young people to take the most suitable study programme; and support for those with part-time jobs, apprenticeships or do volunteer work. 'Rooms with Opportunities' helps young people contact various employers and jobs. Life-coaches can advise employers about the best applicants. They also provide life skills training: learning to cook for your housemates, doing the shopping, making allowances for others, establishing a good daily routine. The young people learn the most basic elements of daily life by living with others under the same roof.

In 2005, the Volksbond set up the 'For and By' project to develop daily routines. It started with youth consultations. Young people interviewed young homeless people to discover their need for useful daily routines. The project is based on the so-called participation audit, whereby young people 'test' what is being offered to arrive at a work-learning trajectory that is set up for and by young homeless people.

The number of best-mate projects, related to buddy projects, is increasing in NL. For various groups, there are initiatives that match volunteers to young people with disabilities, young homeless people, unaccompanied minors (AMVs) or teenage mothers. For AMVs, there is a best-mate project, 'A Mate for You', which stems from social work in Nijmegen - and SAMAH, which is geared towards mediation between volunteers and AMVs by means of host parent and best-mate projects. This entails assisting with doing the shopping, acting as a host family, playing sports with AMVs, providing furniture or attending parents' evenings (SAMAH Working Plan, 2004). The 'Think Peer!' project of the national pressure group for asylum seekers (SAMAH) is a joint activity with the National Youth Council and the educational organisation, Echo. The project provides a mentor team at SAMAH. The aim is to link 100 AMVs to 100 mentors.

Departure training (Spanjaard 2005, Spanjaard, Bijl & Veldt 2000) is a method developed by former NIZW in cooperation with the Paedologic Institute. The method has been practised since 1994. It is based on the competence model, teaching theory and the social networking approach. Departure training consists of intensive individual training for ten weeks, intended for young people 15 years of age or older. The emphasis is on increasing young people's skills and on building a support network. To offer proper counselling to unaccompanied minor aliens (AMVs) who are being repatriated to their countries of origin, a special methodology was developed for educating these young people. The AMVs go through a customised counselling trajectory with various practical instruments. The purpose of this methodology is to offer better prospects on repatriation. The education is geared towards starting small businesses in their own countries and, in this way, building a future.

Other aftercare and recovery projects include assisted housing projects, ambulatory housing counselling, best-mate projects and projects geared towards activation, participation and re-integration. Aftercare contributes to good cooperation between professionals and young people with the transition to independent housing situations. In an effort to measure objectively the extent to which recovery is reached, the four largest Dutch cities and central municipalities adopted the 'stable mix' criterion. This refers to 'the number of homeless people at the end of a trajectory who, wherever possible, are provided with stable housing, regular incomes, care, daily activities or work'. This stable mix criterion was originally developed for adult homeless people in the framework of the Social Shelter Action Plan. This plan will also be applied to young homeless people in the future.

In the UK there was initially a difference between the work of the Foyers with young homeless people and the work of other providers of supported accommodation. The foyer movement was established in 1993 to provide education and training to young people who were living in some supported accommodation; this was either through a specialist foyer hostel (St Basil Projects runs one foyer amongst its 26 projects) or through specialist foyer beds (West London YMCA has 30 beds out of 180 designated as foyer beds). However, during the period since then other agencies have also developed education and training services and this was particularly encouraged by the funding available under Supporting People. Many foyers however still differ from other supported accommodation providers in that part of the tenancy agreement offered to young people is that they must be education, training or work engaged whilst accommodated.

In our interviews it has become apparent that the Supporting People funds that were centrally distributed from 2003 and are now completed integrated into local authorities' central government grants, led to three changes in the work of the voluntary sector. First an expansion of the support services that agencies are able to offer those living in supported accommodation – education and training, life skills training, key worker support during their stay in the accommodation. Second, an expansion of floating support services after they have left their accommodation (which can be provided by the agency concerned or another agency with the contract from the local authority). There has been a real improvement in the quality of both these forms of services as well as an expansion. Third, some of the services funded by SP offered by the voluntary sector were established to fill a gap in the statutory services available to young people – particularly the poor availability of mental health support. St Basils has established their own counselling service attached to family mediation.

4.9   Reinsertion through income support

In CZ The Act on Life and Life Wage Minimum defines life minimum as the basic income needed for people to pay for food and other basic personal needs, and defines the minimum wage as the basic financial income necessary for securing nourishment and other personal needs on the level of survival. Neither of the definitions includes housing expenses as other laws regulate this issue. The life minimum in 2007 was 3126 CZK (c. 107 EUR) and the minimum wage was 2020 CZK (c. 70 EUR) per month for individuals. Housing expenses are assessed

independently from other life expenses. In some cases a household can claim housing contribution (which is different from the above-mentioned housing benefits) but only in the case that the claimant lives in a flat. The flat is defined by the Act nr. 110/2006 Col. and persons living in hostels, in rented flats, mobile homes or other spaces not fit for living can't claim this contribution.

Reinsertion methodologies are focused mainly on regulating documents, claiming benefits where necessary and if possible but especially to finding a job and keeping it. In case of the debt history of the clients, when there is a risk of losing the substantial part of salary on paying debts, NGOs help in making a so-called debt payment calendar. It allows clients to pay the debt gradually, thus leaving them space to invest money into paying rent and buying food.

In PT in terms of support, the Social Insertion Income (RSI) consists of a benefit from the solidarity subsystem and is a variable amount calculated as a percentage of the Social Pension (in 2008 this was 181.91 Euro. This benefit is also available through the integration programme, via contact with a key-worker, and dependent on conditions such as seeking employment, taking children to school (particularly highlighted in the case of the Roma families) and so forth. Agencies reported that benefit levels were too low.

Box 4.10. Inadequacy of social insertion income, PT

"The social insertion income, for living on a city is impossible… 180 Euro what does that give for a person living alone… namely if dependent… of course we have the SCML that gives other support… but…"

"I believe it has more to deal with bureaucracy than the conception of the idea or with the will to solve the problem… there is also the execution that is very behind the needs… the average time of wait for the social insertion income is three months. Three months can be enough to die, for all problems to aggravate… it is very behind from improving people's realities…".

In NL the Work and Social Assistance Act provides the framework for income sup port. Currently social income for a single person aged 21 years or older is 609.83 Euro per month (50% of the minimum wage) and for a married couple aged 21 or older it is 1,219.76 Euro per month. However for young people aged less than 21 years it drops: for a single person aged between 18 years and 21 years it is 210.72 Euro per month, for a single parent it is 454.65 Euro per month and for a married couple with child it is 665.37 Euro per month.

In the UK the benefit regime for young people was fundamentally changed in the 1986 welfare reform regime (instituted in 1988) when young people aged 16 and 17 years were no longer entitled to welfare benefits except in particular circumstances including being estranged from their family. Benefit rates have remained low for all young people; it is currently around £48 a week and they are expected to be available for work. Income Support is paid to young people in education up to the age of 19 years (this has been extended in 2009 to age 21 years for those already undertaking a course) and to young mothers. The benefit regime therefore deals with young people in relation to age – 16/17 year olds, 18-24 year olds, and in relation to circumstances – health, education engagement

or parental status. Minimum wage rates are also different by age with the adult minimum wage being payable at age 23 years.

Agencies in this study reported five major issues with the benefits and income support regime for young people:

1. The low level of benefits for single young people, which restricts their lives. Higher levels of benefits are paid to young single mothers and young people in education on Income Support who may also receive Educational Maintenance Allowance.
2. Young people in their education and training programmes may be pulled out of these to undertake a course prescribed by New Deal which has less relevance for the young person.
3. Young people cannot continue in full time education beyond 19 years and receive welfare payments. Young people in education over the age of 19 years must be in education for less than 16 hours a week in order to continue to receive their welfare payments because in principle they must be available for work.
4. Young people are placed in jobs including temporary contracts with agencies that end abruptly and they then have great difficulties in reclaiming benefits particularly housing benefits.
5. Separate payments are made under housing benefit for the cost of accommodation but for single people aged under 25 years payments are only for a room in a shared house at an area reference rent set by the local authority. In many areas it is difficult to find accommodation at the reference rent.

4.10   Reinsertion into family life

In CZ this is extremely difficult especially for Roma taken into the care of the state and for other social care young people.

In PT family life is the cornerstone of all social services. And this may create a perverse effect whereby those in more need should also sacrifice more to support their families, particularly for the elderly. Also the responsibility for the balance of work and life is placed on the individual.

In NL many workers reported the need for young people to remain in contact with their families and with their culture. Social services give a lot of attention to existing networks, including family networks. On the other hand, as in the UK, some families were themselves a source of problems. Young Dutch people from non-Dutch backgrounds might be enclosed too much in their family network and this keeps them away from mainstream society.

Box 4.11. The importance of family contact, NL

Guardian, Arnhem region, the Nidos Foundation:
"The family is often a huge source of support for the child. As guardians, we also appreciate this. It ensures that the child stays in touch with its own culture. Compatriots are also very important. Theirs is a small world. Most people know each other. There is a network in the Netherlands of every culture. They always know how to find theirs. On the one hand, that is good; on the other, it could also push them in the wrong direction. When young people are drawn totally into their own networks, as an outsider or counsellor it is

difficult to know what is going on – if they are involved in criminal activities, for example. Because their network provides such solid support, if they are in the country illegally, they mostly do not have their own place to stay. They stay with family or friends and many work illegally. You notice that teen-age mothers are more apt to hang on to a certain network because they seek contact with other young mothers."

Group Educator, Youth Custodial Institution:
"Although the young people have weekly contact with their parents, I think there is still too little parental contact. Parents can provide support during compulsory admission, but the distance between young people and their parents is often too great. That makes their role less relevant for the success or failure of the trajectory. As group educator, I have little control over the parents. Some young people have no or very bad home situations. That means, when they go on leave, they cannot go home, although they have earned the right to do so. Ideally, we should use host parenting so that the young people would end up in a stable family situation. But there are hardly any host families. One wonders if more will ever become available. You would like to see these kinds of young people spending their leaves with families that would benefit their treatment. The gap between home and what you are trying to do here with young people is too large. Because what the young people learn while they're here is vulnerable, more home control is needed to make the transition from behind these walls to society easier. For these young boys, it is difficult to withstand the temptation of their old (criminal) contacts."

Project Leader, Youth Intervention Team, and The Hague:
"Social support is very important in the lives of young people. But it is difficult to identify their role models. In its approach, the YIT gives considerable attention to major role models in the lives of young people, the so-called Very Important Persons (VIP's). Sometimes, when I re-read a report, it strikes me that not a single VIP is mentioned. I always ask whether this is really the case. It has considerable effect. The young people at YIT too often lack incentives. As a result, they lack self-confidence."

Staff Member, Information Centre for Pregnant Teenagers and Young Mothers:
"The extent to which people in the immediate surroundings are involved in the trajectory depends on what the young people themselves want. We first try to find out how they feel about their boyfriends, parents, family and neighbours, whether they have anyone or whether their social network is reliable. We first try to understand that. Because they often do not have networks, they are very lonely. But there are others who mention someone, take someone along or someone we see during our home visits. We then get that person involved, but it is not a condition – only if the young person agrees. We work with the best-mate project but that is only possible if the girls are stable. If they go to school or have jobs, they often start building a network."

Ambulatory Staff Member, T-Team Twente:
"The young people that we see are uncertain and suspicious. That leads to social problems, which they cannot cope with. Some become alienated. We then contact sports clubs so that they can play sports there without having to pay. In this way, you try to build a social network, without which they would probably return to their old ways. We also look at the possibilities within the family. A strong social network is therefore a major success factor. Sometimes a single person is enough as a stable factor. The network is often underestimated. By building a social network together with the young people, he or she will gain more self-confidence and realise what can be accomplished."

One of the issues in NL in common with the UK is the problem of broadening the social horizons of young people from deprived backgrounds. An almost identical quotation was given by the Project Manager of a mother and baby hostel in the UK.

Box 4.12. Lack of cultural capital among homeless youth: NL

Housing Counsellor, Youth Crisis Centre, Salvation Army (Utrecht):
"One thing that certainly needs improving is that I wish these young people had a better future. Street policy has resulted in shelter, which is designed to reduce nuisance, but nothing else. The shelter is therefore very meagre. There is hardly ever time or money available to do something with the youth. A great many young people have never visited a museum, walked on a beach or ate in a restaurant. They never did these things when they lived at home. What our team does do sometimes, in our free time, is undertake various activities with young people."

In the UK family mediation has been part of the work of St Basils Projects since 1993 and part of the work of DePaul UK since 1998. DePaul UK also offers family mediation in youth offender institutions and prison. Since the establishment of the Prevention agenda by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) family mediation services have also been commissioned by local authorities from a range of voluntary organisations. As part of the observation of reinsertion methodologies for CSEYHP we will be observing family mediation work. For some young people however their family is part of the problem.

Box 4.13. Developing a new type of life. UK

Project Manager, Mother and baby unit, St Basil Projects
RESP   "Because of them have done so well in the face of adversity, so well, that it hasn't really done them any harm – I'm not saying the way they've been brought up hasn't done them any harm – but actually being in St. Basils has been the best thing that could have happened to them – it's got them away from a situation they were in. They're on the outside now, looking at what their lives were like and they're moving on. I definitely see this as them moving on, because some of their stories are so horrendous."

INT   "Some of them, their kids might come back, but some of them, their kids will never come back because they'll be different. What makes the difference?"

RESP   "I don't know, I wish I knew that. I think the ones with the families that haven't moved on. Some people who come here and they can't even give you a next of kin – there isn't anybody. Can I use you, they might say. And that is the saddest thing, the fact that there's nobody in their life. At 16. Or they might use the social worker. The ones who are on their own can do very well"

INT   "Really?"

RESP   "Yeah. The ones where the family is stuck in the benefits system, not doing anything and they're still in contact with them on a regular basis, they tend to stay down there"

INT   "So no family is better than very poor family for some people."

RESP	"Yeah"
INT	"It is devastating for some people but some people 'All right, start again'"
RESP	"Mmm. It's up to me now, I'll get on with it"

Table 4.1 Intervention and reinsertion programmes across four countries

Country	CZ	NL	PT	UK
Early Intervention – Schools	School psychological counseling	Compulsory education, prevention dropping out school	Mediation with families	Connexions service, Extended schools Voluntary sector projects in schools
Early Intervention – Other	Non-governmental sector, work in schools, leisure time activities provision	New: youth and family centre throughout country in 2011, Local care and advice teams, risk monitors and exchange of records among youth workers and others involved	The Plan DOM aims to create an individual plan for care leavers	Voluntary sector. Work in schools, in detention centres
Prevention Services – Youth		Neighbourhood monitoring networks (school, police, neighbourhood youth workers, housing association rent arrears), information help lines	Day centres	Family mediation services, some attached to local authority housing departments. Floating support services. Night stop host services
Prevention Services – Family	Local authority, family mediation	Home help, Behind the front door-interventions	Local authority and NGO on basic needs and income support	Family mediation
Street work with young people	Streetwork within NGO sector	Outreaching social services, night shelter, walk in day shelter	Outreach on basic needs and conducting to shelters	Contact teams as with all homeless people

Provision of supported accommodation young people	Mostly institutional care	Hostels, reversible housing 2003: c. 800 beds	No data on young people	35,00 yp in supported accom
Provision of services in supported accommodation	Key working with young people, action plans for education and employment	Key working Possibly: stimulating social network, action plans for education and employment	Key working, action plans for education and employment	Key working Action plans for education and employment
Gateway to other services	Health, drug and alcohol	(Mental) health, drug and alcohol, municipality (social security benefit), clothing, food	Health, drug and alcohol.	Health, drug and alcohol. Benefit services Counselling
Reinsertion services – accommodation	Protected accommodation	Reversible housing, Support day to day living. Possibly aftercare	No resources for the local services to make domicile visits	Floating support for 6 months into tenancy. Private sector as well as social housing
Reinsertion services – Job and training	Protected job posts	Voluntary or paid job in cooperation with Employment office (municipal) and/or specialist advisors	Through the Institute for Employment and Vocational Training	Training support in supported accommodation Employment with support of employment service
Reinsertion services – family	Local authorities and NGO sector	Social services part of specialist interventions	Voluntary and public	Voluntary sector
Reinsertion services - income	Income Support and Local Housing Allowance Minimum wage	municipality (social security benefit)	RSI	Income Support and Local Housing Allowance Minimum wage

Section 5   Issues for the European social model and values

5.1   Housing and homelessness are a national responsibility

Housing is still a national responsibility, not a European responsibility, throughout the EU. However developments following the Lisbon European Council in 2000 have increasingly led to specific suggestions in relation to need for adequate housing.

5.2 The importance of Lisbon, 2000 and OCM

The European Social Charter (1961) signed by the governments of the Council of Europe establishes that the Parties should ensure the effective exercise of the right to housing by: promoting access to housing of an adequate standard; prevent and reduce homelessness with a view to its gradual elimination and make the price of housing accessible to those without adequate resources (article 31 – the right to housing). Moreover, article 7 led each Party to undertake several actions in order to guarantee the right of children and young persons to protection.

At the Lisbon European Council (23, 24 March, 2000) Heads of State and Governments agreed to make the Europe Union "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy promoting more and better jobs and with greater social cohesion". They accepted the challenge to fight against poverty and social exclusion, as a key-element for modernizing European social policy by "investing in people and building an active welfare state". Following the European Nice Council (December 2000) several States defined National Action Plans for Inclusion with the objective of creating policies to prevent social exclusion including the loss of housing. Lisbon instituted the Open Method of Co-ordination, which has proved successful in focusing attention on housing and homelessness, leading to a "Light Year" on Homelessness in 2009.

At the beginning of 2005 difficulties of the international economic situation lead to the revision of the targets set out in the Lisbon Strategy for economic growth and employment, re-enforcing some of its governance and proposing a greater simplification and transparency in procedures. Revisiting the European Social Agenda[6] reinforced the importance of the modernisation of social policy in order to provide support to European citizens so that they can face in a more effective way the challenges of unemployment, long-term poverty and inequalities. The Open Method of Co-ordination[7] was also revised in order to respond to the successive appeals of the European Council for greater simplification, integration and coherence in the existing co-ordination processes of social inclusion, pensions, health and long term care.

6 L'Agenda Social 2005-2010 – Une Europe Sociale dans l'économie mondiale; Des emplois et de nouvelles chances pour tous, Emploi & affaires sociales, Commission Européenne in NAPIncl 2006-2008

7 Presented in the Communication "Working together, working better" A new framework for the open method of co-ordination of social protection and inclusion policies in the EU, Brussels, COM (2005) 706 end 22nd of December 2005 in NAPIncl 2006-2008

Following the revision of the Lisbon Strategy in March 2006, national plans for action on inclusion have become broader in scope. Following the streamlining of the Open Method of Coordination on Social Protection and Social Inclusion, Member States of the European Union are now charged with translating the common objectives into national plans for each of the three areas of Social Inclusion: Pensions, Health and Long-Term Care. These plans, which cover a period of two years, are submitted to the Commission in the form of a National Report on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion. In the field of social protection and inclusion twelve objectives were formulated by the European Spring Council 2006.

In recent years, European Commission reports on National Action Plans have identified that policies on housing and homelessness are one of the priorities for the majority of the member states.
With specific reference to housing inclusion in 2008 the European Parliament approved the declaration on "ending street homelessness" (22 April 2008 – Strasbourg) by 2015. The 17th European Union Housing Ministers' meeting held on the 24th November 2008 (Marseille, France) on the theme of "access to housing for persons with difficulties", undertook a commitment for the development of homelessness policies under the 2010 European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion (a 17 million Euro campaign aims to reaffirm the EU's commitment on making a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty by 2010).
On the Europe website it is apparent that decent housing is one of the five key targets for the European Union:
"In the field of social inclusion, EU action has finally created a clear consensus about the following key challenges:
-      to eradicate child poverty by breaking the vicious circle of intergenerational inheritance;
-      to make labour markets truly inclusive;
-      to ensure decent housing for everyone;
-      to overcome discrimination and increase the integration of people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and immigrants;
-      to tackle financial exclusion and over-indebtedness."
(http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/poverty_social_exclusion_en.htm)

In the European Youth Pact, adopted at the European Council spring meeting in March 2005, youth policy became a core element of the revised Lisbon strategy.
On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Treaties of Rome (25th March 2007), two significant Declarations for the sustained development of Europe and the inclusion of youth as an active agent sharing efforts and responsibilities were adopted, regarding fundamental matters such as democracy, integration and identity (Berlin and Rome). But, it is important to note that, at the meeting of young delegates from 27 countries during the EU Youth Summit held in Rome, their declaration included both a right to jobs and a right to housing. It is also important to ensure independent housing to all young people together with a coherent fight against social exclusion of young people by implementing a minimum income strategy, also taking into consideration national contexts.
(Rome Youth Declaration, 25th March 2007)

5.3   The perspective on social inclusion in the National Inclusion Plans of the four countries

In CZ the goal of NAPSI for 2006-08 was to secure accessibility of resources and services necessary for participation in societal life, combat against social exclusion, mainly extreme forms of social exclusion and all forms of discrimination leading to social exclusion; to secure active social inclusion for all through participation at the job marker and destruction of poverty and social exclusion among the most disadvantaged groups of citizens; to include all relevant stakeholders in creation, implementation and monitoring processes.

In NL the twelve objectives formed a guideline for the first National Strategy Report (NSR), written by the Netherlands in 2006 and the second, written in 2008. The importance of the social dimension of the EU as an integral part of the Lisbon Strategy was confirmed in the Spring Council 2008. This requires further integration of economic, employment and social policy. Considering the cohesion between the various policy areas, the Netherlands National Reform Programme (NRP) progress report and the National Strategy Report (NSR) together give a full picture of progress in the Netherlands. In the country-specific report of the NSR 2006 the Commission expressed positive opinions about the Dutch policy. The Commission sees six challenges for the Netherlands. These are:
1)   Encouraging active inclusion of groups that are distanced from the labour market by further promoting labour market integration;
2)   Further development of a suitable evaluation and monitoring framework with a view to reducing the number of households with minimum incomes;
3)   Increasing the participation of women and part-time employees in company pension schemes;
4)   Monitoring the effects that should lead to value and efficiency improvements in healthcare procurement;
5)   Safeguarding the operation of the healthcare insurance market;
6)   Monitoring the effects of the costing system of the Exceptional Medical Expenses Act ('AWBZ').

In the period 2006 - 2008 the Dutch government worked - partly on the basis of the National Action Plan to Combat Poverty and Promote Participation (NAP, 2006) – on shaping the European common objectives with regard to combating poverty and social exclusion by ensuring:

-    Access for all to the resources, rights and services needed for participation in society, preventing and addressing exclusion and fighting all forms of discrimination leading to exclusion.
-    The active social inclusion of all, both by promoting participation in the labour market and by fighting poverty and exclusion.
-    That social inclusion policies are well coordinated and involve all levels of government and relevant actors, including people experiencing poverty, that they are efficient, effective and mainstreamed into all relevant public policies, including economic, budgetary, education and training policies and structural fund (notably ESF) programmes.

In the National Action Plan 2006 the Dutch government again confirmed that work is the best remedy against poverty and that people's opportunities should be taken as a starting point, rather than people's problems. Four priority

objectives were chosen based on the accessibility of facilities and participation incentives:

1. Increasing participation through acceptance of work, training and/or socially useful, unpaid activities;
2. Tackling poverty and promoting participation among children and young people;
3. Prevention of the *non-use* of entitled income support (i.e. the non-take up of welfare benefits); and
4. Addressing over-indebtedness.

In 2007 the European Commission provided comments and a first review of the NSR 2006 in the country-specific comments of the Joint Report 2007. From this, it emerged that – also thanks to the general economic recovery in the Netherlands that was in line with the general economic recovery of the EU - the general employment rate and unemployment in 2005 showed improvements for various groups such as young and older people, women and ethnic minorities. In 2004, the general poverty risk of 11 percent was one of the lowest in the EU. In 2006 that risk dropped to 10 percent.

- Tackling the homeless problem
The National Action Plan paid specific attention to the homelessness problem. It states: attending to the homeless is and remains necessary. By an accumulation of problems, the homeless risk severe poverty. They are usually difficult to deploy in the labour market. In recent years, much attention has been paid to improving the preconditions for the municipalities to conduct a cohesive policy for this target group in the area of social support, housing, care, income and daily activities. This increased the municipalities' and institutions' capacity to offer prospects to clients in shelters. In the coming years even more focus will be put on preventing people becoming homeless. The Social Relief Action Plan for the four large cities, which was set up in 2006 and has been in operation since that time, was expanded in 2008 to 39 municipalities that look after social shelters for the homeless as central municipalities. The target is that all central municipalities should have a Municipal Compass for social shelter at their disposal by 2009.

- Tackling poverty and promoting participation among children and young people
As a basis, the Dutch Cabinet takes five development conditions for children, identical to those of Every Child Matters in the UK. They apply to every child, regardless of cultural background or physical condition. Children must grow up healthily and safely, participate in society, develop their talents, have fun and be well prepared for the future. In addition, it is important that parents have a proper command of the Dutch language so that they can offer their children good opportunities for development, as it appears that migrant children and young people are less easily reached by a development-orientated offer. The theme of child abuse and domestic violence has been included after social organisations expressed the wish during the consultations towards the National Action Plan 2008 (National strategy report on social protection and inclusion the Netherlands, 2008).

In PT the global strategy defined in the National Action Plan/ National Inclusion Plan (NAPincl 2006-2008) established as a principal aim, the promotion of inclusion of all citizens by ensuring their access to resource, rights, to goods and

services, and promoted equal opportunities and social cohesion based on the following principles:

- The consecration of basic rights of citizenship; which postulates the right to work, and to a basic support in integration, but also to the exercise of civil rights, in culture, education, and to dignified housing, and to participate in the social and cultural life;
- The accountability and mobilization of all of society; and of each person in the effort to eradicate poverty and exclusion with particular emphasis in the contractualization of social protection measures.
- The integration and multidimensionality understood as the convergence of economic, social and environmental measures so as to develop and promote local communities, appealing to the convergence of synergies and combination of efforts;
- An adequate combination between universal rights and positive discrimination; that is, the guarantee that, in compliance with the social inclusion objectives, all citizens are equally treated based on the diversity of their situations and needs in relation to resources and opportunities;
- The local specificity of interventions; services to be provided in relation to needs of local situations, creating enhanced resources and competences;
- The recognition of the importance of equal opportunities and gender perspective; in a form to ensure the exercise of rights both in the public and private sphere.

In the light of these guiding principles and according to the main trends and challenges identified previously, the National Strategy for Social Inclusion 2006-2008 assumes as main policy priorities[8]: the fight against child and elder poverty, the correction of disadvantages in education; and the overcoming of discrimination against people with disabilities and against immigrants.
In relation to child and elder poverty policies concentrate on providing a basic integration income, improving access to affordable housing, debt counselling and debt policies, the inclusion of disadvantaged areas, and the social integration of excluded populations. The eradication of child poverty, as a fundamental priority to fight against intergenerational reproduction of poverty, and the commitment to reduce the poverty risk of the elderly, implies for Portugal a significant effort in order to promote social inclusion.

Children poverty policies include increased family allowance (particularly for families on low income and for lone parent families), more places in child care centres, and more solutions for children at risk, with special emphasis in creating alternatives for them to stay in their family and in the support to young people in their autonomy. The active employment policies reinforce the support provided to families and consequently to the children as part of these households. In the fight against child poverty, special emphasis is given to the measures promoted within

---

8 These priorities follow the ones considered most relevant by the EU: 1. Promote the participation in the labour market; 2. Modernize the social protection systems; 3. Correct the disadvantages in education and training; 4. Reinforce and develop specific instruments to fight poverty and inequality in income distribution; 5. Guarantee decent housing conditions; 6. Improve better access to quality services; 7. Overcome discriminations and reinforce the integration of people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and immigrants.

the educational system, namely, at pre-school level and the conditions of compulsory schooling.

Policy measures to correct educational disadvantage in relation to formal qualifications of the different target groups include: the recognition and validation of several informal qualifications acquired by citizens, and an increase in qualifications and places on professional programmes as well as alternative courses for students with difficulties. The process qualifying active adults, identified in the "New Opportunities Programme", both by providing them with education/training courses and certification of competences acquired throughout life represents a challenge.

Creating universal access to new technologies constitutes a fundamental challenge, which it is pressing to respond so as to intervene and prevent the info exclusion risks of the Portuguese population. Therefore, the policy measures defined in this Plan are to create the necessary infrastructures to generalize the use of broadband.

Following the framework's priority, it is important to underline its articulation with the measures established in the National Action Plan for Growth and Employment – PNACE, which encompasses in a coherent form the Plan for Stability and Growth, the Technology Plan and the National Employment Plan.

With regard to the policies for immigrants and ethnic minorities as well as victims of human trafficking with preventive and/or corrective characteristics, they seek to guarantee rights and facilitate the welcome and integration of these groups. These policies are focused on the following domain (s): information, training and sensitisation towards the fight against discrimination, education, qualification and employment, equipment and legislative services. There is increasing investment in systems providing useful information to this population in different languages, teaching the Portuguese language and culture, training and professional integration courses, creating interface solutions and integrated support between the immigrant population and public central and local administration. Portugal is adjusting its national legislation on immigration policy to the recent community directives seeking thus, among others, to grant a legal status to foreigners similar to the Portuguese citizen, by simplifying and making more transparent the legalization process and increasing protection to the victims of human trafficking. Finally, it is important to refer to the main dimensions to be taken into consideration within Good Governance to implement the social inclusion strategy in a co-ordinated and effective form, namely by carrying out efforts to mobilize and facilitate participation of all actors, including the most vulnerable groups to poverty and exclusion, as well as to guarantee the continuity of the monitoring and evaluation of the measures established in this Plan[9]".

The development of the Plan demands the adoption of several measures, some of which co-ordinated with other Strategic Plans. The implementation of these measures presupposes a national effort in investment, as well as EU support through different programmes from the new National Strategic Reference Framework (QREN) for 2007-2013. The effective link between the financing

---

9 The first step was reinforced with the publication of D-L nº15/2006.

coming from State Budget, Social Security Budget, and from QREN, contributes to determine the sums to allocate and is one of the fundamental factors, which encourage the Plan's development. Besides, the action framework which the NAPincl represents, it is a form to avoid the dispersion of national and community interventions and to streamline them by concentrating resources and specializing the instrument.

In the UK in 2006 the UK government set up the Social Exclusion Task Force (SETF) to focus on problems of severe deprivation with two key work streams – Socially Excluded Adults and Families at Risk building on the *Every Child Matters* model. The work of this taskforce and plans to deal with social exclusion and child poverty impacted directly on the targets for the UK National Inclusion Plan (DWP 2008) which reports all the current government policies to deal with social exclusion including housing and homelessness and tackling workless households through housing providers helping their tenants into employment (reversing residualisation), and tackling inequality in relation to gender, disability, race, ethnic minority employment and gypsies/Romas and travellers.

The current National Inclusion Plan for the UK for 2008-11 (DWP, 2008) began from the premise that the UK is one of the most successful economies in Europe and that economic growth will continue. It reported that three million jobs were created since 1997 and builds on this to argue for a new National Action Plan for Social Inclusion in relation to EU common objectives. It reports on the range of indicators (Annexe 3) agreed by the EU to argue that *'Both European and national indicators of poverty and social exclusion show that the UK continues to make significant progress…. The New Deal for Lone Parents has helped more than half a million lone parents in to work since October 1998 … We have lifted 600,000 children out of poverty, and up to 300,000 more will follow as a result of policies announced in July (2008). The number* of *people reliant on key out-of-work benefits is down by one million since 1997*. (Introduction. p v) '

The National Inclusion Plan goes on to argue that through Public Sector Agreements it will be possible to progress on the two central fronts – socially excluded adults (including care leavers and families at risk of exclusion) and child poverty. As in the Netherlands the UK report argues that full employment is at the heart of this strategy with an ambition of an 80% employment rate. The other important foci in the report are a renewed focus on equality legislation, on efficient public services and on the unacceptable high cost of drug misuse including increased numbers of benefit claimants. It reports that its Children's Plan (published in December 2007) '*sets out an ambition to make Britain the best place in the world to grow up for every child – regardless of their background'*.

However, the premises of the report are no longer true. The prediction for the current crisis is that the employment gain of three million extra jobs will disappear. There have been warnings that 800,000 youth could be affected in relation to youth unemployment, as they were in the early 1980s and early 1990s and tracking studies of these earlier cohorts have shown that the effects of youth unemployment last throughout life in terms of lower earnings and greater instability in the labour market. If youth unemployment rises to previous levels then it is likely that youth homelessness will also rise.

The issue of young unemployment in particular cohorts is one that challenges the European social model and European social values. As we have argued social exclusion in the UK has particularly affected those young people from workless households and areas where workless households are the norm. The key workers we interviewed report that the most disadvantaged young people are young people born in the UK most of whom do not have the cultural capital to rebuild their lives and many of whom are at greater disadvantage in this respect than some young refugees. Key workers report their endeavours to rebuild the cultural capital, educational capital and social capital of young homeless people through small steps over the period of a year.

5.4   Issues for European Social Values with regard to the inclusion of Young Homeless Populations
As with other European projects for young people it is important to raise the question what are minimum 'social guarantees' for a young person at risk with respect to education and training, employment, housing, social support and income? For young people facing a challenging transition to adulthood how do we relate citizenship rights to responsibilities? What should they comprise and in what contexts and at what age?
Each country report identifies specific issues that have been identified of importance for the social inclusion of young homeless people in their country, based on interviews with agencies that are active in this sphere.

In CZ the identified issues from the Czech Republic perspective are:
-    A necessary significant reduction of children growing up in institutional care and corresponding help to families in order to avoid the need for such state intervention.

-    Expansion of social, protected and training housing for youth who try to reinsert themselves into regular life.

-    To open the possibility for shortening the period for criminal record deletion for young homeless people.

-    Creation of and cooperation with job offices and agencies specialized for young homeless persons. Training of state employees most likely to come in contact with them.

-    Training of media workers to become sensitive to the needs of this target group.

-    Enforce prevention and early-stage detection of the risk of homelessness to particular young people.

-    Complex, systematic and long-term support for non-governmental organizations dealing with reintegration of young homeless population

In NL the issues that were identified were:
-    More information on the numbers and nature of youth homelessness is needed. For that, more unity in defining homeless youth is helpful.

- Local, specific capacity problems for helping youth at risk must be solved

- Therefore municipalities have to understand the nature and the scope of the problems in order to come to a more differentiated offer of provisions.
- More places are needed to give ex-homeless youth the opportunity to progress to independent living accommodation.

- The Social Relief Action Plan for the four large cities might be of help in the years to come. The plan, which was set up in 2006 for homeless adults, will also operate for homeless youth. Young homeless people will be individually accompanied towards independent living accommodation.

- When at-risk youth reach the age of 18, they are deemed to be of age and as such subject to assistance options of adults. Experts indicate this makes at-risk youth more vulnerable.

- The general government cuts back on the general insurance arrangement (AWBZ, Exception Medical Expenses Act). As a result, a range of financing is transferred from the AWBZ to the Wmo (Social Support Act, every citizen must be able to participate in society), shifting responsibility to municipalities. It is uncertain if basic needs of homeless youth, like supporting counseling, will be fulfilled in the years to come.

- Young illegal youth at-risk are formally excluded from social services.

- Social integration of certain groups of young immigrants in Dutch society is slow. These groups are at risk of becoming homeless more than average.

In PT the issues that were identified were:
- Enforce early intervention, calling for the cooperation of several social agents, namely school, local social support centres, civic associations and the community in general;

- Enforce early-stage detection of homelessness threat, by also having more local support agents involved;

- Promote families support (not only income) including personalized and direct contact on a tenancy sustainment perspective, contributing to reduce institutional care;

- Encourage the integration of migrants and ethnic minorities on educational and training options compatible with their cultural values and mobility. There are still gaps in terms of diploma equivalences for migrants or times of wait between the end of compulsory education and the possibility to apply for professional training for the general youth population;

- Lack and blockage of documents still constrains the access to education and employment, including migrant descendents, proving fundamental to promote the access to juridical counseling, the involvement of embassies and information to socially excluded young persons;

- Cooperation between job offices and agencies specialized for young homeless persons. Training of social action professionals, including a competences referral and the definition of action strategies and methodologies;

- Promote access to vocational and professional training, by creating more vacancies and on more appealing areas for young people, including the IT field;

- Promote employment and housing support for young people in social exclusion situations, including those leaving institutions, investing on low cost housing and other move on options;

- Promote follow-up strategies after autonomy and resettlement of the reinsertion plan and empowerment.

In UK the issues that were identified were:
- The problem of motivating young homeless people who had been raised in workless households. There needs to be assisted routes into employment.

- An increase in the number of homeless young people with criminal records. Although an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) is not a criminal offence, breaking its conditions is a criminal offence. This needs to be readdressed as it is leading to the criminalization of many homeless youth.

- It is 5 years before a criminal offence is 'spent'. As in CZ this appears too long for young people.

- The low level of benefit payments for young people leaves them unable to participate in social life or travel to friends and relatives.

- The benefit trap for young people living in hostel accommodation remains. The total cost of accommodation support and housing benefit for rent is more than a young person can pay on youth wages. They must either leave their accommodation before they are ready to be independent or remain on benefits. The most useful difference would be greater taper on housing benefit so that they could continue to pay hostel rents.

- The transfer of 'Supporting People' funds to local authority budgets has led to greater variability in relation to the payments offered to supported accommodation providers. Some local authorities have cut the amount of support payments whilst others have not. Therefore whilst the 2002 legislation led to a more universal provision for young homeless people across local authorities, this funding shift may lead to support for young homeless people being less funded in some local areas.

- As funding has shifted to local authorities many local authorities now control the referral process to supported accommodation. Whereas young homeless people could self refer in the past to a hostel they are now largely interviewed through the local authority homeless procedure. Local authorities are using supported accommodation places to discharge their

duty under the homeless legislation towards young people who are refugees, young 16-17 year olds and young people from care. There is concern that some young people who are homeless but are unknown to social services in the local area, are not being offered safe supported accommodation.

- Under the prevention of homeless agenda some young people are being offered accommodation in the private rented sector (PRS). Some key workers are concerned that PRS accommodation is too volatile for their clients, with six month rental agreements (Assured Shorthold Tenancies) being the rule.

- More social housing places are needed to give ex-homeless youth the opportunity to progress to independent living accommodation.

During the next phase of its research, the CSEYHP project aims to respond to a number of these issues and to provide recommendations for national and European policy development in the field of combating youth homelessness and promoting reinsertion into society of homeless young people.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*For full national references please consult the national reports on each team's website.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND EUROPEAN COUNCIL REFERENCES.

White paper, *A New Impetus for European Youth*, 2001
"Council conclusions on Youth in the framework of the Mid-Term Review of the Lisbon
Strategy" The Council (Education, Youth and Culture), 21 February 2005, 6609/1/05
JEUN 9 SOC 77.
YOUTH IN ACTION 2007-2013
Declaration on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the signature of the Treaties of Rome, 25th March 2007, Berlin Declaration
Rome Youth Declaration, 25th March 2007

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL ON EUROPEAN POLICIES CONCERNING

Youth*. Addressing the concerns of young people in Europe – implementing the European
Youth Pact and promoting active citizenship*, Brussels, 30.05.2005, COM(2005) 206
final
COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS – *Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society, Brussels,
5.9.2007*, COM(2007) 498 final
Summary of the General Comments of the Working Groups, EU2009, CZ Presidency
*Key messages to the Spring European Council on the European Youth Pact and European
cooperation in the youth field*, No prev. doc. 5210/09 JEUN 2 SOC 28 EDUC 10, Brussels, 23 January 2009

SOCIAL INCLUSION & HOMELESSNESS:

European Social Charter, 1961
European Social Charter (revised), Strasbourg, 3.V.1996
Lisbon European Council, 23, 24 March, 2000
European Nice Council, December 2000
"Measurement of Homelessness at European Union Level*", European Commission-Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities DG*, January 2007
"Conference of European Statisticians Recommendations for the 2010 Censuses of Population and Hou*sing" (2006),* cooperation United Nations Economic Commission for Europe e EUROSTAT
"The production of data on homelessness and housing deprivation in the European Union: survey and proposals (2004) de Cécile Brousse*, INSEE para o Eurostat unit D2* "Living Conditions and social protection" – *Working Papers and Studies – Theme 3: Population and social conditions*
Declaration on "ending street homelessness", European Parliament, 22 April 2008, Strasbourg

17th European Union Housing Ministers' held on the 24th November 2008, Marseille, France
Lisbon Strategy revision, March 2006

UNITED NATIONS
Strategies to combat homelessness, UNCHS (Habitat), Nairobi, 2000

UNICEF (2007) An Overview of Child Wellbeing in Rich Countries The United Nations Children's Fund www.unicef-irc.org//presscentre/presskit/reportcard7/rc7_eng.pdf

UNICEF 2008 The State of The World's Children The United Nations Children's Fund www.unicef.org/sowc08/docs/sowc08.pdf

WEBSITES

European Commission, European Youth Portal:
http://ec.europa.eu/youth/index_en.htm

European Commission, Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities:
http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/index_en.htm

Youth Partnership Web Portal (Council of Europe and the European Commission):
http://youth-partnership.coe.int/youth-partnership/

Consilium, Education, Youth and Culture Council (EYC):
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=416&lang=EN

European Youth Forum: http://www.youthforum.org/

European Parliament:
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/parliament/public/staticDisplay.do?id=146&language=en

FEANTSA: http://www.feantsa.org/

EUROSTAT: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home/

References: Czech Republic

Hradecký, Ilja et. al. 2007. *DEFINICE A TYPOLOGIE BEZDOMOVSTVÍ. Zpráva o realizaci aktivity č. 1 projektu Strategie sociální inkluze bezdomovců v ČR*. Praha: Naděje

Hradecký, I. 2006a. *Národní zpráva o bezdomovství v České republice 2006, politikcá část* [online]. Praha [cit. 12.7.2008]. Available at:
http://www.bezdomovci.eu/index.php?sekce=tlacitka&id=10&jazyk=>

Hradecký, I. 2006b. *Národní zpráva o bezdomovství v České republice 2006, statisitcká část* [online]. Praha [cit. 12.7.2008]. Available at the above website

Hradecký, I. et. al. 2004. *Sčítání bezdomovců Praha 2004, Závěrečná zpráva* [online]. Praha: Arcidiecézní charita Praha, Armáda spásy, Městské centrum sociálních služeb a prevence, Naděje o.s. [cit. 12.7.2008]. Available at the above website.

Hradecká, I.; Hradecký V. 1996. *Bezdomovství: Extrémní vyloučení*. Praha: Naděje, o. s.

Kovařík, J., Bubleová V. Práva ohrožených a znevýhodněných dětí. 2003 Available at: http://www.helcom.cz/view.php?cisloclanku=2004022608 (retrieved 7 April 2009)

Lux et al. 2003. „Finanční dostupnost a postoje občanů". In: *Standardy bydlení 2002/03* [online]. Praha: SÚ AV ČR [cit. 13.3.2009]. Available at: http://seb.soc.cas.cz/publikace_download/standardy2003_downcz.htm>

Matoušek, Oldřich, Koláčková, Jana, Kodymová Pavla (eds.). 2005. *Sociální práce v praxi: specifika různých cílových skupin a práce s nimi*. Praha: Portál.

Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí. 2006. *Národní zpráva o strategiích sociální ochrany a sociálního začleňování na léta 2006 – 2008, Česká republika*. Praha: Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí.

Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí. 2004. *Národní zpráva o rodině 2004* [online]. Praha: Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí [cit. 13.3.2009]. Available at: http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/899/zprava_b.pdf

Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj. 2005. *Koncepce bytové politiky* [online]. Praha: Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj [cit. 4.3.2009]. Available at: http://www.mmr.cz/koncepce-bytove-politiky-schvalena-vladou-usnesenim-ze-dne-16-brezna-2005-c-292

Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. 2004. Strategie prevence sociálně patologických jevů u dětí a mládeže v působnosti resortu školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy na období 2005 – 2008. Available at: http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/strategie-prevence-socialne-patologickych-jevu-u-deti-a-mladeze (retrieved 7 April 2009)

Ministerstvo vnitra. Nezletilí bez doprovodu. 2004 Available at: http://aplikace.mvcr.cz/archiv2008/azyl/nezletili.html (retrieved 7 April 2009)

Naděje o.s. 2005. *ANALÝZA VÝSTUPŮ TERÉNNÍHO VÝZKUMU MEZI BEZDOMOVCI POHYBUJÍCÍMI SE NA ÚZEMÍ MČ PRAHA 5. Závěrečná zpráva* [online]*.* Praha: Naděje o.s. [cit. 12.7.2008]. Available at: http://www.bezdomovci.eu/index.php?sekce=tlacitka&id=10&jazyk=>

Petřík, Martin; Zukalová, Sylvie; Akrman, Pavel; Kosorin, Pavel. 2006. *Sčítání bezdomovců v Brně 2006* [online]. Brno: Armáda spásy, Magistrát města Brna, Odbor sociální péče [cit. 12.7.2008].Available at:
http://www.bezdomovci.eu/index.php?sekce=tlacitka&id=10&jazyk

Průdková, T.; Novotný, P. 2008. *Bezdomovectví*. Praha, Kroměříž: TRITON.
Schwarzová, Gabriela. „Sociální práce s bezdomovci". In Matoušek, Oldřich, Koláčková, Jana, Kodymová Pavla eds. 2005. *Sociální práce v praxi: specifika různých cílových skupin a práce s nimi*. Praha: Portál.

Zpráva o situaci v oblasti vnitřní bezpečnosti a veřejného pořádku na území České republiky v roce 2007. 2008. Available at:
http://aplikace.mvcr.cz/archiv2008/dokument/2008/verejnyporadek/zprava08.pdf
(retrieved 7 April 2009)

References: The Netherlands

Algemene Rekenkamer, *Opvang zwerfjongeren 2008. Stand van zaken beleidsontwikkeling*. s'-Gravenhage: Servicecentrum Uitgevers [distr.].

Altena, A., Brilleslijper-Kater, S. & Luijtelaar, M.v., 2009. *Houvast. De ontwikkeling van een bij zwerfjongeren passende interventie.* Available:
http://www.werkplaatsoxo.nl/index.php?action=view&page=100&tag= [2009, 4/3].

Bijvoets, M. 2006, Zwerfjongeren in Den Haag. Een onderzoek naar de profielen van zwerfjongeren en de hulpverlening bezien vanuit profielen, Universiteit Utrecht, Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2008. *Jaarrapport 2008 Landelijke jeugdmonitor.*

Deben, Léon, Peter Rensen & Robert Duiveman, 2003. *Nachtzwervers in Amsterdam 2003*. Amsterdam: Aksant.

Dossier Jeugdzorg, *Operatie Jong.* Available: http://dossierjeugdzorg.nl/operatie-jong/ [2009, 3/26].

European Commission, 2008. *National strategy report on social protection and inclusion the Netherlands 2008.* European Commission.

Gijtenbeek, J., 1996. *Thuisloze jongeren op weg : eindrapport van het evaluatie-onderzoek van een nieuwe methodiek van hulpverlening aan thuisloze jongeren in Den Haag, Rotterdam en Utrecht.* Amsterdam: Stichting Kohnstamm Fonds voor Onderwijsresearch [distr.].

Kamers met kansen, 2009. *Kamers met kansen.* Available:
http://www.kamersmetkansen.nl/index_content.php [2009, 4/3].

Leads on Demand, *Maatjesproject.* Available: http://www.maatjesgezocht.nl/
[2009, 4/6].

Leeuwen, P. v. & Heineke, D., 2008. Het 8-fasenmodel: methode voor planmatig werken in de maatschappelijke opvang. Utrecht: MOVISIE.

Maaskant, J., 2005. *"Bandieten", "dissidenten", "weglopers" of "verschoppelingen"? : profielen van thuisloze jongeren in Rotterdam; "Bandieten", "dissidenten", "weglopers" of "verschoppelingen"?: profielen van thuisloze jongeren in Rotterdam?* Rotterdam: Dienst Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid, Sociaal-wetenschappelijke afdeling.

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, 2008. *Aanval op schooluitval. Speerpunten.* (Updated 06-08-2008). Available: http://www.minocw.nl/aanvalopschooluitval/1000/Speerpunten.html [2009, 3/27].

Ministerie van Volksgezondheid, Welzijn en Sport, 2006. Plan van aanpak Maatschappelijke Opvang. Available: http://www.minvws.nl/images/dmo-2658121b1_tcm19-101331.pdf [2009, 9/8].

Ministerie van Volksgezondheid, Welzijn en Sport, 2007. *Voortgangsrapportage maatschappelijke opvang*. 18 februari 2008 - DMO/SSO-2830213.

Ministerie voor Jeugd en Gezin, 2007b. *Verwijsindex risicojongeren.* Available: http://www.verwijsindex.nl/over-de-verwijsindex_over-de-verwijsindex/ [2009, 3/27].

Muskens, G., 2006. *Homeless young people in Amsterdam.* Doca bureaus.

Rensen, Peter, 2002. *Uitgeteld in de Bijlmer. Nachtzwervers in de Bijlmer-hoogbouw 2002*. Amsterdam: Aksant.

Rensen, P., Arum, S. v. & Engbersen, R., 2008. *Wat werkt? Een onderzoek naar de effectiviteit en de praktische bruikbaarheid van methoden in de vrouwenopvang, maatschappelijke opvang en opvang voor zwerfjongeren*. Utrecht: MOVISIE.

Spanjaard, H., 2005. *De VertrekTraining. Intensief ambulante hulp gericht op competentievergroting en netwerkversterking.* 2e licht gewijzigde herdruk, Amsterdam: SWP.

Spanjaard, H., Bijl, B. & Veldt, M.C.v.d., 2000. *Implementatie en kwaliteitsbewaking van de VertrekTraining.* Utrecht/Duivendrecht: NIZW / PI Research.

Stichting Alleenstaande Minderjarige Asielzoekers Humanitas, 2005. *Werkplan 2005 - 2007.* Stichting Alleenstaande Minderjarige Asielzoekers Humanitas.

Susteren, J.v. 1993, "Aanpak thuisloze jeugd, het T-team" in *Overal en nergens: stijlen van aanpak van thuisloze jongeren in Nederland en omringende landen*, eds. J. Hazekamp & H. Jumelet, Utrecht.

Take off. *Kleinschalige woonvoorzieningen voor jongeren.* Available: http://www.takeoffjongeren.nl/cms/ [2009, 4/3].

Venicz, L. & Vanwesenbeeck, I. v., 1998. *Aard en omvang van (gedwongen) prostitutie onder minderjarige (allochtone)meisjes.* Utrecht: NISSO.

References: Portugal

CASTRO e CAEIRO (2004-05), "Estudo dos Sem-Abrigo", Instituto de Segurança Social, Lisboa.

Relatórios Anuais de Avaliação da Actividade das Comissões de Protecção de Crianças e Jovens (2001-2006), CNPCJR/ISS, IP in "Estudo de Diagnóstico e Avaliação das Comissões de Protecção de Crianças e Jovens", CIES-ISCTE, coord. Anália Torres, Fevereiro de 2008.

Trajectórias de Vida das Crianças e Jovens Saídos dos Lares da SCML (1996-2001) (2005) Maria Gabriela Colen (coordenadora), Edição Santa Casa da Misericórdia de Lisboa (SCML), May

Inquérito às crianças e jovens que vivem em lares, CNPCJR/IDS/IGMTS, 1998/99

- Laws and Government Initiatives:

Law nº 147/99 for the Protection of Children and Young People at Danger

Decreto-lei nº 401/82

Law nº 133/99 for civic tutelary processes;

Law nº 166/99 - Tutelary Educative

Constitutional Law, 7th Revision, 2005

Youth Associativism: Law n.º 23, 23rd June; Portaria Educação; Portaria Programa Formar; Portaria Programa de Apoio; Portaria Reconhecimento; Portaria RNAJ

PAIDEIA Initiative (Portaria n.º 58/97, 25 January)

OTL Program (Portaria n.º 202/2001, 13 March)

SNS-Youth (Despacho Conjunto 36-2004 de 22nd January)

Program TDTI ("All different, all the same" - Portaria n.º 111/2007, 24th January)

Law 71/98 of 3rd November – legal status of the volunteer

Program "Cuida-te" (Portaria n.º 655/2008 25th July)

Initiative for Childhood and Adolescence (INIA – up to 2010)

National Action Plan for Inclusion – NAPIncl 2006-2008

PNACE - National Action Plan for Growth and Employment - Programa Nacional de Acção para o Crescimento e o Emprego (2005 -2008)

QREN - Reference National Strategy Frame - Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional)

"Program Youth in Action" (2007 -2013) (Minister Council Resolution n.º 94/2007, approved by the European Parliament)

Inter-ministerial commission for youth policies 77/2007)

"Escolhas Programme (2007-2009) (Minister Council Resolution n.º 80/2006)

"New Opportunities Initiative" & Network for Recognition, Validation and Certification of Competences (RVCC)

"Programa Integrado de Educação e Formação – PIEF" (Despacho conjunto n.º 171/2006 dos Ministérios do Trabalho e da Solidariedade Social e da Educação, publicado a 10 de Fevereiro, DR n.º30, II série)

"Door 65" ("Porta 65" - Decreto-Lei n.º 308/2007, 3rd September)

Strategic Plan for Housing (2008/2013)

National Strategy for the Integration of the Homeless (2009-2015)

References: UK

Brynner, Londra, Jones (2004) The impact of government policy on social exclusion among young people. Report for the SEU and OPDM

Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG) (2008) *Child Poverty the Stats* London: CPAG www.cpag.org.uk/info/briefings_policy/CPAG_poverty_the_stats_1008.pdf

Child Exploitation and Online Protection (CEOP) (2007) A scoping project on child trafficking in the UK www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/ceop-child-traffick-report-0607?view=Binary

Children and Young Persons Act (2008) London: The Stationary Office www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2008/ukpga_20080023_en_1

Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) (2008) National Statistics: Children looked after in England (including adoption and care leavers) year ending 31 March 2008

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2006) Homelessness Statistics at www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingresearch/housingstatistics/housingstatisticsby/homelessnessstatistics

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003) *Every Child Matters*

Department for Education and Skills (DfES), (2005). Youth Matters Green Paper

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006) Working Together to Safeguard Children: A guide for inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. London: TSO.

Department for Work and Pensions (2005) *Workless Couples and partners of benefit claimants: a review of the Evidence.* Research Report No 262 prepared by Chris Hasluck and Anne E. Green

Department for Work and Pensions (2008) *Working Together: UK National Action Plan for Social Inclusion* and *Annexe 3 Indicators of Social Exclusion*.

Dickens S and. Woodfield K (2004), *Impact on Users – a Qualitative Evaluation of Safe in the City Cluster Schemes*. National Centre for Social Research/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

GHS (General Household Survey) annual report at
www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/)

Hills J, Sefton T and Stewart K, (2009) *Towards a more equal society: Poverty, inequality and policy since 1997.* Policy Press/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Homelessness Act 2002* at
www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/ukpga_20020007_en_1
*(Previous Acts of 1977, 1985, 1996 can also be accessed through the Office of Public Sector Information as above)

The National Youth Homelessness Scheme website commissioned by the Government Homelessness Team
www.communities.gov.uk/youthhomelessness/widerneeds/lgbtmodule/

Office of National Statistics (2005), *Focus on Ethnicity and Religion* at
http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub

Office of National Statistics (2002 to date) *Social Trends* 32 (2001) Social Trends 34 (2003) Social Trends 37 (2007) Social Trends 38 (2008), Social Trends 39 (2009) Annual report from ONS at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub/

Pawson et al, 2007: *Evaluating Homelessness Prevention* for DCLG at
www.communities.gov.uk/publications/housing/preventhomelessness

Prince's Trust (2007). *The Cost of Exclusion: Counting the cost of youth disadvantage in the UK*. The Prince's Trust, London. Research undertaken by Sandra McNally and Shqiponja Telhaj of the Center for Economic Performance, LSE.

Pleace, N., Fitzpatrick, S., Johnsen, S., Quilgars, D. and Sanderson, D. (2008) *Statutory Homelessness in England: The Experiences of Families and 16–17 Year Olds.* London: CLG

Quilgars, D., Johnsen S. and Pleace N. (2008) *Youth homelessness in the UK A decade of progress?* Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Rees, G. and Lee, J. (2005) *Still Running II: Findings from the Second National Survey of Young Runaways.* London: Children's Society

Safe in the City (2002) *A practical Approach to Preventing Youth Homelessness*, London Safe in the City

Social Exclusion Unit, (2001) *Preventing Social Exclusion*: Cabinet Office

Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Young Runaways.* London: ODPM

Social Exclusion Unit (2003) *Breaking the cycle of exclusion*. London: Social Exclusion Unit, www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/publications/reports

Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) (2004), *Jobs & Enterprise in Deprived Areas*: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Social Exclusion Unit (2005) *Transitions; Young Adults with Complex Needs:* Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Smith J and Ravenhill M (2007) What is Homelessness? At www.centrepoint.org