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It’s tough at the top - whatever sector you’re in. But in the social sector, including the youth sector, there are some distinct challenges for leaders.

The CEO needs to manage their senior team, but also their Board, on which they don’t actually sit. It’s a truism that a charity CEO has to be the Chief Fundraising Officer but these days they’re often expected to be a ‘thought-leader’ too, usually at the same time as pursuing an ‘ambitious growth agenda’ signed off by the Board just before the last CEO left. All this, and they’re also responsible for motivating staff or volunteers who are working with young people facing huge challenges.

This is what you’ll see in the recruitment ads for new CEOs. What you’ll rarely see in the job descriptions is an unambiguous accountability for the impact of the services they provide to young people – and the continuous improvement of this impact, year on year. Neither will you see Chief Execs charged with embedding a culture of accountability for outcomes throughout the organisation, from Board to frontline. The CEO of a youth organisation is driven on all sides to be anxious about fundraising, about staff morale and retention, about survival – but about its impact?
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When the sector talks about impact it asks ‘Do you measure impact? How good are you at measuring it?’ They don’t ask ‘Do you make impact? How do you know? How are you improving?’ The implicit assumption is of course you do – and if you just get better at counting the right things you’ll be able to prove it. But for a leader of an organisation serving young people their primary business should not be measuring impact, but making it: consistently delivering life-changing, enduring outcomes to young people, who are often facing multiple challenges. However hard fundraising in the youth sector is, making impact for young people is harder.

At Impetus-PEF we believe that the lack of support and challenge for leaders on actually making impact lets down young people and weakens the sector. We devote our time and resources towards providing this support and challenge. We find CEOs who are already anxious about their performance on impact, and who suspect that they are not making as much difference as they could for the young people they serve. Some of them have already delved deeper – they are aware that they don’t know who they help and who they fail, what exactly success looks like for the lucky ones, and which variables make the difference between the two groups.

Facing up to these things is difficult – at both organisation and sector levels. ‘We don’t know if we’re making any difference’ doesn’t feel like an inspiring message for staff (although we’ll come back to that). It definitely doesn’t seem like an easy thing to say to the Board who can fire you, and it’s a downright dangerous message for funders. So when the scary thought that their last glossy Impact Report doesn’t say anything meaningful about what they do crosses the overworked CEO’s mind, and is followed by the thought that they don’t know how to talk to their colleagues about the impact of their services, there’s usually only one course of action – push it back under the carpet.

We know that when a leader decides to bring their performance anxiety out into the open and grasps the impact nettle, the changes to an organisation are transformative.
Management were shocked – and responded by tightening their enrolment criteria, and halving the frontline caseloads.

This information, and the performance anxiety it inevitably induces in an organisation of dedicated people, can be used by a leader to engage the whole organisation in making a series of crucial decisions:

**Who will the organisation serve and who won’t they serve? Or, to which young people will the organisation be accountable?**

Who doesn’t really need their help – as rewarding as they might be to work with? And who is the organisation not fit to help – as hard as they might be to turn away?

**What outcomes will the organisation commit to achieving for these young people?**

Building a young person’s self-confidence, or ‘employability skills’, or improving their behaviour at school are valuable, but are they enough to feel confident that you’ve had a significant effect on a young person facing significant challenges? If you’ve decided to serve young people from low-income backgrounds with a history of struggling at school then committing to GCSE success might represent a meaningful change, and improved future prospects. But if you’re serving a group where poor mental health is their greatest challenge, then improvement on a reliable, validated scale, sustained over time, may be the right outcome for which to hold the organisation accountable. Finally, once an organisation know the long-term outcome it commits to achieving, what are the short-term outcomes, the markers of progress, which will tell them if a young person is on track?

**What programme will be delivered?**

Once an organisation has decided whom it serves, and to what end, the services offered must be critically examined. Is it credible that the programme currently delivered can get these young people to that outcome? How long must the intervention last, and how often must there be contact between a young person and their youth worker? What qualifications or experiences must that youth worker have? What’s the content of the sessions and where are they delivered? The evidence base can be useful here – positively evaluated programmes can provide pointers on content, duration, and intensity. However, taking elements of a programme that has worked elsewhere for a similar group of young people is no guarantee of success. The codified programme is simply an organisation’s best hypothesis of how it will make impact for individual young people. It will have to flex – both in real time to support individuals’ progress, and as the organisation takes data and improves the programme in response to it. But from now on when a frontline worker delivers something different, they’ll record it – so the leader and organisation can know about, and can learn from it.

**We describe it as performance management – not a top-down process to drive compliance, but a reciprocal relationship between the frontline and their managers to ensure no young person disappears from the programme or fails to make progress.**

**How will continuous learning and improvement inform frontline delivery, and the design of the programme?**

This is how you turn a decent hypothesis for making impact into a programme which can actually deliver outcomes for individuals. We describe it as performance management – not a top-down process to drive compliance, but a reciprocal relationship between the frontline and their managers to ensure no young person disappears from the programme or fails to make progress. It is based on the decisions above and tracks whether the organisation is enrolling the young people it committed to...
the organisation is delivering the
programme it codified everywhere it
operates
young people are completing the
programme
young people are making progress
during the programme (the short-
term outcomes)
young people are sustaining
that outcome past the end of
the programme (the long-term
outcomes)

Frontline staff record the data for their
‘caseload’ of young people in real time, or
as close to it as possible. They can see the
progress of the young people for whom they’re
accountable at any point.

The tracking allows the creation of real-time
feedback loops: it makes visible individual
young people’s progress towards outcomes,
and allows reflection and discussion about
what to do differently if they’re off course. This
is where frontline staff need their colleagues
and managers to provide the support,
challenge and resource that allows them to
meet a young person’s needs.

The journeys of individual young people add
up to powerful information about how well
the programme is serving those it wants to
help. Changes to the programme can be made
when leadership can see high levels of drop
out at certain points, or a repeated failure
to get young people to a certain short-term
outcome.

Changes may also be made to the decision
about who to serve – one charity found that
it was enrolling some young people that they
had agreed were ‘too hard to help’. However,
their progress throughout the programme
was no worse than the other young people
enrolled. As a result they widened their
eligibility criteria.

A leader who takes accountability seriously
doesn’t want to fail any of the young people
they serve. Performance management makes
it possible to see failures before they happen –
and when you can see this, you can take action
to prevent failure.

Evaluations can tell an organisation how many
young people it failed last year and provide
valuable insights as to why. But they
don’t give an organisation a second chance to help those
individual young people –
they have been failed, possibly
with serious consequences.
Performance management
means an organisation can
get it right first time.
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The performance management described
above is possible because of the earlier
conversations and decisions – about which
young people they will serve, about what
outcomes can be achieved for them, and
what good progress towards these outcomes
look like. A hypothesis cannot be tested – and
a better one emerge – if it is never decided
upon. A leader cannot be held accountable, or
hold others accountable, if they never decide,
and share, what they are to be accountable
for. No organisation can credibly claim to be
good at achieving all outcomes for all young
people – they must put a stake in the ground
declaring what they will try to be good at.

At the beginning of this essay, I said that raising
sceptical messages to staff about the impact
of the organisation can feel very risky to a
leader. What should they do with the anxiety
they provoke? The answer is to channel it into
taking all staff – from most senior to most
junior – through the process above. It will be
a challenging and often emotional process,
but ultimately a motivating one. Reaching
organisational clarity and alignment on who
you serve, how, and why, allows all staff to
understand how their role supports this mission, and to challenge when they don’t believe a role or activity is doing this.

Making these decisions is the first challenge for an impact-focussed leader. Turning this blueprint into reality is the second challenge, and one which takes much longer to complete, and with fewer quick wins.

It means winding down activities which are no longer part of the programme, integrating IT systems which can enable performance management, getting staff buy-in so they use it routinely, and changing job descriptions and schedules to build in the tactical and strategic performance management. These things all come with financial and time costs, and require relentless focus and attention from the CEO.

As already described, impact is far from the only thing a youth sector CEO has to worry about – or be held accountable for. A well-funded organisation which – at best – probably makes some impact for some of the young people it serves, some of the time has a great deal of work to do to improve. But at least it has the opportunity to do it. An organisation with all the tools for impact, but not the funding to deliver it, can’t do anything at all. Any youth sector leader must drive a focus on sustainability.

But the overriding accountability, and the relentless focus, of a leader is to make their organisation as good as it can be. This may seem blindingly obvious, but this is not a focus that is currently recognised or rewarded. What is celebrated is fundraising success, expansion in locations or the numbers of ‘lives touched’, high-profile moments with politicians and celebrities, and emotive case studies.

Any individual organisation can decide to make a change to their own practice. But this challenging process is even more difficult in an external environment which doesn’t recognise or support diligent focus on improving services, and slowly building robust evidence.

Funders of all stripes, including policymakers and commissioners, are accountable for funding those things most proven to, or most likely to, create impact for those who need it – and they must be better held to account on this.

We should all be anxious about those young people born into poverty in the UK today, particularly those facing the additional challenges which can derail a life full of promise. And we should be dissatisfied with our attempts to change things for them. Leading an organisation that delivers services to young people isn’t the only way to make a change. But those who take on that role must be supported – and challenged – to build accountability for outcomes for every young person into the DNA of their organisation. Only this can answer the anxious question: ‘Are we making any difference?’

... the overriding accountability, and the relentless focus, of a leader is to make their organisation as good as it can be.
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