

York Youth Support Services

Model Consultation Staff Survey Results

Q1-5 - Respondents

101 members of staff completed the survey

In order to gauge numbers for some of the cross-tabulated, the following was the breakdown of respondents, where specified (these questions were optional):

14 managers

67 practitioners

10 administrators / support staff

42 staff with Youth service background

28 staff with Connexions background

19 staff with Youth Offending Team background

79 staff who work 17 hours or more per week

10 staff who work less than 17 hours per week or on a casual basis

6 staff who have worked in the service between 6 months and 2 years

24 staff who have worked in the service between 2 and 5 years

34 staff who have worked in the service between 5 and 10 years

15 staff who have worked in the service between 10 and 20 years

7 staff who have worked in the service over 20 years

Q6 – Youth Offer

94% of staff felt that the Youth Offer depiction was a fair representation of what we will need for the next few years

Of the 6 that felt it didn't, here are selected comments:

“Needs clarity over age remit for the services”

“Needs clarity over what services will be available in evening/ weekend (currently could be a bias towards office hours provision- does this meet need?)”

“Community action and volunteering opportunities for young people should be included”

“Some elements should be shown as more of a priority than others, for example - less focus on voice and influence and more focus on the elements based on young people's needs”

“I feel the offer reflects what we feel we need to provide (and can afford) rather than what the vast majority of young people would feel they would want/need/would benefit and make use of.”

“Voice and Influence is an area I would question in relation to real outcomes and value for money, and whether it is a necessity”

Q7-10 – Overall Structure / Groupings (For a more detailed breakdown of Q7-10 see spreadsheet)

58% of staff thought model B was closest to the best grouping of functions / overall structure

This overall grouping of functions preference may be slightly exaggerated based on fact many staff liked the higher level staff profile in model B and commented on it when asked to comment on overall groupings.

Nevertheless, **reasons why staff thought model B was closest to the best groups of functions were:**
(where there were duplicate views, these were reconciled – comments about staffing can be found in overall comments at end of survey)

Clear, straightforward divisions. Smaller numbers of staff doing similar work can be co-located - invaluable for peer support, continuous professional development, more efficient processes and shared outcomes.

I don't think you can impose a tiered model on much of the work undertaken

Flexibility

Allows for joint working with the voluntary sector

More targeted roles for young people's needs

It is clearest to understand and explain to outside agencies, yp and public what we do.

Standardised structure across York providing a consistent provision

It is transparent and look like it is more needs led which means the service is for the YP not other way round.

Targets the more needy young people

Clearly defined groupings protecting professional specialisms

No advantage to localities if only two of them; YP needs of various targeted support overlap, so easier if they fall into one broad column rather than tier 2 split as in A

Clear distinction between TYS and Community Development

Consistency of worker, allows the young people to develop relationships with workers, as they are not passed through a tiered structure.

Complimentary teams of professionals working together to offer client centred-support

Better delivery for targeted young people

Clear to see how a young person would progress through and access into a service set up like this one. Would mean a young person building stronger relationships with fewer workers and less duplication of any type of work. Still a flexible model that is YP focussed yet streamlined to accommodate financial changes.

It offers greatest flexibility within streams to respond to changing needs/ priorities. It allows sharing of practice and mutual staff support.

Model A and Model B are very similar, however Model B is more transparent and gives clearer structure of functions

Suggestions about improvements to model B were:

There needs to be far more emphasis on prevention and areas of work that would feed into this. The overall feel of each of the models is that of 'fire fighting', dealing with young people only at the point where they are already in intense need.

A mixture of B and C to provide a more localised provision

Strategy to link in with the voluntary sector/volunteers - a role for the business support manager?

More flexibility, with practitioners working between the three columns, depending on their specialisms.

Think it should be considered for YOT services to less of an island.

I am not sure that any model provides sufficient support to the voluntary and community sector- a SLA with CVS may be needed to do this, support needs will vary as time progresses. I wonder whether the needs of minority group may get 'lost' in the community stream (will depend on QA and management arrangements).

21% of staff thought model A was closest to the best grouping of functions / overall structure

Reasons why staff thought model A was closest to the best groups of functions were:

While there is a strong focus on targeting, it is still possible to identify vulnerable and at risk young people through open access.

I think that this makes the most sense in terms of grouping and structure. It will also allow young people to access all services regardless of where they live

The model is transparent with clear lines of accountability and with "read -across to other Children's workforce sectors. Provides resilience across all sectors, protects specialist knowledge and skills thereby ensuring a consistent and effective service. It provides a range of step -down opportunities and clear routes between levels of support and intensity of service provision. Provides capacity for developing provision within the voluntary and community sector. Provides the flexibility for the service to be directed at those areas /young people with greatest assessed need.

Targeted structured support and the ability to get resources where they are most need.

Balanced workforce to support young people, flexibility to move between tiers for the young person, focused delivery utilising resources to the best possible degree and maintaining specialisms to meet the needs of young people

It seems the closest to how we currently deliver

Similar model to other agencies, shared awareness of tier levels

Tiered model aligns with Children's Social Care, CYC Front Door thinking & needs of young people. Would hopefully have more resilience for specialities than Models B & C.

It is the easiest system to understand, it is the most clear and seems to be a natural step from where we are now.

Matches childrens services models and the tier system is well known across the city however model C is very closely second as I feel this maybe easier to adapt to

Suggestions about improvements to model A were:

I am not sure this model fits in with the wider political drivers towards localism and may not have enough resource /capacity to draw in community /private sector engagement to deliver greater universal provision.

Rather segregated (does not encourage intergration of staff) and maybe less able to respond to change.

Whilst I have chosen Model A for Q9, there are definitely some merits to combining aspects of the models. For example, I can see the advantages of locality working within a tiered model.

21% of staff thought model C was closest to the best grouping of functions / overall structure.

Reasons why staff thought model C was closest to the best groups of functions were:

Emphasis on targeted work where it is needed most (geography)

Locality approach able to respond to local issues and need - we are already working in localities and I feel most staff would say this works well

Staff with different specific expertise are able to work together to help the same young people. Lots of YP come through via universal and open access settings and then identify specific support needs. It makes sense for them to be able to access help from the same place, rather than be transferred between settings based on tiers.

It meets the locality/front line requirements. Keeps a level of consistency after the changes have been put in place.

Best chance of involving YP, best in terms of access to expertise

It is the most simple model and therefore understandable to all. Model A is far too complicated to the point where it would be difficult to conceptualise how the different components fit together. Model C also seems the most user friendly to young people - they will have 2 localities, a city centre hub and youth justice all clearly signposted with the reassurance that all are working together.

Clearer spread of the Youth Offer across the City. Clearer lines of accountability and responsibility

It gives the opportunity to reach a wider selection of young people and encourages multi agency working at a local level

Ability to target and build services in particular communities, close working with wards, councillors and vol. sector, better links with statutory youth justice system in central hub,

Easier for services to reach out to those in the community, gives a wider choice for those we are here to help and easier for closer links to be created with other organisations.

Suggestions about improvements to model C were:

It's good to base staff teams around localities but in practice this shouldn't necessarily mean that staff should share offices based on locality. Staff can become isolated if they are not able to work closely with similar workers in other areas, especially if staff numbers doing the same job are lower. Also, youth provision should still be delivered on a much more local level, with projects and sessions not just being run from 2 hubs as young people are territorial when choosing which sessions to access and may not choose to travel between areas even if transport isn't an issue. Lastly, it is important that young people have a voice in all aspects on the services they receive so 'youth involvement and empowerment' shouldn't just be based in localities but should play a part in youth justice and city-wide initiatives too.

The integration of more of the Youth Justice areas into the localities. Joint and partnership working rather than silos.

Obviously, a hybrid model would be best.

Would need to have a business manager and work closely with other CYC services e.g. children's centres, leisure, learning hubs (ie libraries)housing, health, schools etc

56% of staff thought model B was closest to the best management structure.

Reasons why staff thought model B was closest to the best management structure were:

- *It makes the most sense to me.*
- *business support manager good,*
- *Fewer tiers of management - quick and effective lines of communication. Practitioners will need to be professional, qualified in their area of expertise, autonomous and self managing to the greatest degree. A qualified and well experienced work force of practitioners will be essential in taking the slimmed down service forward.*
- *Because there is a clear distinction between justice and youth support service, so meetings and updates can easily be passed between two individual managers in regular meetings.*
- *Clearer than one incorporating 'Lead' roles etc*
- *Staff will be supported more effectively by managers with responsibility for specific areas of work. Good communication across the service.*
- *clear management structure*
- *The right amount of managers which allows higher numbers of practitioners .*
- *Managers with experience of their specialism*
- *management equally supported*
- *Business manager is an important role with commissioning of CYC services and I question the need for 'tier lead posts', an unnecessary level of management, when practitioners are well qualified and trained.*
- *it is clear who is management and who is practitioner. and although it is not the cheapest, it is better value for money.*
- *Consistent across the city*
- *Managers are more specialised rather than generic and better communication through ranks.*
- *Better support for staff members*
- *clear lines of communication*
- *likely to be clearer in terms of management roles, avoids danger of unfair demarcation between manager and 'lead' posts*
- *It feels like a joint service rather than Yot and youth. Think the focus will be directed more towards the needs of young people*
- *It appears to have clearer lines of communication between practitioners and senior managers. Managers look more accessible to practitioners and its important to feel you can have this kind of support as and when required*
- *It is clearer and defines appropriate roles and responsibilities, other models it is unclear if Leads would take on a staff support/supervision role.*
- *A business support manager - essential role to generate/explore more funding streams.*

Suggestions about improvements to model B were:

- *get rid of the Service Manager posts and keep all practice manager posts - very flat structure*
- *Reduce numbers (all models top heavy).The specialist nature of the managers in Model A would be a useful addition, though not the tiers*
- *Could still have a locality division*
- *We do not need this number of managers for a greatly reduced service.*
- *Still manager heavy and makes it difficult for people to progress*
- *yes - not have youth justice ran so separately from the rest of the service - will still be two services running alongside one another and not joining up.*

- *All three models are too top heavy- need more practitioners and fewer managers*

27% of staff thought model C was closest to the best management structure.

Reasons why staff thought model C was closest to the best management structure were:

- *Clear understanding of who does what.*
- *Managers would be forced to have a broader understanding of all services provided and would therefore be better able to support staff to support young people with multiple issues. If teams are based in localities then having a manager who understands the needs of that particular locality is vital*
- *clearer more defined lines of communication*
- *Clearest accountabilities, and support for staff*
- *Better value and cost. More sensitivity to diversity/equality needs of clients. Support for staff at ground level.*
- *Need a centre hub manager and need a clear and simple management structure.*
- *Combination of central services and youth justice management could make for more joined up thinking. Less management, 'heavy' - fewer tiers - so better communication, and greater personal responsibility but still in a clear management framework.*
- *tiered management structure*
- *management is shared out equal so practitioners have someone clear to go to for support*
- *the split into 2 localities which each have a practice manager*
- *Clear accountability. Ability to deliver services near to young people. Keeping existing models that work.*
- *clear lines of accountability but also flexibility within what will be a much depleted management system; the potential to better integrate statutory youth justice services and preventative work, feels "closer" to the young people and partners*
- *Service Managers strategic responsibility is spread across the whole service, whilst practice managers and leads can offer appropriate support to staff*
- *ability to ensure management support for practice and maintain strategic oversight during a time of change*

Suggestions about improvements to model C were:

- *Only really sensible to have locality based managers if staff teams are structured on locality areas. If they are not, model B would be more suitable. There is forced divide between youth justice and the rest of the service and that might not be useful in uniting the service under one structure.*
- *Could performance manager and business manager be one post - so as to add this function, without using too much of the budget up away from the 'front line'*
- *Model 1 accords higher status to YOT work. Not sure how this values youth and IAG work.*
- *matrix management has not worked - some people have to respond to 3 managers - hopefully we could move away from this with model C. All models will need a business manager.*
- *I don't quite understand why Service level managers are required, it looks very much like managers managing managers, this should be done by the Head of Service (who would only be supporting 6-7 people). Having a Business Support Manager is good, this will encourage other organisations to work with the new service, so closer links with other organisations.*

17% of staff thought model A was closest to the best management structure.

Reasons why staff thought model A was closest to the best management structure were:

- *Ensures proportionate level of management oversight and responsibility in areas of service that are the most highly regulated .It also has a clear oversight of all areas of business thereby ensuring an overarching management perspective. Provides effective and proportionate support to delivery of service .*
- *HOS is directly line managing Service Managers so he will have a good handle on how the Service is developing and more front line workforce.*
- *I think there would be more immediate support to practitioners.*
- *professional support to staff, business manager role,*
- *Better support and distribution of responsibility*
- *it is closest to justice model we have now and i feel that works well.*
- *A combinations of models 1 and 2 are the best option. I think the overall distribution of grades is better in A, with more managerial support for tier 1 services (at least in the short term).I think the flatter management structure of A offers a better option of the service.*
- *Transferrable to other services, easy to understand.*
- *Clear lines of responsibility & support for managers & staff. Leaned towards Model A for reasons that worked against Models B & C below (Q14).*
- *I think having a number of managers who are 'leads' and therefore working closely with staff will be extremely important for good communication across the service.*
- *in terms of the team I work within it avoids having a new level of management which I think at this time of change would be hard to introduce.*
- *Is clearly defined line management structure - the model is not top heavy with lower tiers of management which is far better for accountability , decision making and defensible decisions.*

Suggestions about improvements to model A were:

- *It's difficult to see which management model will work best when I cannot envisage what or whom the managers will be managing.*
- *In model 1 I think there needs to be on clear lead for Youth justice, with a deputy underneath, I wonder if the leads in tier 2 could be combined (as in model B to bring teams and services together- offering more flexibility/ resilience as well as a continuous service for yp in this tier)-and allowing for another lead underneath?*
- *Worry that Model A has no Service Manager for Tiers 1&2 so that level would fall to HOS? Model B is too heavy on the "red" level - feel. Model C would benefit from a "Business Manager" type role to lead on QA and commissioning for the entire service.*
- *Could adopt lead professionals in the tier 3 model*

Q 15 – Staff arrangements

See spreadsheet for breakdown of Q15.

Q16 – Statements

See spreadsheet for breakdown of Q16.

There were few trends between specific groups of staff, but below are some statements where particular groups of staff felt more strongly than others:

65% of staff with a youth service background agreed that Model B would only work if the voluntary sector took on all universal provision.

63% of staff with a connexions background disagreed that Model B would not fully utilise all of the more complex and responsible roles, as some of the work required needs staff to work more generically. On the other hand, 68% of staff with a YOT background agreed with the statement.

83% of staff with a YOT background agreed that model C would only work if it was focused away from 'bases' on outreach work and in a variety of community owned buildings.

83% of staff with a YOT background disagreed that the YOT was too separate on all of the models.

Q17 Other comments

The new service in my opinion, needs to retain as many highly skilled, trained and experienced practitioners as it possibly can. A lower grade workforce that is more transient in nature and easier to recruit as and when needed, should be kept to a minimum and would more readily come from the voluntary/community sector.

Model B could do with more lower responsibility workers, which could be financed through removing the service manager roles

The models appear to provide a range of services that will continue to support young people, to an extent, in their localities. Model B seems to offer a service geared to targeted work with the most vulnerable/ high risk young people. However it is top heavy and will rely heavily on the voluntary sector if any universal provision is put in place due to the lack of low responsibility workers. Model C offers the most balanced worker profile, however there is perhaps not enough high responsibility posts in order to only do targeted work which seems to be the way it is going. Taking in to consideration the aim will be to work with targeted, although top heavy still, model B would equip us with appropriate staff to deal with the challenging nature of targeted young people. This would also mean our work force would have to be highly skilled and trained to achieve positive outcomes with these young people.

Very difficult to judge models against each other without seeing the kind of roles each colour would take on, as responsibility is relative. All models depend more on the voluntary sector, and this would mean that more staff would need to be dedicated to training/supervising voluntary staff. It's not clear at what level these staff should sit.

I find it hard to envisage how any model will work with examples that I can relate to. I'm sorry if this is not helpful but I worry that if I try to guess an answer or interpret it I may get it wrong and therefore not be showing my true feelings.

Still very hard to decide when you dont know where and if you fit in the structure.

There are good aspects of all the models. Maintaining specialist roles as much as possible is important as well as a system of collaborative working to link specialisms and staff together.

To provide a quality service to all tiers of clients, you need a well qualified, motivated workforce with clearly defined, complimentary roles. I believe model B comes closest to this, but doubt any one of these models could be adopted without some further refinement. All three models retain far too many managers- practitioners do not

require such levels of support: almost one manager to 4 or 5 staff. This has resulted from previous mergers of services and tasking managers with developing these three models.

I feel that a more balanced model with the main frame work from Model B but with a localised/locality provision would be the most ideal model

Locality teams in my experience do not work. Young people often do not access them - the mix of staff does not assist in day to day work as do quite separate things. Knowledge and support is diluted. York is spread out so often easier for people to access city centre. Currently my line manager does not have a caseload. They do not help me with my job and I feel very over managed. In the new structure I feel managers will be needed who can help with the more complex cases, who you can offload to and will aid decision making. They will need a caseload or good understanding of support needed. Whilst front line staff are facing massive cuts and changes in role the management structure which is already far too heavy is not reflecting this in the new structure. I would be very interested in seeing comparisons across the private sector or other councils at the ratio of staff to management. On a different note I would like to see examples and research on other similar models in different councils to see what have been the positive and negative outcomes of different structures and how they work in practice.

Business manager role is important

B matches best the needs of a highly trained, professional workforce. Young people with complex needs will gain very little value from a service if it mainly provides generic or 'support' type roles. Professional qualifications, depth of experience and strong continuous professional development are what we should aim for. This is my view both as a practitioner and a 'customer' of Childrens and Young Peoples Services.

Could the Business Manager role be combined with Performance manager, and so keep management numbers to a minimum? If voluntary sector takes over activity based youth work, could these posts be absorbed into general provision. Could weighting between posts specialist/generalist be adjusted to take account of the identified needs of the young people needing the service? It seems a shame that all models place Youth Justice in such a separate place; granted there are statutory drivers to this, but there are many shared areas of interest in earlier intervention which could be developed better than any of these models currently demonstrate. Hopefully there will be parity between managers (one model puts the Youth Justice managers at a higher level), as between workers.

Staffing within these models need to be shared out on a more equal level without activity and support workers, specialist workers are very top heavy and will not have tyhe young people to work with, the support and activity workers are first port of call as young people come to them through choice if them workers are not in place and seen as important there will be no links to feed up or down in the chain of events, therefore young people will be receiving dilutred services

Based on the fact that the service will be more targeted Model B seems to be the most logical approach in dealing with this, the support of the voluntary sector would be extremely useful in making this a successful model and these are links which should be being made already and if managed could present good opportunities for young people wanting to enter this area of work in the future

A and C have too few well qualified staff.

Even when working with partners, can CYC deliver the Youth Offer with this number of staff, are we being too ambitious? I think I would ditch all universal work, apart from Urbies going out into targeted communities, and concentrate all our resources on vulnerable young people to ensure that we really do make a difference to families that are well known in the city. Huge cultural change required for many workers including case holding, CAF, etc.plus better training to take place to ensure highly professional wokforce able to assess need and deliver on a wide range of issues. In order to influence vol sector we will need to commission work - have we the resources to do this, especially as we will be expecting them to deliver much of the universal work? Concern that the service might be dominated by youth justice statutory requirements - not sure we have the balance right in management structures. Concern that voice and influence will not be embedded across the service/ partnerships but become

even more tokenistic. Need to stop working in silos within CYC and work across directorates to ensure service delivery e.g. leisure services events could be supported by youth outreach workers working with the more vulnerable clients, as CYC takes on a health responsibility making sure we have a role. Information, advice and support extremely important for all but especially LDD clients including those with mental health problems - need to work closely with the Transitions Team, Job Centre and NHS to support up to the age of 25. Not sure if any of the models have taken this need on board. Consistent staff working as teams to ensure high quality work, able to challenge and motivate themselves. The service needs to ask more young people their views on what they want. Should we have a senior member of the management team responsible for communications, tweets, blogs, facebook stuff and be resourced well so young people actually know what opportunities there are in York?

A hybrid between Band C would work. Disagree with a as it undervalues the contribution of youth work and IAG.

Would need more info on the role of a business manager and how this would impact on the service to comment on this. I feel that all 3 models need workers on all levels with the ability to progress and to become qualified.

Question 16 subsection 5 above- I don't think that only model C would require a shift away from working out of our own buildings- I think we will need to consider it with other models too. I think we need to think carefully about whether a 'detached youthwork' approach actually would address the issues (there is a tendency for it to lead to building based work- as that's often what the yp want). I think the functions of the business manager are vital to the new service, however, wonder whether they would be better located with some of the broader management so they are more integrated into the service as a whole, and more responsive to practice needs?

Again i find this difficult to actually relate to practice. the descriptions use re complexity of role I feel need examples. I would really like to contributed more but have found the process difficult.

I prefer the structure of Management that was demonstrated in Model B, however believe that across the service there needs to be a more balanced staffing approach in terms of support staff, workers and Lead roles to allow for a better staff set-up and more scope for professional development.

I personally favour Model A as it allows us to work within the context of responding to young people's levels of need. I feel Model B places rather too much emphasis on only very intensive work. I think Model C could work okay, however I have some reservations as Young People's Services has been operating on a 'locality' approach, and I have found it to be poorly organised and fragmented, with duplication of work and difficulties with communication. I am not sure York is a large enough city to justify the use of 'locality working'.

The youth justice team and YPS need to understand each others roles and work closely together in order to move forward however some teams are already doing this so over time this would happen

Further explanation is needed to give examples of the types of roles that will be included in each model. Again, my response may not be a true representation of what I really believe as I'm not sure about the finer details of each individual model.

With all the models, more practitioners and fewer managers required. Qualified, well trained staff do not require such a large fleet of managers

Q18 – Feedback on models exercise

77% of staff felt that the consultation on models had been a helpful exercise?

Of those who didn't – they gave the following comments:

Generally speaking, members of staff too concerned with the position of their own roles with each structure to really consider it from a 'service' point of view. We have had no information about job descriptions within the new service and therefore its been very difficult to realistically consider staffing structures.

I fear there has been too little information/time made available, on which to base judgements.

I have not had enough time to really get my head around this due to being on leave over Easter and a heavy work schedule this week. I have left some answers blank where I feel unable to comment or feel unsure about what they are asking. Having said that, it has made me consider the structures in more detail, which is a good thing.

Unfortunately not. Perhaps if you were involved in devising the models you can fully understand which offers what to whom, why and how. The translation of the models to the wider staff team has not been effective for me and without being able to see a comparison between a current level/worker/post and a future level/worker/post I cannot answer the questions.

Yes, however people just want to know what jobs will be available so they can plan their future! Surely some indication is available to staff?

Too little consultation-while managers had over 6 weeks to work on these models, practitioners were given one session to both assimilate the information and feedback. Survey monkey deadline was only 6 days, meaning many staff did not have the chance to discuss with colleagues and, as a consequence, many have different interpretations of the models. This is not consultation, especially as the terms of the discussion in sessions for practitioners were predetermined. The format of this survey does not allow for creative dialogue and it is difficult in practical terms, as you are unable to easily see your responses as sentences are displayed in 'one line boxes'. Very disappointed in the process and, while working hard to fulfill our role supporting young people, I have felt practitioners have been excluded from key decisions. I remain unconvinced that some senior managers have gained a thorough understanding of the different roles and responsibilities of many of their staff.

Diagrams and graphs are not enough to formulate an opinion of a restructure through a q and a survey.

Without job descriptions and clearer details it is very difficult to offer constructive criticism. Also it is impossible when faced with redundancy and whilst your profession feels very undervalued to make an impartial judgement.

although more time to assimilate the models would have been better, I understand the timing of the holidays ha approved difficult.

Yes, it has been of help, but the key issues will be the specifics of job roles, responsibilities and grading.

Because it has not been specific enough, and roles are not even clear.

It has been useful! Its just that it has not helped me become clearer about which model would be best at delivering the youth offer.

The uncertainty of job security is overshadowing the consultation process.

The process started with staff being told the number of job losses. Communication has been disappointing, with line managers fearing for their own jobs, being the main point of contact. Managers had 6 weeks plus in which to develop these models- staff were given one session to enable them to assimilate the information and feedback. By this time the criteria for discussions were limited to the three models. I have been tremendously impressed by the dignity, courtesy and conscientiousness of practioners/colleagues during this process.

I would have benefitted greatly from the opportunity to discuss the models in depth so that I could truly understand them. As I am not used to drawing conclusions from models and proposals I have found it difficult to really understand the actual physical differences between all 3 of them i.e. how the service is actually going to be?

I have no knowledge of the Youth Service. Therefore I find it difficult to comment on what is best for it.

it seems to have been a time consuming process, I ahven't had the time to go to any of the events and the models are quite difficult to understand on paper.