

2018

# Delivery Options Appraisal – Youth Review



## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. This paper sets out 6 headline options for the future delivery models for youth services in RBKC, as follows:

- **Option 1:** Do nothing
- **Option 2:** Extend all current provision
- **Option 3:** Bring all commissioned services back within the purview of Council control
- **Option 4:** Re-procure all components of youth services to the market
- **Option 5:** Mixed economy model: bring key components back into Council control, procure locality based provision and activity based provision

**And**

- **Option 6:** One of the options above, with the development of an RBKC Youth Foundation to sit alongside the youth offer

1.2. Option 5 in conjunction with Option 6 is the recommended option. In this option, there would be a mixed model. Components of the current commissioned offer would instead be delivered by a new team within Early Help as well as procuring locality based provision and activity based provision.

1.3. There would be the potential to develop a Youth Foundation alongside this which could build capacity within the sector.

1.4. This option is recommended as it would best meet all of the key drivers as identified by young people, parents, the community, voluntary sector organisations and internal stakeholders. Additionally, it would be most in line with recommended best practice approaches and benchmarking analysis.

1.5. This option would enable an integrated and whole systems approach that maximises the best of our in-house expertise as well as what the sector offers. This option would ensure open access provision is maintained and delivered through organisations which are known and trusted in the community. This Option Analysis has been informed by the findings from the engagement activity, best practice analysis, the needs analysis and a service review of current provision.

## 2. PURPOSE OF PAPER

2.1. To present options on the future delivery models of youth services and set out the analysis of these options.

2.2. Based on the analysis of the options appraisal, to put forward a recommended option that meets the priorities and needs of young people and residents.

## 3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE YOUTH REVIEW

3.1. To design youth services in RBKC that meet the needs of young people, developed through consultation with young people, families and community groups.

3.2. To ensure that services meet the needs of and improve outcomes for young people

3.3.To design the best quality service for young people that improves their outcomes whilst meeting financial requirements

3.4.Reduce the number of children and young people requiring intervention from statutory services

3.5.Make services more financially sustainable and consider alternative forms of delivery

#### **4. YOUTH REVIEW PRINCIPLES & METHODOLOGY**

4.1.In developing the new service for young people, the Council has been working to principles that were identified as important to young people, local organisations, Council departments and partners. These are to:

- To refresh the offer and design services that young people say they want and are important to them;
- To build flexibility into the new model and ensure that services meet local need and are responsive to what young people have said;
- To design a service that delivers improved ambition and outcomes for young people to better meet their needs across the areas that they have said matter most to them (Future and Ambition, Community and environment, Safety and security, Happy Healthy Lives);
- To give more choice and control to young people about the services that they receive and decisions that affect them;
- To deliver a broader range of activities to young people as well as continuing to support locality based provision;
- To create new safe spaces beyond that of youth clubs or designated youth spaces;
- To ensure that services are accessible and inclusive, attracting young people who haven't typically engaged in Youth Services, including vulnerable groups such as those with Special Educational Needs or Disability;
- To strengthen targeted youth work and reduce the number of young people requiring intervention from statutory services;
- To improve alignment and coordination within and beyond youth services and to communicate the offer effectively;
- To support and capacity build within the sector, and;
- To deliver a sustainable model for the future that represents value for money.

#### **Approach and Methodology**

4.2.In commencing the youth review three key workstreams were established in order to undertake an assessment of the current provision, as well as shape the future provision of youth services in the Borough. These workstreams as outlined below, this Options Appraisal forms part of the Commissioning workstream:

- Commissioning workstream
- Outreach and engagement workstream
- Young people's engagement workstream

#### **Commissioning Workstream**

4.3. As part of the early stages of the Youth Review the Council used an appreciative enquiry methodology to review the various systems and models of youth services in the Borough.

4.4. To date this has involved:

- Undertaking a needs analysis that identified needs of young people in the Borough and set out priority areas for new services
- A review of best practice of national models of youth services and analysis of what could work in a local context
- Mapping of current provision and reviewing performance
- Running a task and finish group with internal stakeholders to identify their priorities
- Running a number of workshops with current and potential suppliers to understand what is being delivered within the borough.
- Market engagement with current and potential organisations to understand what is being delivered within the Borough.

4.5. The Council employed two outreach workers to engage with young people from across the Borough, in youth clubs, local settings and other forums, to understand their needs, views of the current provision, and future priorities.

4.6. Outreach workers and commissioners have undertaken wider engagement with parents, carers, community groups, and local residents' associations. The purpose of this engagement has been to obtain their views on current provision for young people, what their priorities are their vision for future youth services.

4.7. See the Findings and Engagement Report for more information regarding the overall numbers engaged, the types of engagement, the methodology and the findings.

4.8. The preferred model outlined within this paper will be subject to cost modelling and analysis prior to final recommendations to Leadership.

## 5. FINDINGS AND DRIVERS FOR THE NEW MODEL

5.1. Based on the findings of the work streams set out above, a number of key findings and drivers have been identified for the new youth offer to deliver against. These findings correspond to potential components which could be offered in the new model. These are set out in greater detail in the engagement and findings report, and the proposed delivery model will be explored in greater detail in the full Youth Strategy.

5.2. An overview of these findings and drivers and corresponding and recommended components for the future model, is as follows:

Driver / Finding	Evidence	Component to deliver this
Young people have a voice in shaping services /making decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people have said that they want their voices to be heard and central in decision making and shaping services. They have said they want a more coordinated approach across the Borough, and a direct link with the Council.</li> <li>• Internal stakeholders have said they want a more joined up or network approach to hear young people's voices across the Borough.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borough wide youth voice or youth participation function that connects with local decision making</li> </ul>

A more diverse offer / wider range of activities across the borough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people have said they want more choice, the sector have highlighted the diverse range in the market, and needs analysis has identified gaps in provision (see findings report for more info).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A broad activity based offer</li> </ul>
Safe spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people value youth clubs as safe spaces &amp; also wanted delivery from other community sites that are safe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth Clubs to provide this</li> <li>• Pop up activity offer from other spaces across the borough</li> </ul>
Priority areas – Future and Ambition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focus on future ambitions and aspirations including employment, mentoring, entrepreneurship and training, as well as personal development, and having opportunities to broaden their horizons through trips and new experiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority areas to run through all components- delivered through youth club provision, through youth participation work, through pop up activities and through holistic and effective targeted support .</li> </ul>
Community and environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people want to maximize use of local assets and spaces across the Borough and spoke about wanting to bring communities together. Young people also want to ensure that their voice and that of the community is central and heard when changes to services are made.</li> </ul>	
Safety and security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• young people do not always feel safe when travelling around the Borough. They have concerns about, gangs and knife crime, and feel there is a need for more safe spaces and diversionary support. For some young people youth centres have been identified as safe spaces, but a need for greater outreach has also been identified and for there to be a better balance between centre based and detached provision. There was also a want for a more robust offer of support and streamlined pathways.</li> </ul>	
Happy Healthy Lives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mental health and emotional wellbeing, was a key priority. There was a focus on what can help young people feel happy and less stressed, as well as their physical health. Young people want to see a broader range of activities available beyond a core sports offer, such as activities that support wellbeing, personal development and pathways into employment, life skills and arts based provision.</li> </ul>	
Flexible and responsive offer that can meet changing needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people want services which meet their changing and needs and priorities, and the voluntary sector also want an offer which is responsive and adaptable, especially post the Grenfell Tragedy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity based offer</li> </ul>
Locality based provision delivered across a range of community spaces and sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people value youth clubs but also want services that are not just building based, and want trips and visits outside of their youth clubs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locality offer of youth hubs</li> <li>• Activity based offer</li> </ul>
Offer is accessible to all (i.e. hard to reach groups of young people)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some young people don't feel that the youth offer is for them, or are not how to access it.</li> <li>• Providers have told us specific groups of young people are underrepresented or may not feel comfortable in accessing youth services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detached and outreach to engage all young people</li> <li>• Youth clubs to focus on</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal stakeholders highlighted that there is a need for vulnerable groups of young people and minority groups to better access services.</li> </ul>	engagement with young people
Strengthened targeted youth support  Strengthened detached and outreach offer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people, parents and the sector have highlighted a need for additional support particularly in areas of wellbeing or mental health</li> <li>Young people feel unsafe in certain areas of the borough and have highlighted a need for greater outreach and targeted support to address this more robustly</li> <li>Young people have told us they don't know where to go to or who to approach to get support</li> <li>Young people have said when they are receiving youth services and have areas of concern they don't know who to go to get the right specialist support. This can make accessing the right service difficult</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted Youth Support offer</li> <li>Detached and outreach offer</li> </ul>
More joined-up approach across service provision / whole systems approach / integrated approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The voluntary sector would like a more co-ordinated and joined up way of working to make best use of resources, avoid duplication and to best meet the needs of young people.</li> <li>Young people have said that they are confused about who to approach or how to get additional support.</li> <li>Internal stakeholders have said that they want more integrated working to promote the trusted relationship model, which is best practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Hubs best practice model which could provide this coordination function</li> </ul>
Better use of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people feel community spaces have lots of potential and that more services could be run from them. Young people have said they value local organisations in their community and feel more support for these organisations is needed.</li> <li>Residents and community groups said they would like more access to Council owned spaces for delivery of their services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pop ups activities delivered from different spaces</li> <li>Youth Hubs could offer spaces for delivery</li> </ul>
Promotion and co-ordination of the offer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people and parents want a more visible and comprehensive youth offer</li> <li>Young people want to know what services they can access, how and when.</li> <li>Organisations have said the offer needs to be better promoted and understood so that there is more coordination and opportunities to work together</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Hubs best practice model which could provide this coordination function</li> <li>Youth Participation function could also bring services together and coordinate/ advertise the offer</li> </ul>
Support and capacity build with the sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people have said they value local organisations in their community and feel more support for these organisations is needed.</li> <li>Voluntary sector organisations would like more support to build capacity, improve sustainability, work together and share resources. They want a range of opportunities: both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Foundation could build this capacity with the sector</li> </ul>

	longer contracts and more flexible provision, with proportionate processes.	
--	---	--

5.3. As seen in the table above there are a number of emerging components which could meet the drivers which have been identified.

5.4. These include:

- **Locality based provision:** which could be in the form of coordinating ‘Youth Hubs’ and additional Youth Clubs
- **Activity based provision:** which could include flexible or ‘pop-up activities’ delivered in community spaces
- **A youth participation function:** to give young people a voice, and coordinate and promote the offer
- **Targeted youth Support offer and detached and outreach offer:** to provide additional support to young people with the greatest need with direct linkages to specialist services delivered by the Council and Partner agencies to identify need and address concerns effectively in line with Early Help methodology and the trusted relationship model
- **Function to support and capacity build with the sector:** this could be in the form of a Youth Foundation

5.5. These components will be further developed and refined through engagement and co-design with young people and stakeholders, and will be set out in greater detail in the full strategy.

5.6. The options considered below have been evaluated against these drivers and key components, to establish which would best meet the priorities and requirements of young people, parents, community groups, providers and internal stakeholders.

## 6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

6.1. Six broad delivery options have been considered for the future delivery model for youth services in RBKC, from 1st September 2019 onwards. In summary, these are:

### 6.2. Option 1: ‘Do nothing’

6.3. In this option, all current youth contracts would be allowed to expire and would not be re-commissioned. This would mean provision would end once these contracts expired.

#### **Analysis of Option:**

6.4. Youth contracts are due to cease during 2019. If nothing changes, services will cease upon contract expiry. Services have not been holistically reviewed or refreshed since 2014 and since then the sector has changed and diversified.

6.5. It would not be good commissioning practice to allow the contracts to end without a clear plan in place.

6.6. The Council recognises the value that these services aim to deliver in terms of early intervention, preventative work, support into education and employment and reducing

referrals to statutory social care services. Ceasing these services would mean the positive benefits that youth services may have on young people and families across the Borough would no longer be realised and reliance on other, potentially more costly services, may increase.

**6.7. This is not the recommended option.**

**Option 2: Extend all current provision**

6.8. This option would involve extending all 11 current youth service contracts for a period of between 2- 3 years, and therefore in general maintaining the 'as is' service offer.

**Analysis of option:**

- 6.9. This option is not viable as it would mean maintaining the 'as is' service offer for a further period when change to the service model has been requested by young people. Although current providers are well connected to the community, due to the changing context in the Borough, and the identified needs and priorities of young people, this option does not meet what is required from the future youth offer. Additionally, this option would be non-compliant with current legislation as there is no legal provision to extend these contracts.
- 6.10. The current offer does not currently meet the identified drivers and priority areas of young people, community groups, the sector and internal stakeholders. For example:
- Continuing the 'as is' picture would not allow for flexibility of provision and for new provision to be implemented where there is a need.
  - It would not provide opportunities for additional providers to deliver services, and would not enable the full drivers and priorities of young people, parents, the community and providers to be met.
  - The current offer is not conducive to a centralized and joined up youth voice across the Borough; young people don't currently have a strong presence in the decision making process and shaping services.
  - This option does not best enable an integrated approach to targeted youth support and outreach between providers and Council services
  - The current offer is not believed to have resulted in expected referrals to Early Help to provide targeted support to young people most in need. Young people raised a number of key concerns and priorities which they would like addressed through a robust targeted offer.
  - Although youth club spaces would be maintained as safe spaces, this model would not best facilitate additional safe spaces in the community being established and utilized.
  - In the main, the current offer only allows for limited delivery outside of the main youth club settings.
  - Maintaining the current offer would not deliver against the driver to increase diversity, responsiveness and flexibility of provision and would not offer additional choice for young people.
- 6.11. Additionally, there would be considerable risks with this option: particularly risk of provider challenge as there is no provision to extend, and risk that young people and the community would disengage having been involved in a review focused on a transformed future service, if the 'as is' picture was then to continue.



- 6.12. Following the Grenfell Tragedy, the voluntary sector landscape has changed significantly resulting in organisations providing a wide range of services in the Borough. This option would prevent these organisations from accessing and participating in commissioning opportunities, and would therefore not make best use of available resources, expertise, knowledge and skills in the sector.
- 6.13. Unit price analysis of the current provision varies significantly from provider to provider even where like for like provision is offered. When taken as an aggregate figure the unit cost is high. Changing the model provides an opportunity to reduce the unit cost and make it more consistent and equitable across like for like provision.
- 6.14. **This is not the recommended option.**

### **Option 3: Bring all commissioned services back into the Council**

- 6.15. In this option, all components of the main commissioned youth contract would cease and from September 2019 be provided by the Council; this includes youth hubs, youth clubs, water sport sites; and open access provision; youth participation; detached and outreach work; community safety and gangs work and targeted youth support.
- 6.16. Funding to all voluntary sector organisations would cease, and support would be given to the youth sector in bidding for grants from other sources.

#### **Analysis of option:**

- 6.17. There would be potential strengths of this option including:
- The potential to develop an enhanced Targeted Youth Support function and detached and outreach function which are strongly aligned to Council practice, processes and systems. This would be especially effective given the Trusted Relationship model that the Council is embedding and alignment with wider targeted support delivered within the Council and Partner agencies.
  - This would enable greater alignment particularly across Early Help and Youth services, with practitioners sharing approaches and practice; and staff benefiting significantly from an effective training offer (such as Focus on Practice or systemic practice).
  - It would also meet key drivers in terms of providing young people and families with a more robust and joined up approach, and reducing duplication of services. Currently, youth work referrals into Early Help are not systematic. Given the range of concerns raised by young people through the review and the nature of the Early Help caseload this is an area that needs to be better connected which would be addressed via an in-house model.
  - Benefits for Locality Based Provision would include the potential alignment with a wide range of Council departments such as economic development and community safety, having direct oversight of the offer, and having greater flexibility in piloting new approaches or projects, if a procurement is not undertaken.
  - Benefits for Activity Based Provision would include the above, as well as the potential to establish direct relationships with young people who could shape the activity based offer.
  - There are particularly strong benefits to this option for the Targeted Youth Support, detached and outreach, and youth participation functions as has been outlined above. Establishing these three functions in house would facilitate a whole systems approach to supporting young people most at risk, providing young people with a central point of

contact where additional support is needed, which is in line with what young people have asked for, best practice models as well as reducing hand-offs between organisations.

- This approach would allow for greater responsiveness, alignment of services and greater efficiency.
- This would meet key drivers of young people, providers and internal stakeholders to have a strengthened targeted support offer that is strongly aligned to Early Help processes and best practice, with the benefit of being able to then extend systemic working to youth work.

6.18. However, this would not meet a number of identified drivers and priority areas of young people, community groups, the sector and internal stakeholders. For example:

- This model would not allow existing or additional local providers to bid for services; this would mean a potential loss of local knowledge and expertise.
- This would also not allow for the flexibility, service delivery or the diversity of activities which young people, the community, and providers have highlighted as key for the future model.
- Disadvantages for Locality Based Provision would be that this would not build on the expertise of existing well established youth clubs in the Borough, which are well regarded in the community and well attended by young people.
- Additionally, it may not be feasible to deliver this option in house as the Council would not have the infrastructure or the premises required to run this volume of youth club provision, in areas of need across the Borough. This could mean funding was diverted to cover costs of sourcing buildings or covering rents as opposed to funding being spent on direct provision of services for young people.
- Disadvantages for Targeted Youth Support, detached and outreach work and youth participation are that this function would not be available for external providers to tender for or deliver. If the function were moved in-house significant community based delivery would be required to ensure that the youth workers were visible, trusted and present.
- Disadvantages for Activity Based Provision, would be that this could be highly resource intensive for the Council to deliver as a full team might be required who would only be running activities part of the time. The Council does not currently have trained staff to deliver this provision, which (subject to TUPE) could result in delays in order to train staff. It would also mean activity provision was further removed from external youth club provision.
- There is the potential that this option may cost more, like for like, and would be subject to full financial modelling were it the preferred option.

6.19. Risks of this option would include a loss of provider expertise and community based delivery.

6.20. Although there would be particular benefits of this option for targeted youth support, detached and outreach work and youth participation, this would not be a feasible model for other key components such as locality based youth clubs, as the Council would not have the infrastructure or premises to deliver these elements.

6.21. This option is therefore not viable due to the strategic aims of RBKC to work closely with external organisations, including local providers in delivering services. Many local community and voluntary sector organisations are delivering services in RBKC, and across the Council there is a commitment to working collaboratively with the community and maximizing local assets.

- 6.22. For the provision of targeted youth support; detached and outreach; and youth participation; it is anticipated that efficiencies can be achieved whilst maintaining or improving outcomes for young people due the integration with Early Help that results in a reduction in duplication of key workers; a reduction in hand-offs & referrals; clearer pathways for young people and a strong internal training offer.
- 6.23. For the provision of universal youth clubs and support, additional infrastructure, such as property, may be needed and would come at significant cost.
- 6.24. While youth participation in youth clubs cannot be provided by the Council, the coordination of the overall participation network and young people's voice through an inhouse team would add significant value as the team will have oversight of participation activities across the Borough; will promote accessibility for vulnerable young people and minority groups; will promote the youth offer; and will work with young people to ensure they participate in decisions that affect them. The team will be able to ensure that young people's voices are heard in relation to local decisions that impact on them.
- 6.25. **This is not the recommended option.**

**Option 4: Re-procure all components of youth services to the market**

- 6.26. In this option a procurement process would take place for services to commence on the 01st September 2019 for all youth services, including youth club provision, youth participation, detached and outreach, community safety and gangs work, targeted family support and any activity provision that is not offered from youth clubs.

**Analysis of option:**

- 6.27. This model could potentially meet key drivers to offer a wider and more diverse range of activities across the Borough, delivering against young people's 4 key priority areas which could be built into new service specifications, and offering a flexible and responsive offer that provides opportunities for a wide range of providers to deliver services.
- 6.28. There would be advantages to this option for the elements of activity based provision and locality based provision in particular:
- For activity based provision: there is an identified need for a greater diversity of programmes and activities to be offered; this would enable a wide range of providers with specialisms in different areas, to offer services.
  - This option allows for a more creative procurement approach that offers more opportunities to providers, which would enable a broader range of activities to be offered as requested by young people.
  - For locality based provision: there would be advantages in providing opportunities to a strong external market of providers who are known and trusted, with established working relationships and communication links in the community.
  - Additionally, many of these providers are able to effectively engage with young people in specific areas of the borough or those from particular target groups, or those who might not otherwise access services. This option would therefore maintain and continue to strengthen this focus on outreach and engagement.

- This option would meet key drivers of offering range of opportunities to providers, offering a diverse range of activities and choice for young people, and supporting the sector

6.29. However, although a viable option this is not the recommended option as it would not deliver the desired integration and alignment with Council services, or deliver the targeted outcomes that young people have said matter to them. Specifically, this model wouldn't meet a number of key drivers and priorities:

- With no Council provision, there would be potential for lack of oversight of services and further fragmentation across the youth sector consisting of multiple providers delivering the same or similar services
- It would be more challenging to provide a central point of coordination and oversight of services.
- Young people have told us they can often be unsure of who to go to, in particular when they are accessing multiple services and professionals. This model would therefore not meet this priority or the best practice approach of 'trusted relationships'
- For the components of targeted youth support, detached and outreach and youth participation, disadvantages might include:
- Not meeting the key driver to strengthen and integrate elements of the Youth Offer with Family Services
- Potential duplication with the Council's targeted offer, if this component is procured. Additionally, this would not effectively meet the driver of increasing alignment between the Youth Offer and Social Work, Youth Offending, Community Safety and Early Help services.
- A third party provider is unlikely to be as equipped as a Council function to be able to broker a range of targeted and specialist support for young people from within the Council and partner organisations if required.
- Young people have said that they are unclear about what youth provision is available and who they should go to for support; having a number of providers delivering the same or similar services could therefore result in multiple professionals working with young people, with increased referral points, which could make it more difficult for young people to access the right support and services, at the right time.
- Youth forums and youth participation initiatives across the Borough would continue to function independently, without a network or making the voice of young people heard in any coordinated way.

6.30. Additionally, there would be risks in this approach including:

- The risk that this would not create the desired change and transformation of services as it would continue existing issues of fragmented external provision which is not effectively joined up and integrated with Council services.
- Risk of needs not getting picked up early enough or issues escalating to statutory services, if the targeted offer is commissioned and not delivered in line with Council practice and early help approaches.

6.31. Having a commissioned offer can deliver added value as providers can leverage additional funding while the Council cannot.

- 6.32. Providers can deliver social, cultural and economic value. For example, Locality provision, including youth clubs, could deliver strong social and cultural value, as organisations have strong connections in the community.
- 6.33. This case is less compelling for Targeted Youth Support, Detached and Outreach and Youth Participation as commissioning these services introduce potential multiple key workers; hand-offs and referrals; and loss of the ability to coordinate the voice of young people across the Borough.
- 6.34. This would not have the potential to deliver added value through integration with Council services, specifically in relation to aligned practice and training.
- 6.35. **This is not the recommended option.**
- 6.36. **Option 5: Mixed economy model: bring key components back into Council control, procure locality based provision and activity based provision.**
- 6.37. With this option, there would be a mixed model of delivery.
- 6.38. A specification would be developed for youth club provision and youth provision within two 'hub' sites, in addition to two water sport facilities. A procurement of these elements would be run in time for services to commence on 1st September 2019. In addition, a framework style agreement would be established which providers could apply to join to deliver a core schedule of programmes and activities in addition to bespoke, seasonal activities that offer a flexible model of delivery. Finally, youth work (consisting of Targeted Youth Support, Detached and Outreach) and Youth Participation would be delivered by the Council.
- 6.39. The proposed model draws on best practice elsewhere. Best practice youth models have been reviewed and 6 models have been proposed as potential fits. After reviewing these, a blended model is being developed with the best of each of these models. These are the Locality Model of Tower Hamlets, the Early Help and Prevention model of Hackney and Norfolk's Youth Advisory Board. Research into Ian Thomas' work on contextual safeguarding in Rotherham as well as longitudinal research carried out by Dartington Social Research Unit on measuring impact have also informed the proposed model.

**Analysis of option:**

- 6.40. This option, combined with option 6 below, is the recommended option, as it would best meet the priorities of young people, diversify the offer and maximize Council and wider sector resources and expertise. Please see the analysis above which builds a case for this option.
- 6.41. In particular, it would address all key areas and priorities including:
- Ensuring young people have a voice in shaping services, through both coordinating and joining up existing youth forums and establishing a Borough wide youth participation function.
  - Offering a more diverse range of activities across the Borough, which is flexible and responsive to needs of young people and provides opportunities for a wide range of providers to deliver services.

- Maintain youth clubs as safe spaces for young people to access whilst developing additional community venues and other spaces where services can be delivered.
- Promote engagement and outreach both through the in-house detached and outreach service which would be well placed to link young people into both Council and provider services; and engagement of young people who do not typically access services by providers who are well regarded and trusted in the community.
- Deliver a whole systems model with an integrated offer with the Council.
- Offer a central coordination function of the overall offer.
- Enable the best use of both what the sector offers, in addition to developing in-house capacity and expertise
- Enables a thorough understanding of the local context and needs with the ability to respond accordingly through either procurement or in-house delivery.

6.42. This would offer benefits in line with the key component areas as it would enable the best use of resource and expertise across both internal Council departments and the sector, as follows:

- For locality based provision: This would enable effective use of two youth hubs as community assets which are run and coordinated by the Council, and therefore accessible for all groups to use. While the Council would coordinate the building, organisations will provide youth club provision.
- There is a strong market of local providers who are known and trusted, with established working relationships in the community.
- Additionally, many of these providers are able to effectively engage with young people in specific areas of the Borough or those from particular target groups, or those who might not otherwise access services. This option would therefore maintain and continue to strengthen this focus on outreach and engagement.
- This option would meet key drivers of offering range of opportunities to providers, offering a diverse range of activities and choice for young people, and supporting the sector
- For activity based provision: there is an identified need for a greater diversity of programmes and activities to be offered; this would enable a wide range of providers with specialisms in different areas, to offer services.
- This would give young people the chance to participate in decision making in terms of which projects are needed and established.
- This option also implements the priorities of young people, to have a wider range of activities spread across the Borough.
- This option allows for a more creative procurement approach that offers more opportunities to providers, and allows new providers to join regularly in offering services, which would enable a broader range of activities to be offered as requested by young people.
- Unit price analysis of the current provision varies significantly from provider to provider even where like for like provision is offered. When taken as an aggregate figure the unit cost is high. Changing the model provides an opportunity to reduce the unit cost and make it more consistent and equitable across like for like provision.

6.43. Specific benefits for targeted youth support, detached and outreach work and youth participation:

- As outlined under option 3 above, there are strong benefits to establishing these three functions within the Council. This would result in a whole systems approach to supporting young people most at risk, providing young people with a central point of contact where

additional support is needed, which is in line with best practice and avoids multiple referrals.

- This will ensure greater alignment across Social Work, Youth Offending, Community Safety and Early Help services. This will also enable practitioners to use the same approaches and develop systemic practices, reduce duplication of services and provide young people and families with a more joined up approach so that they know who to contact if they need support.
- This would meet the driver to strengthen and integrate elements of the Youth Offer with Family Services. In doing so this will further embed Contextual Safeguarding as an approach to understanding, and responding to, young people's experiences of significant harm beyond their families
- This would meet key drivers of young people, providers and internal stakeholders to have a strengthened targeted support function that is integrated with Council services, with the benefit of being able to then extend Early Help approaches such as systemic working, to a youth work.

6.44. There may be disadvantages to this model including:

- The set up costs were youth hubs to be run by the Council, and resource implications in terms of managing these premises.
- There would be some reduction in the potential funding available to organisations if some provision were delivered by the Council. However, there will continue to be a range of extensive opportunities being offered to providers through the procurement process through the locality based provision as well as more specialist activity focused provision. This would develop a diverse and varied range of activities across the Borough.
- There is a potential that the vision for a joined up offer is not achieved if a combination of in-house and commissioned services are offered. However, a key function of the Council provision is to establish a central point of coordination across commissioned and independent providers. This will result in organisations working more collaboratively and young people knowing who to approach when they need support.

6.45. This option would enable the greatest benefits and deliver the greatest added value by implementing a mixed model that builds on the strengths of the sector and the Council.

6.46. Youth participation and strong engagement in youth clubs will continue to be supported through commissioned provision, and the coordination of the overall participation network and young people's voice through an inhouse team would add significant value as the team will have oversight of participation activities across the Borough; will promote accessibility for vulnerable young people and minority groups; will promote the youth offer; and will work with young people to ensure they participate in decisions that affect them by linking in with decision making across the Council.

6.47. Having a commissioned offer can deliver added value as providers can leverage additional funding and deliver social, cultural and economic value.

6.48. For the provision of targeted youth support; detached and outreach; and youth participation; it is anticipated that efficiencies can be achieved whilst maintaining or improving outcomes for young people due the integration with Early Help that results in a reduction in duplication of key worker; a reduction in hand-offs & referrals; and a strong training offer.

6.49. **This is the recommended option subject to detailed cost modelling.**

6.50. **Option 6: One of the options above, with the development of an RBKC youth foundation to sit alongside the youth offer.**

6.51. This option would establish an independent organisation (registered as a charity) that will act as an umbrella organisation for all providers in the voluntary sector that work with young people. This organisation will sit outside of the Council and will bolster the future youth offer. The organisation will help to sustain, capacity build and support the voluntary sector in the Borough.

6.52. There will be 4 cornerstones of the Foundation model that will develop and sustain a robust voluntary sector. These are to:

I. Work as a strong consortium to fundraise collectively in order to:

- Secure funding from *new* sources (e.g. Big Lottery and European Social Fund) into the local area
- Successfully secure commissions from the local authority
- Attract corporate and individual funding streams. The YPFs should be a practical and simple way for the corporate sector to engage with CYP organisations

II. Organise sector (and location) specific capacity building including training events, advice sessions and a forum for organisations to share ideas and best practice

III. Share venue spaces and develop a 'venue bank'

IV. Coordinate sector networking opportunities and support services.

6.53. Once they have established their four cornerstones of work, the organisation could develop other services to the sector, including:

- The distribution of small grants to member groups (where funds allow)
- Developing local giving programmes
- Centralised accountancy and pension services for member organisations

6.54. While these are desirable they are not essential components of a foundation model.

**Analysis of option:**

6.55. The foundation would sit alongside any of the options identified above; it would support the sector enabling organisations to develop sustainable services and bid for alternative funding streams, coordinate the youth offer and enable providers to share resources and spaces. It would build the capacity of providers to deliver high quality services, whether independently or on behalf of the Council, and to robustly measure impact and outcomes. A Foundation model enables the sector to be innovative, creative and more robust in securing long term funding that sits outside of Council funding arrangements.

6.56. The benefits of a foundation model include:

- Providing fundraising expertise to smaller organisations.



- Embedding coordination and collaboration within the voluntary sector. This is especially needed in RBKC as it has been a constant theme from engagement with the market that there is a need for collaboration and the coordination of a network.
- Sharing knowledge of alternative funding streams between member organisations thereby promoting sustainability.
- Complimenting RBKC's values and principles of sustainability of smaller and local 'grass roots' organisation in RBKC.
- Encouraging organisations to be more independent.
- Closer working between the Council and members of the foundation to shape the priorities and vision of the sector.

6.57. In considering a youth foundation, three possible routes were considered, these being a Council managed foundation; the John Lyons model for a Youth Foundation; and a foundation run by an alternative provider.

6.58. Please see appendix 1 for analysis of these three routes that explored these various iterations and how these would best meet the needs of RBKC. John Lyons' Youth Foundation model is being recommended given that the aims and objectives of this model are consistent with what is needed in the Borough, including areas such as income generation on behalf of the sector, as well as the fact that this route was the only one where the Youth Foundation model would benefit from being match funded.

6.59. Funding a foundation model represents value for money as it promotes long term sustainability and works with the sector to identify alternative funding sources. It also promotes collaboration with member organisations to share resources and spaces, thereby deriving further value for money.

6.60. John Lyons' Youth Foundation model represents added value due to the fact that the organisation is expected to match fund the foundation with RBKC spend.

6.61. **The John Lyons model is the recommended route for the RBKC Youth Foundation.**

## **7. Recommendations:**

7.1. Option 5 in conjunction with a John Lyons Youth Foundation is the recommended option. Locality Based Provision would be re-procured, Activity Based Provision would be established by implementing a Framework for providers, and a new extended Early Help Team would be established to offer youth work and youth participation. These youth services will be in place from 01 September 2019.

7.2. Alongside this, the Council will commence with activity to set up a Youth Foundation once the key decision is approved.

7.3. This option is recommended as it diversifies the youth offer, it enhances activity based provision, enables an integrated and whole systems approach that maximizes expertise of the voluntary sector and the Council. This option would ensure open access provision is maintained and delivered by local organisations that are known and trusted in the community. It would meet specific drivers and priorities including:

- Embedding coordination and collaboration within the voluntary sector. This is especially needed in RBKC as it has been a constant theme from engagement with the market that there is a need for collaboration and the coordination of a network.
- In establishing a network, knowledge of alternative funding streams can be shared between member organisations thereby promoting sustainability and reducing competition.
- The Foundation model compliments RBKC's values and principles of sustainability of smaller and local 'grass roots' organisation in RBKC.

7.4. Were a Foundation to be established, we would be able to build capacity within the voluntary sector to ensure they can participate in grant and procurement processes whilst maintaining a core offer outside of the Foundation.

## 2. APPENDIX 1

Item	All in-house	External provision: John Lyons Youth Foundation Model	External provision
<b>Description</b>	<p><i>In this option a Council managed foundation would be established, with an internal team established in order to provide support to the voluntary sector.</i></p>	<p><i>John Lyons Youth Foundation model established to develop an umbrella function across the sector, developing capacity, sustainability, sharing resource and promoting alternative funding streams.</i></p> <p><i>John Lyons is expected to match fund annually, and part of the offer is the promotion of a shared portal with other community groups that are DBS checked and have safeguarding policies in place. In this way, voluntary sector organisations that typically lack community spaces will have access to locations to run their activities.</i></p>	<p><i>Model developed by an alternative external organisation, which will act as an umbrella organisation across the sector, developing capacity, sustainability, sharing resource and promoting alternative funding streams</i></p>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has effective oversight of the performance of the services.</li> <li>• The Council has effective performance management processes in place to address issues or performance of arrangements. It would be responsible for the process and therefore considered as a neutral advisor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The significant benefit of this option is the match funding that John Lyons will contribute annually to infrastructure costs as well as the neutrality of the foundation.</li> <li>• The John Lyons model is known across London and recognised as a good practice model, with a strong record of delivering additional funding streams and supporting organisations across several London Boroughs</li> <li>• The Foundation could attract additional funding streams to run grant processes or distribute the funding according to agreed and local priorities.</li> <li>• The Foundation will be viewed as independent from the Council and able to coordinate and harness its network and members.</li> <li>• The Council could still be an active partner, helping set the local priorities and being an active participant to sustain the market, develop the network, assist where possible to secure funding from new sources and promote Council venue spaces.</li> <li>• The John Lyons model is well established across London</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are organisations with expertise in delivering some of the key cornerstones: such as supporting voluntary sector organisations in bidding for alternative funding streams.</li> <li>• There could be greater flexibility in how the model is developed, working alongside an organisation to establish a new model, as opposed to following an already established format for a youth Foundation</li> <li>• The Foundation will be viewed as independent from the Council and able to coordinate and harness its network and members.</li> <li>• The Council could still be an active partner, helping set the local priorities and being an active participant to sustain the market, develop the network, assist where possible to secure funding from new sources and promote Council venue spaces.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Disadvantages</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council may not be better placed to secure additional non-statutory funding which is only available to the voluntary sector providers registered as charities.</li> <li>• Could be seen as having a conflict of interest being within the Council.</li> <li>• Providers might see this as being further removed from the sector as a whole.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially less flexibility in adapting this offer as it is based on an existing model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although there are organisations with experience of delivering some of the key foundation areas, this would not offer the same level of expertise or evidenced good practice, as adopting a well-established London wide model, such as the John Lyons Youth Foundation model.</li> <li>• This option would not necessarily deliver match funding</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---	--	---